

11. FULL APPLICATION – PROPOSED RESTORATION AND EXTENSION OF THORNSEAT LODGE AND ANCILLARY BUILDINGS TO FORM HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION AND GUEST FACILITIES; ERECTION OF EVENTS VENUE; ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING ACCESS INCLUDING PARKING FACILITIES; ENHANCED SITE LANDSCAPING, THORNSEAT LODGE, MORTIMER ROAD, SHEFFIELD (NP/S/0622/1300, JRS)

APPLICANT: THORNSEAT LODGE LTD

Summary

1. Thornseate Lodge is located in open countryside adjacent to Bradfield Moors 2.2km west of Low Bradfield.
2. The application proposes the conversion and extension of the Lodge to create six units of holiday accommodation and the erection of a wedding venue and bunkhouse in the former courtyard, along with alteration to the existing access, creation of internal driveways, car park and associated landscaping.
3. The proposed development would result in the restoration of the original lodge, an important non-designated heritage asset, but with some significant rebuilding and it would also involve the erection of a new courtyard of buildings to provide the wedding venue. By virtue of its scale and nature, the wedding venue would result in unacceptable harm to the valued characteristics of the area, particularly in terms of tranquillity and quiet enjoyment. Consequently, the development would not deliver the public benefits required to justify major development and would result in harm to the landscape and cultural heritage of the National Park.
4. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

Site and Surroundings

5. Thornseate Lodge is located in open countryside approximately 2.2km west of Low Bradfield. It sits above Mortimer Road, the main route through this part of the National Park, connecting the A57 and A616, via the Bradfield and Ewden valleys. Bradfield and Strines Moors lie above the site, with fields below the road extending down to Dale Dike reservoir. The site was originally built and occupied as a shooting lodge and later occupied as a children's home. The building has been unoccupied for the past thirty years and the condition of the building has deteriorated significantly. It is not a listed building but it is considered to be a regionally important non-designated heritage asset and it is a locally prominent building.
6. Thornseate Lodge sits within a site of approximately 3.2 hectares, with a further 7.3 hectares of land to the north also within the applicant's ownership. The site comprises the Lodge and a number of ancillary buildings which are set within an extensive area of woodland which is made up of conifer plantation and self-set deciduous trees. The setting of the lodge was originally enhanced by the ornamental planting of Scots pines and rhododendrons which provided areas of increased privacy and allowed the principal façade to be viewed from Mortimer Road to the east. The vegetation is now very overgrown and unmanaged and the building has suffered from vandalism and theft of materials so it has security fencing around it. The original drive to the Lodge runs through the woodland from the south-west, off Mortimer Road. There are a number of public footpaths off Mortimer Road and open access land on the moors to the north of the site.
7. Land to the west of the site is within the Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) Special Protection Area (SPA), South Pennine Moors Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the Dark Peak Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).

8. Access to the site is from Mortimer Road along the historic driveway. The nearest neighbouring property is Warden's House located 25m to the northeast of the Lodge.

9. The supporting Planning Statement provides the following useful background information on the site:

"The building is of regional architectural and historical interest as a fine example of mid to late Victorian architecture, its association with the Jessop family (of Jessop's Hospital fame) and a reflection of the growing fashion for grouse shooting at its time of construction. The Lodge is associated with a number of extant and ruined buildings which primarily relate to its earlier periods of use and which draw significance from their association with the main house.

At the outbreak of the Second World War in May 1939 it was announced that Thornsett Lodge would house infants from Herries Road Nursery 'in case of emergency' (Sheffield Daily Telegraph 4th May 1939). It was the start of a long association with children and when peace returned Thornsett Lodge was used as an adjunct to Sheffield Corporation's cottage homes at Fulwood. It was also around this time that the name appears to have been changed to Thornseat Lodge. Several photographs survive from its time as a Children's Home which also show the building prior to its more recent collapse. A swimming pool was built at the rear of the house and in 1973 it was described as a mixed sex home for 16 emotionally disturbed or 'difficult' children of all ages. By 1978 it was listed as an Intermediate Treatment Centre accommodating 12 young people, however, in 1980 it was closed down. It had limited use after this, as in the early 1990s it was used by the Sheffield Gingerbread Group as a place for families on low incomes to go and stay.

In 1994 Sheffield City Council sold the site at public auction. The site was then occupied by a caretaker until the late 1990's. The site was at the time of becoming vacant bounded by stone walls on all boundaries and iron gates to the bottom of the drive secured by padlock, the Lodge building itself was alarmed, however such technology did not exist as to secure the entire site boundary with alarms. However, despite these efforts the Lodge, and the other vacant buildings on site were repeatedly the victim of architectural theft, arson and general antisocial behaviour.

In 2017 the site was acquired by the present owners and had a new site boundary wide technological alarm/ CCTV system installed to detect intruders, warn intruders to leave immediately with audible tannoy alarms, and alert their presence to fulltime guards."

Proposal

10. In summary, the application proposes the restoration and extension of Thornseat Lodge and ancillary buildings to form holiday accommodation and guest facilities to provide a wedding and events venue, with associated access and parking works. The various elements are set out in more detail below. The resubmitted application now includes some additional details and revised plans which seek to address some of the concerns raised on the previous application. These include a revised Viability Appraisal report, a Travel Plan, a Transport Statement, an Energy and Sustainability statement, a Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment, a revised Flood Risk Assessment, a revised Landscape and Visual Appraisal, an updated Ecological Appraisal and the associated protected species reports, a Heritage Statement, a Noise Impact assessment, a Structural Report and addendum, a woodland management plan, and lighting scheme product schedule.

Lodge accommodation

11. The application proposes the restoration and extension of Thornseat Lodge and ancillary buildings to form holiday accommodation and ancillary guest facilities.

12. The plans are very similar to those submitted for the previous application, but with some important changes. They show that the south-east elevation (front), north-east elevation

(side), south-west elevation (side) and part of the north-west (rear elevation) would be retained. The remaining elevations and roof structure would be re-built and a new floor plan and two-storey rear extension would be constructed. New and replacement window and door frames would be provided.

13. The extension would be two storey projecting from the rear of the lodge. The extension would have two projecting gables and connecting flat roof structure reflecting the elevation behind and the roof and walls would be clad with natural stone and slate. The design and appearance of the rear extension would have a more contemporary appearance than the original lodge, particularly in terms of window design.
14. The lodge would be sub-divided internally to provide six holiday cottages, five with three bedrooms and one single bedroom. Each holiday cottage would have bathroom(s), kitchen/living room and a separate external access. A shared lounge/sitting room would be provided at ground floor.
15. The existing pool to the rear of the lodge would be removed/filled in and incorporated into the garden.
16. The existing modern garage to the rear of the lodge appears to be retained for storage.

Wedding venue

17. The application states that the development would restore a historic stable block. However, the stable block buildings no longer exist, so the scheme is based on an interpretation of what was thought to be there. Therefore, the application proposes the erection of new buildings in the location of the former stable block to be used as a wedding venue.
18. The wedding venue would have a total floor space of 868m² and include a dining area, stage, external courtyards, meeting rooms, catering area, entrance foyer, toilets and storage. The buildings would be arranged within the walls of a courtyard, with one and two storey stone buildings with pitched roofs around the perimeter. The majority of the internal courtyard would be provided with a glazed roof.
19. To the south west of the proposed wedding venue, an external courtyard would be created with stone retaining walls and stone steps down to the access road and car park.
20. An existing building known as the 'engine room' would be converted for use as ceremony space, keeping an open space with mezzanine above.
21. A new detached building forming two-storey bunkhouse accommodation would be constructed on the ruins of a former building, described in the application as a cottage. This building would provide four bedrooms with 13 sleeping spaces, bathrooms, living room and kitchen.
22. The former Game Larder would be retained as existing to use as storage.
23. The application proposes the erection of a building to house a biomass boiler to provide a renewable energy heat source across the site.

Access, parking and landscaping

24. A car park providing for car/ minibus/ cycle parking would be set within the wooded area adjacent to the events venue. The car park would provide 80 spaces for cars along with an additional overflow parking area. The car park would be surfaced with a mixture of tarmac and grass reinforcement mesh. It proposes 8 dedicated EV charging spaces and capacity

for 8 more to be provided. Three disabled spaces would be provided for cars. A landscaping scheme and woodland management plan has also been submitted.

25. The existing driveway to the lodge would be retained with the existing stone setts. Two new internal access roads would be created from the main access and existing drive to a proposed parking area. The new access roads along with hardstanding around the Lodge would have a tarmac surface.
26. Outside patio areas would be surfaced with paving flagstones.

Sustainable building, climate change and utilities

27. The application states that conversion of existing buildings is a sustainable form of development in that it seeks to re-use existing buildings. It says that the development will be built to meet modern standards of insulation, heating, lighting, glazing and draught-proofing. The application includes a biomass boiler, housed in a separate building, to provide heating for the development. Following the concerns raised in the consideration of the previous application, other measures have been discussed with the applicants and are referred to in this report.
28. Surface drainage would be dealt with by a sustainable urban drainage strategy (SUDS). This would include cellular trench soakaways, oversized pipes, and storage with a restricted outfall managing runoff from surfaces and connecting downpipes to water butts. The application states that foul drainage will be to a package treatment plant discharging to a drainage field or ditch. A detailed drainage report has now been submitted which addresses the concerns initially expressed by the Sheffield Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA).

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons

- 1 The development would be major development in the National Park. The development should only be allowed in exceptional circumstances and in the public interest. Whilst it would result in some restoration of a non-designated heritage asset, this benefit is outweighed by the harm caused by the proposed development. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policies GSP1, DS1, RT1, E2 and the National Planning Policy Framework.**
- 2 The development would result in harm to the character and setting of Thornseat Lodge, which is a non-designated heritage asset of regional importance contrary to policies L3, DMC3, DMC5, DMC10 and the National Planning Policy Framework.**
- 3 The development would harm valued landscape character, as identified in the Landscape Strategy and Action Plan, particularly through the impact on tranquillity and dark skies. The development is therefore contrary to policies L1, DMC1, DMC3, DMC14 and the National Planning Policy Framework.**
- 4 The development would not be sited in a sustainable location and has not been designed to mitigate the impacts of climate change. The development does not encourage sustainable transport and would exacerbate the impact of traffic in the local area. The development would not encourage behavioural change or achieve a reduction in the need to travel. The development is therefore contrary to policies CC1, T1, T2, DMT6 and the National Planning Policy Framework.**

Key Issues

- Whether there is a justification for the proposed major development
- The impact of the proposed development upon the valued characteristics of the National Park
- Whether the development is acceptable in all other respects.

Relevant Planning History

29. 2008 – 2013: Four enquiries received about the dilapidated condition of the building.
30. 2018: ENQ 34312: Pre-application enquiry about current proposals. Officers advised that the proposal would be major development and normally contrary to our development plan. Therefore, exceptional circumstances would need to be demonstrated to justify enabling development that achieved the restoration of the lodge. Concerns were raised about the impact of the proposals upon the lodge. Officers also provided advice on information required to support the planning application.
31. 2020:NP/S/0620/0511: Planning application refused for the *“Restoration and extension of Thornseat Lodge and ancillary buildings to form holiday accommodation and ancillary guest facilities. Restoration of historic stable block for wedding venue, restoration of existing access and creation of new car park and associated landscaping and management”*.
32. The reasons for refusal were:
1. *The development would not be in the public interest and therefore exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify the proposed major development. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policies GSP1, DS1, RT1, E2 and the National Planning Policy Framework.*
 2. *The development would result in very significant harm to Thornseat Lodge, which is a non-designated heritage asset of regional importance contrary to policies L3, DMC3, DMC5, DMC10 and the National Planning Policy Framework.*
 3. *The development would harm valued landscape character, as identified in the Landscape Strategy and Action Plan and tranquillity and dark skies. The development is therefore contrary to policies L1, DMC1, DMC3, DMC14 and the National Planning Policy Framework.*
 4. *The development would not be sited in a sustainable location and has not been designed to mitigate the impacts of climate change. The development does not encourage sustainable transport and would exacerbate the impact of traffic in the local area. The development would not encourage behavioural change or achieve a reduction in the need to travel. The development is therefore contrary to policies CC1, T1, T2, DMT6 and the National Planning Policy Framework.*

Consultations

33. Parish Council - *“Due to further information having been received by Bradfield Parish Council from the applicant regarding the parking and other issues surrounding Thornseat Lodge, Bradfield Parish Council would like to withdraw its comments previously submitted on 10-11-22. This will in effect remove any prior concerns we may have raised”*.
The Parish Council’s initial comment was: *“Councillors have concerns given the planning history in the local area and problems in relation to previous nearby wedding venues. If this application is granted Councillors would wish to see parking restricted to on-site with no road-side parking allowed.”*
34. Highway Authority – No response to date.

35. Sheffield City Council – No response to date.
36. Environmental Health – No response to date.
37. Lead Local Flood Authority – No objection. Recommend that full details of the proposed surface water management for the site are secured by an appropriate condition.
38. Environment Agency – No objections.
39. Historic England – On the basis of the information available to date, in our view you do not need to notify or consult us on this application under the relevant statutory provisions.
40. Natural England – No objection subject to appropriate mitigation being secured:
41. *“We consider that without appropriate mitigation the application would:*
42. *Have an adverse effect on the integrity of Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) Special Protection Area and South Pennine Moors Special Area of Conservation.*
43. *Damage or destroy the interest features for which Dark Peak Site of Special Scientific Interest has been notified.*
44. *In order to mitigate these adverse effects and make the development acceptable, the following mitigation measures are required / or the following mitigation options should be secured:*
45. *mitigation measures should be as put forward in the Habitats Regulations Assessment with actions during the construction and operation phases agreed and established in a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and / or Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) and the Bird and Bat Mitigation Plan.*
46. *We advise that appropriate planning conditions or obligation is attached to any planning permission to secure these measures.*
47. *Natural England acknowledges receipt of ‘Thornseat Lodge, Strines Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment’ (May 2021) and agrees with its conclusion that, taking into account the proposed mitigation, it has been possible to conclude that there would be no adverse effects upon the integrity of designated sites either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. The mitigation measures being:*
 - a. *the release of fireworks or sky lanterns, or any other such devices that cause short-term but significant noise and light disturbance, and fire risk, will not be permitted during any function held at Thornseat Lodge, at any time of the year. Guests of the holiday apartments will also be subject to the same restriction during their stay at Thornseat Lodge.*
 - b. *acoustic insulation will be used in renovations and extensions at all site buildings where loud music could be played during functions, to reduce the level of noise that punctuates the outside space from internal function rooms.*
 - c. *an upper-decibel limit on any PA music system that may be generated from the outdoor and terrace spaces at the wedding venue between the hours of operation (13:00 to 00:00) will be implemented during the bird breeding season (March to August, inclusive).*
 - d. *the existing woodland buffer at the western site boundary (see Figure 9 of the Bird and Bat Mitigation Plan) will be strengthened with new planting of a well-vegetated boundary of native fruiting species, maintained during and post construction to help minimise*

disturbance of birds using nearby habitat, and managed for biodiversity and nature conservation through a Management Plan.

48. *We note that the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) has not been produced by your authority, but by the applicant. As the competent authority, it is your responsibility to produce the HRA and be accountable for its conclusions. We provide this advice under the assumption that your authority intends to adopt this HRA to fulfil your duty as a competent authority. the release of fireworks or sky lanterns, or any other such devices that cause short-term but significant noise and light disturbance, and fire risk, will not be permitted during any function held at Thornseat Lodge, at any time of the year. Guests of the holiday apartments will also be subject to the same restriction during their stay at Thornseat Lodge.*
49. *The CEMP, LEMP and Bird and Bat Mitigation Plan should address the potential impacts of fire, noise, illumination, and visual disturbance which, if unmitigated, could lead to a likely significant effect or an adverse effect on the integrity of the designated sites. We therefore advise that appropriate planning conditions should be attached to any planning permission to secure these measures.*
50. *Please note that if your authority is minded to grant planning permission contrary to the advice in this letter, you are required under Section 28I (6) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) to notify Natural England of the permission, the terms on which it is proposed to grant it and how, if at all, your authority has taken account of Natural England's advice. You must also allow a further period of 21 days before the operation can commence."*
51. PDNPA Archaeology – Makes detailed comments (available in full on the Authority's website) and summarises the response as follows:

Assessment Summary and Recommendation:

- The development represents a use of the Lodge building and wider site that would secure some heritage benefit, and secure the future of a heritage asset (the lodge) that is in very poor and deteriorating condition.*
- The proposals for the site will result in some harm to the archaeological and historic interest of its heritage assets.*
- The development claims to achieve the 'restoration' of a number of structures of which very little remains. There is so little standing fabric left at the site of 'The Cottage' and at the Stable Yard, that the development as proposed is not a 'restoration' of these structures, but rather entirely new buildings on the site of these historic structures. The core significance of these structures lies in the archaeological and historic interest, and siting new buildings over their footprint will result in the complete loss (or almost complete loss) of this interest and significance.*
- As non-designated heritage assets NPPF para. 203 requires a balanced judgement needs to be made that has regard to the scale of the harm and the significance of the heritage asset affected by the proposed development.*
- Should the planning balance be favourable conditions are recommended.*

52. PDNPA Conservation Officer – Largely repeats her comments on the previous application, to which she objected, but notes the following changes. Firstly, the rear extensions in traditional materials - sandstone and Welsh slate - are an improvement on the previous proposals, more sympathetic to the non-designated heritage asset and reflecting the historic enlargements to the original Lodge, which were in stone. However, as previously commented, these extensions are still large and dominant. Secondly, more of the south-west elevation is being retained than previously, and some sections of timber panelling and the plasterwork cornices and door architraves are now being retained and replicated, which is welcomed. However, as previously commented, internally the historic plan-form would

still be largely lost, in particular to the earliest 1853 Lodge. Her comments on the previous application were as follows:

53. *“Thornseat Lodge is an important non-designated heritage asset, noted in the Heritage Statement as a building of regional architectural and historical interest: as a fine example of mid to late Victorian architecture; for its association with the Jessop family (of Jessop’s Hospital fame); and as a reflection of the growing fashion for grouse shooting at its time of construction.*
54. *Both the exterior and interior of the Lodge are of historic interest, illustrating both the mid-19th century ‘shooting box’ and late-19th century gothic enlargements (including ornate timber bargeboards etc.). To the rear, the latter were of subservient single-storey form (at least one of the two wings with a low inset hipped roof). Internally, the plan form (despite more recent collapse of internal walls) still reflects the stages of development of the Lodge. Decorative internal architectural features including skirtings, cornices, door and window architraves and moulded panelling beneath windows still survive in places.*
55. *The external form and detailing, the surviving internal decorative features and the internal plan-form therefore make an important contribution to the significance of this historic non-designated heritage asset and are integral to its historic integrity.*
56. *The current proposals would effectively result in the retention only of the south-east and north-east facing façades to the Lodge. Internally the historic plan-form would be lost, including the central and south-west chimneybreasts, and the original external 1850s walls between the earliest and later building phases to the rear and adjacent to the later tower.*
57. *The total loss of the interior, including plan-form and any original decorative features, together with the retention of only 2 facades (and potentially the loss of much of the historic external detailing would fail to conserve or enhance this regionally important heritage asset, harming its significance.*
58. *The proposed new rear extensions would not respect the architectural hierarchy of the principle building, unlike the existing rear extensions (which are considerably lower, and more subservient), but would instead be dominant structures, visible from both rear and side elevations.*
59. *No details of proposals for windows and doors to the Lodge have been provided. Some of the remaining windows appear to be of historic interest (particularly to the rear). In order to better conserve or enhance the non-designated heritage asset, a comprehensive window schedule should be drawn up, identifying the significance of those windows which remain, to form a basis for the any new windows proposed.*
60. *Insufficient information has been provided, as identified above. This is required in order to provide a more detailed understanding of the alterations proposed to the Lodge, and to enable a full assessment of their impact on its significance.*
61. *However, based on the information submitted to date I consider that the proposals would result in an unacceptable level of harm to the significance of this regionally important heritage asset, and would not result in either its conservation or enhancement.”*
62. PDNPA Ecology – No further written comments have been received on the current application but on the previous application the Authority’s Ecologist raised no objection to the scheme on the basis of potential impact upon birds associated with the nearby SSSI and SPA, taking into account the revised comments from Natural England.

63. PDNPA Landscape – No further written comments have been received on the current application but objected to the previous application and made the following comments:
64. *Insufficient information has been submitted with the application and the application is in conflict with policy L1. The submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVA) does not describe how the scheme is sensitively located or designed to avoid or minimise impact upon the landscape and there is no mention of an iterative design process.*
65. *While it is accepted that the site contains detracting features, it is not correct to state the landscape of the site has a medium value – it is still a positive landscape feature within the National Park. In terms of susceptibility, the trees are an integral feature of this site and the loss of these could result in a significant level of adverse effect – I consider that the site has a high susceptibility to the form of change proposed (which would result in tree loss and extensive areas of new car parking and access roads). I consider the sensitivity of the site therefore to be high.*
66. *The LVA states that effects on the character of the site would be negligible beneficial at Year 1 and minor beneficial at Year 15 – I fundamentally disagree and think that effects would be moderate-minor adverse at Year 1 and reduce to minor adverse at Year 15. The LVA considers effects on the surrounding Landscape Character Types (LCT) to be neutral – this is probably fair when the LCTs are considered in their entirety, but the LVA does not identify a local landscape character area. I would consider that effects on the surrounding landscape (within a 1 km radius) would be minor adverse at Year 1. The LVA does not consider the effects of increased vehicle movements on the local road network.*
67. *I do not consider the supplied LVA to be a robust or accurate assessment of the potential effects of the application scheme. While the derelict nature of Thornseat Lodge is not a positive feature in this part of the Park, I object to this application. This is partly on the grounds of insufficient information supplied with the application (the lack of robustness in the LVA) and partly on the grounds that the application shows clear conflict with Policy L1 that development must conserve and enhance valued landscape character, as identified in the Landscape Strategy and Action Plan, and other valued characteristics.*
68. PDNPA Tree Officer – No objection subject to compliance with submitted Tree Protection Plan, Tree Survey and Tree Constraints Plan and Woodland Management Plan.
69. PDNPA Policy – No response on the current application, but objected to the previous application for the following reasons:
70. *“This planning application is for substantial alteration, extension and new build. I’m classing the engine room as new build given there is nothing left. The main house will have a new 2 story extension and is to be used for holiday accommodation. The stables are largely ruinous - to be significantly rebuilt, altered and extended and used as a wedding venue. Please refer to the draft Conversion of historic buildings SPD which has been out for public consultation. This SPD sets out 6 guiding principles for converting historic buildings for new uses.*
71. *I have no objection to the principle of reusing the main house for holiday accommodation. However, the level of overall rebuild and intensification of use proposed across the site would, in my opinion, have an unacceptable impact in the open countryside. This is an isolated, quiet location.*
72. *The intensification of use required for the wedding venue, as a result of the substantial rebuilding of curtilage buildings, would adversely impact on the open countryside, contrary to policy RT2 of the Local Plan. Some of the proposal is new build and would also be unacceptable under policy RT2 of the Local Plan.*

73. *I consider policy E2 to be relevant and in particular para 13.16. Businesses are encouraged to re-use existing traditional buildings of historic or vernacular merit wherever possible. However, in line with national policy statements, more modern agricultural buildings may be re-used if development management criteria are satisfied. It may be possible to replace an existing building with a smaller new building, if siting and design can achieve enhancement.*
74. *However, business use in existing or new isolated buildings in more remote areas of the countryside will not be permitted. Decisions will take full account of factors including the character of the surrounding landscape, the degree of separation from other buildings or settlements, and the nature of road access. Proposals to redevelop a business site or building in the open countryside for other uses are not likely to be acceptable unless enhancement can be achieved (see policy GSP2). I do not consider there to be any enhancement to the wider landscape as a result of this proposal and therefore it would fail to accord with policy E2.*
75. *In addition to the above, there is a lack of effort by the applicant to embrace the purpose of policy CC1, and as such the proposal fails to accord with the Local Plan policies on climate change.”*
76. PDNPA Transport Policy Planner: Makes the following comments:
77. The current application includes the document ‘Transport Statement 19-10-2022’. These comments largely addressed a lack of information provided within the original Transport Statement and Travel Plan submitted as part of application NP/S/0620/0511. The current Transport Statement and Travel Plan have been prepared in a way which addresses the majority of points raised by the Transport Policy Planner in response to the previous consultation. The resulting outline Travel Plan is acceptable as a means of encouraging modal shift from the private car by employees of and visitors to the site, should planning permission be granted.
78. Outstanding items – Traffic flows: There is however, one point within the Transport Assessment that appears to have not been fully considered. Paragraph 3.5.2 refers to another venue operated by the applicant, stating: - “Typically, events begin at 12pm and end at 11.30pm. It is reasonable to assume that the proposed use of the Site will operate in a similar manner and therefore any traffic generation will be outside traditional network peak hours and predominantly at weekends.” As stated within the previous comments provided, it is important to recognise that Mortimer Road offers a link between a number of popular Peak District visitor destinations including the Upper Derwent Valley, Strines and Langsett. As such, the road is likely to be busy at weekends with a mix of local, visitor and venue-bound traffic. We would have expected some analysis of existing weekend traffic flows to accompany this Transport Statement, based around likely periods of busyness for the venue.
79. Overspill parking: In commenting on the previous application, the following information was provided: “There is a reference to the provision of overflow parking, this is a sensible approach, however, this should not be seen as a permanent additional car park. Rather this is land that can be used for overspill parking for a limited number of days each year (currently 56 under the emergency Covid-19 measures). Parking should not form a primary use of the land, nor should it require additional development to support such use.” It should be noted that the emergency Covid-19 measures are no longer applicable and that the maximum number of days for which the overspill parking could be used under the General Permitted Development Order would be 28.

Representations

80. The applicant has carried out a 'neighbour survey' and submitted 48 responses. The survey includes several pre-written statements which respondents have ticked in agreement and in some cases added additional comments. The survey responses are available to read in full on our website. The statements set out in the survey and on which people commented in the survey can be summarised as:
81. Do you agree with the proposal; will it create jobs; will the project reduce vandalism and anti-social behaviour; do the current state of the buildings pose a danger; will the plans bring more visitors to the benefit of the local economy; are the plans in the public interest in terms of improving the landscape; is the site conveniently located for wedding parties and tourism?
82. We have also received 26 representations. 23 support the application, one makes a general comment and two object, including a letter from the CPRE. These are summarised below:

General comment:

83. One representation has been made making the following general comment:
84. Regarding consultation comments made by LLFA, regarding a purported watercourse crossing the site, as shown on the old plan where the proposed car park is to be located, I can categorically state (having been intimately acquainted with the site for the last past 30 years) that there is no open water course. I imagine, many years ago before the wood was planted there may have been one but there is no sign of it now and it was likely filled prior to the wood being planted. The existing access to the engine room and access to the moor crosses this point. There is no open water course in this area and a simple site visit would be able to see this. It is frustrating that LLFA Officer did not consider carrying out a site visit or speaking with the applicant on the matter.

Support:

85. 23 representations have been received in support of the application, making the following points (the full response scan be seen on the website)
86. Thornseat Lodge needs a new life. It is an important building in the national park and it needs a new life. This applicant not only invests a LARGE amount of money in the building it also invests in jobs for the Community. I applaud this application.
87. We have suffered the loss of too many buildings in the Peak Park due to the lack of development meaning fabulous buildings like Thornseat Lodge have disappeared. I fully support this application and look forward to the saving of this building.
88. The development is expected to create jobs which will pay an annual total combined salary of £500,000.
89. As a local business owner, a farmer and somebody who has lived in the area a long time, I know the Lodge well and can only ever recall it as it is now, which is a sorry state. I feel it is very important that the members making decisions on this planning application realise that unless there is some action taken to secure the buildings future there will soon be no lodge left. A project like this will cost a not inconsiderable sum to realise, however we should feel pleased that there are people out there who want to take on such a big project and will see it to completion. The Lodge wants a great sum of money and time spending on it and I think that the carefully considered proposals put forward should be approved by the planning authority.

90. I notice that a noise consultant has been involved in the design and layout of the plans and their comments have led to design changes being necessary such as a fully glazed roof across the courtyard (design changed in July 2021) in order that there is no chance of noise disturbance from the venue. This is a real bonus as many old antiquated venues are working within the historic fabric of the buildings and cannot therefore install noise reducing glazing etc, whereas the process here means that cutting edge solutions can be employed from the start to make the venue work harmoniously for guests, staff and residents nearby.
91. I cannot see a problem with traffic or access, as the Lodge is set on a busy main road, Mortimer Road, this road actually is the same road that my own farm is located on so I am well aware of it, and the fact that it can carry high volumes of traffic, I do not feel that the extra traffic attending the holiday cottages or weddings there will see any real impact on that road.
92. This site is located off the main road, Mortimer Road, and as such offers excellent transport links to Sheffield, Barnsley, and Manchester. We agree that the majority of journeys to and from the site will be made by private cars or likely minibus shuttles as this is often a popular option for bridal parties held at the Village Hall. We do feel that cycling is not likely to ever be a mode of transport for staff hosting the functions, although it may be for those guests hiring the holiday cottages. The unsociable hours posed by working late night functions should detract planners from trying to push cycling or even car sharing as it can be a dangerous place for single women to be alone in cars with others or for anybody cycling and it should not be pushed as a necessity for the owners to explore further.
93. The design of the entire site appears well thought-out the plans submitted detail the use of high-quality materials such as natural stone, yorkstone flags, slates and hardwood joinery.
94. I am pleased with the sustainable measures that have been added especially the biomass district heating system across the whole development and the parking measures will be adequate for the operation of the entire business model with 80 spaces along with disabled provision and electric vehicle charging ports which is expressly important nowadays with more vehicle owners converting to this. The landscaping scheme has been well thought out with protection measures for nesting birds and landscaping buffers. In summary I am wholly in support.
95. The lodge is tucked away in an inconspicuous place and renovation and wedding use will not cause a major problem. I am aware that local people have been consulted on the project and there has been overwhelming support with the surveys. The plans for Thornseat Lodge are both realistic and achievable. The team that I am a part of is more than capable of realising the plans. These proposals are a way to satisfy public demand for the site to be restored to its former glory.
96. The proposal will be good for other local businesses.

Object

97. A representation has been received from a local landowner, supporting the restoration of the Lodge but objecting to the extension on the rear of the lodge and the proposal for the wedding venue, on the basis that they would be out of keeping with the landscape and that Mortimer Road carries too much traffic at high speeds especially at weekends and in the evenings.
98. A letter of objection has been received from the CPRE. The letter sets out the CPRE's objection, the key points of which are set out below; a full copy is available on the Authority's website:

99. *“The previous 2020 application for restoration and extension of Thornseat Lodge was refused as it failed the test of major development in a National Park; would significantly harm Thornseat Lodge; would harm valued landscape character; and would be in an unsustainable location. Whilst the aspiration to restore this crumbling Victorian Gothic manor is welcome, the impacts of the accompanying development for a wedding/event/function facility for 150 guests on the edge of Bradfield moors remains substantial and insensitive to its location. We find that the grounds on which refusal of the previous application was based apply to this current application. We therefore object to the development and ask that it is refused.*
100. *Restoration of Thornseat Lodge In principle we would support the proposed restoration and conversion of Thornseat Lodge to six holiday lets as an important non-designated heritage asset of ‘regional level architectural interest’ [Heritage Assessment page 28]. This was once a fine and imposing building which has been long neglected and fallen into a ‘very poor structural condition at severe risk of further collapse’. However, ‘The present ruinous condition of the building has significantly affected the architectural interest of the building, with the degree of loss being such that it makes no more than a moderate contribution to its significance’. In our view the historic structure and what remains internally is unlikely to survive. The new use for 6 holiday lets is unlikely to be visually intrusive or have an adverse impact on tranquillity, dark skies or other valued characteristics. However, the restoration would require unacceptable enabling development in order to be viable in the form of the event facility.*
101. *Proposed wedding/event/function facility We object in principle to the proposed wedding/event/ function venue on the footprint of the former stables and its courtyard, conversion of the ruins of an old cottage to a 4- bedroomed bunkhouse for up to 13 wedding guests and 80 car parking spaces in adjacent woodland, with overflow parking arrangements. The viability assessment shows that restoring the Lodge alone to market housing or holiday lets is not financially viable. Only when ‘enabled’ by significant development relating to the other buildings on site is it viable to restore the Lodge.*
102. *They would create a massive area of development out of a currently dispersed and fragmented cluster. The proposed intensification of use adjacent to significant and sensitive natural assets is unacceptable. Recommendations have been made, to adequately control music noise breakout at appropriate acoustic levels within and beyond the site (Noise Assessment). Control of noise breakout would require some practical measures that rely on rigorous controls when loud music is playing, such as doors closed and guests using the main entrance, no openings in the glazed roof, windows closed behind the stage and music reduced to background levels at 23.00hrs.*
103. *Travel and Transport The number of guests would be limited to 150 with up to 10 staff. For the 10 staff the Travel Plan has proposed cycling to work, a lift share car scheme and a minibus. Although e-bikes would enable longer journeys by bike, it is the intimidation by speeding traffic that inhibits many people from using cycles. However, it is the events at the venue that would generate the greatest impact on sustainability and on minor rural roads. The Transport Assessment assumes the majority of guests would arrive by car. The generated traffic is assumed to be negligible but the frequency of use of the venue is not given, except to say it would occur predominantly at weekends.*
104. *There is no attempt to reduce the need to travel, to encourage sustainable transport (except for several EV charging points), or discourage car use. The distance of the venue from any public transport would mean guests (and probably some staff) would have to drive to and from the venue, which would make the proposal unsustainable.*
105. *The approach from urban areas on all points of the compass would require vehicles negotiating country lanes. These lanes should be protected from intimidating traffic both for*

their valuable role in improving people's quality of life and to enhance their character and tranquillity

106. Energy Sustainability *The approach towards energy and sustainability remains unsatisfactory. It does not fully consider all the options and concludes without explanation with 'Provision of a Biomass boiler system to provide heating and hot water to all properties within the development.' There is enough surrounding land within which to bury a ground source heat pump which would have less impact on tranquillity, nor require regular deliveries of wood fuel or the erection of an ancillary building to house it.*
107. Ecology: *The Bradfield Moors are an extremely important habitat for wild birds and other species. The boundary of the designated habitats SSSI/SPA/SAC and of open access land are within 250metres of the development site which lies within the Dark Peak SSSI Impact Zone. A venue accommodating 150 people is inappropriate on the edge of the SPA/SAC/SSSI, and would prejudice the quiet informal enjoyment of the National Park.*
108. Events at the venue would generate unacceptable increases in traffic on minor rural roads. *The approach from urban areas on all points of the compass would require vehicles negotiating country lanes, all of which are steep and narrow with blind bends, and passing through villages such as High and Low Bradfield. This network of quiet lanes covering Bradfield Dale and extending to the Sheffield boundary is hugely popular and important to cyclists and walkers, especially Sheffield residents for whom it provides easy and quick access to tranquil and beautiful countryside. The lanes around Damflask Reservoir are also part of a PDNPA Miles without Stiles route for the less mobile. With the Covid-19 crisis the use of these lanes for recreation has intensified greatly. On most stretches there is room for only one vehicle and impatient motorists often take risks overtaking other users. These lanes should be protected from intimidating traffic both for their valuable role in improving people's quality of life and to enhance their character and tranquillity.*
109. The development fails the test of major development in a National Park (NPPF 2021, 177). *There is no need for the development in terms of national or local considerations. There is already a wedding venue in the vicinity and the claimed benefits to the local community should be accruing at Foxholes Farm; re-location adds no further economic benefit except for the 6 holiday flats. Whilst restoration of the Lodge would provide short-stay breaks within the Dark Peak, the enabling development would be contrary to policy in this location. Three of the special qualities for which the PDNP was designated - internationally important and locally distinctive wildlife and habitats; undeveloped places of tranquillity and dark night skies within reach of millions; an inspiring space for escape, adventure, discovery and quiet reflection, would be harmed by this proposal”.*

Main Policies

110. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, L1, L2, L3, RT1, RT2, CC1, CC5, E2, T1, T2 and T7
111. Relevant Development Management policies: DMC1, DMC3, DMC5, DMC10, DMC11, DMC12, DMC13, DMC14, DMR3, DMT3, DMT6, DMU1 and DMU2.

National Planning Policy Framework

112. 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.
113. 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.'
114. Paragraph 177 states that planning permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. 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; and
 - c) Any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.
115. Paragraph 180 says that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:
- a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;
 - b) development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it (either individually or in combination with other developments), should not normally be permitted. The only exception is where the benefits of the development in the location proposed clearly outweigh both its likely impact on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest, and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest;
116. Paragraph 194 says that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum, the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

117. Paragraph 195 says that local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.
118. Paragraph 196 says that where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision.
119. Paragraph 197 says that in determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:
 - a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
 - b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
 - c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
120. Paragraph 203 says that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
121. Paragraph 208 says that local planning authorities should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies.
122. Paragraph 84 says that planning policies and decisions should enable:
 - a) the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings;
 - b) the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses;
 - c) sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside; and
123. Paragraph 85 says that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads and exploits any opportunities to make a location more sustainable (for example by improving the scope for access on foot, by cycling or by public transport). The use of previously developed land, and sites that are physically well-related to existing settlements, should be encouraged where suitable opportunities exist.
124. Paragraph 113 says that all developments that will generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a travel plan, and the application should be supported by a transport statement or transport assessment so that the likely impacts of the proposal can be assessed.

125. Paragraph 185 says that planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should:
- a) mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life;
 - b) identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason; and
 - c) limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.
126. Paragraph 157 says that in determining planning applications, local planning authorities should expect new development to:
- a) comply with any development plan policies on local requirements for decentralised energy supply unless it can be demonstrated by the applicant, having regard to the type of development involved and its design, that this is not feasible or viable; and
 - b) take account of landform, layout, building orientation, massing and landscaping to minimise energy consumption.
127. Paragraph 169 says that major developments should incorporate sustainable drainage systems unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate.

Peak District National Park Core Strategy

128. Policy DS1 sets out the Development Strategy for the National Park. DS1 C. says that in countryside outside of the Natural Zone conversion or change of use for housing, community facilities and business uses including visitor accommodation, preferably by re-use of traditional buildings is acceptable in principle. Other development and alternative uses needed to secure effective conservation and enhancement is also acceptable in principle.
129. Policy GSP1 requires all development to be consistent with the National Park's legal purposes and duty. Where there is an irreconcilable conflict between the statutory purposes, the Sandford Principle will be applied and the conservation and enhancement of the National Park will be given priority.
130. GSP1 E says that in securing national park purposes major development should not take place other than in exceptional circumstances. Major development will only be permitted following rigorous consideration of the criteria in national policy. GSP1. F says that where a proposal for major development can demonstrate a significant net benefit to the national park, every effort to mitigate potential localised harm and compensate for any residual harm to the area's valued characteristics would be expected to be secured.
131. GSP2 says that opportunities for enhancing the national park will be identified and acted upon. Proposals must demonstrate that they offer significant overall net benefit to the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area. They should not undermine the achievement of other core policies.

132. 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, impact on living conditions of communities, impact on access and traffic levels and use of sustainable modes of transport.
133. L1 says that development must conserve and enhance valued landscape character, as identified in the Landscape Strategy and Action Plan, and other valued characteristics.
134. L2 says that development must conserve or enhance any sites, features or species of biodiversity or geodiversity importance and where appropriate their setting. Other than in exceptional circumstances development will not be permitted where it is likely to have an adverse impact on any sites, features or species of biodiversity or geodiversity importance.
135. L3 says that development must conserve and where appropriate enhance or reveal the significance of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic assets and their settings, including statutory designations and other heritage assets of international, national, regional or local importance. Other than, in exceptional circumstances development will not be permitted where it is likely to cause harm to the significance of any cultural heritage asset.
136. RT1 says that proposals for recreation, environmental education and interpretation must conform to the following principles: The National Park Authority will support facilities, which enable recreation, environmental education and interpretation, which encourage understanding and enjoyment of the National Park and are appropriate to the National Park's valued characteristics.
137. RT1 B says that new provision must justify its location in relation to environmental capacity, scale and intensity of use or activity, and be informed by the Landscape Strategy. In the open countryside, clear demonstration of need for such a location will be necessary. RT1 C says that wherever possible, development must reuse existing traditional buildings of historic or vernacular merit, and should enhance any appropriate existing facilities. Where this is not possible, the construction of new buildings may be acceptable.
138. RT1 D says that development must not on its own, or cumulatively with other development and uses, prejudice or disadvantage peoples' enjoyment of other existing and appropriate recreation, environmental education or interpretation activities, including the informal quiet enjoyment of the National Park.
139. RT2 says that proposals for hotels, bed and breakfast and self-catering accommodation must conform to the following principles. The change of use of a traditional building of historic or vernacular merit to holiday accommodation will be permitted, except where it would create unacceptable landscape impact in open countryside. New build holiday accommodation will not be permitted, except for a new hotel in Bakewell.
140. CC1 says that in order to build in resilience to and mitigate the causes of climate change all development must: make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources; take account of the energy hierarchy; be directed away from flood risk areas and reduce overall risk from flooding; achieve the highest possible standards of carbon reductions; achieve the highest possible standards of water efficiency and non-residential major development above 1000m² floor space must achieve a Buildings Emissions Rate at least 10% less than the Target Emissions Rate.

141. CC5 C says that development which increases roof and hard surface area must include adequate measures such as Sustainable Drainage Systems to deal with the run-off of surface water. Such measures must not increase the risk of a local water course flooding.
142. E2 says that proposals for business development in the countryside outside of the Natural Zone and named settlements must take account of the following principles:
- A. Businesses should be located in existing traditional buildings of historic or vernacular merit in smaller settlements, on farmsteads, and in groups of buildings in sustainable locations. However where no suitable traditional building exists, the reuse of modern buildings may be acceptable provided there is no scope for further enhancement through a more appropriate replacement building.
 - B. On farmsteads, or groups of estate buildings, small scale business development will be permitted provided that it supports an existing agricultural or other primary business responsible for estate or land management. The primary business must retain ownership and control of the site and building, to ensure that income will be returned to appropriate management of the landscape.
 - C. Business use in an isolated existing or new building in the open countryside will not be permitted.

E2 goes on to say that beyond this policy and our recreation policies there is no scope for setting up new businesses in the countryside.

143. T1 aims to reduce the general need to travel within the National Park and encourage sustainable transport. T2C says that modal shift to sustainable transport will be encouraged. T2E says that impacts of traffic within environmentally sensitive locations will be minimised. T2F says that sustainable access for the quiet enjoyment of the National Park, who does not cause harm to the valued characteristics, will be promoted.
144. T2F says that sustainable transport patterns will be sought that complement the development strategy. Travel plans will be used to encourage behavioural change to achieve a reduction in the need to travel, and to change public attitudes toward car usage and public transport, walking and cycling. Travel plans to reduce traffic movements and safeguard transport infrastructure will be required on appropriate new developments and encouraged on existing developments.
145. T7 B says that residential parking and operational parking for service and delivery vehicles will be the minimum required for operational purposes, taking into account environmental constraints and future requirements. T7. C says that non-residential parking will be restricted in order to discourage car use, and will be managed to ensure that the location and nature of car and coach parking does not exceed environmental capacity.

Development Management Policies

146. DMC1 A says that in countryside beyond the edge of designated settlements any development proposal with a wide scale landscape impact must provide a landscape assessment with reference to the Landscape Strategy and Action Plan. The assessment must be proportionate to the proposed development and clearly demonstrate how valued landscape character, including natural beauty, biodiversity, cultural heritage features and other valued characteristics will be conserved and, where possible, enhanced taking into account: the overall strategy for the relevant Landscape Strategy and Action Plan area, any cumulative impact and the effect of the proposal on the landscape.

147. Policy DMC3 A 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.
148. Policy DMC3. B sets out various aspects that particular attention will be paid to including: siting, scale, form, mass, levels, height and orientation, settlement form and character, landscape, details, materials and finishes landscaping, access, utilities and parking, amenity, accessibility and the principles embedded in the design related SPD and the technical guide.
149. Policy DMC5 says that applications for development affecting a heritage asset, including its setting must clearly demonstrate its significance including how any identified features of value will be conserved and where possible enhanced and why the proposed development is desirable or necessary. The supporting evidence must be proportionate to the significance of the asset and proposals likely to affect archaeological and potential archaeological interest should be supported by appropriate information.
150. DMC5 E says that if applicants fail to provide adequate or accurate detailed information the application will be refused. DMC5 F says that development of a non-designated heritage asset will not be permitted if it would result in any harm to, or loss of, the significance, character and appearance of a heritage asset unless the development is considered by the Authority to be acceptable following a balanced judgement that takes into account the significance of the heritage asset.
151. Policy DMC10 says that conversion of a heritage asset will be permitted provided that: it can accommodate the new use without changes that adversely affect its character (such changes include enlargement, subdivision, other alterations, and major rebuilding); and the building is capable of conversion; the changes brought about by the new use and any associated infrastructure conserves or enhances significance and landscape character; and the new use will not be visually intrusive in its landscape or have an adverse impact on tranquillity, dark skies or other valued characteristics.
152. Policy DMC11 A says that proposals should aim to achieve net gains to biodiversity or geodiversity as a result of development. In considering whether a proposal conserves and enhances sites, features or species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance all reasonable measures must be taken to avoid net loss.
153. DMC11 B says details of appropriate safeguards and enhancement measures for a site, feature or species of nature conservation importance which could be affected by the development must be provided, in line with the Biodiversity Action Plan and any action plan for geodiversity sites, including provision for the beneficial future management of the interests. Development will not be permitted if applicants fail to provide adequate or accurate detailed information to show the impact of a development proposal on a site, feature or species including:
 - i. an assessment of the nature conservation importance of the site; and
 - ii. adequate information about the special interests of the site; and
 - iii. an assessment of the direct and indirect effects of the development; and
 - iv. details of any mitigating and/or compensatory measures and details setting out the degree to which net gain in biodiversity has been sought; and

- v. details of provisions made for the beneficial future management of the nature conservation interests of the site. Where the likely success of these measures is uncertain, development will not be permitted.
154. DMC11 C says that for all sites features and species development proposals must also consider cumulative impacts and the setting of the development in relation to other features of importance, taking into account historic, cultural and other landscape context.
 155. DMC12 A says that for Internationally designated or candidate sites, or European Protected Species, the exceptional circumstances where development may be permitted are those where it can be demonstrated that the legislative provisions to protect such sites or species can be fully met.
 156. DMC12 B says that for sites, features or species of national importance, exceptional circumstances are where the development is essential for the management of those sites, features or species; or for the conservation and enhancement of the National Park's valued characteristics; or where the benefits of the development at a site clearly outweigh the impacts on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest and any broader impacts on the national network of SSSIs.
 157. DMC12 C says that for all other sites, features and species, development will only be permitted where significant harm can be avoided and the conservation status of the population of the species or habitat concerned is maintained; and the need for, and the benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh any adverse effect.
 158. Policy DMC13 says that planning applications should provide sufficient information to enable impact on trees, woodlands and other landscape features to be properly considered. Development should incorporate existing trees and hedgerows which positively contribute which should be protected during the course of the development.
 159. Policy DMC14 says that development that presents a risk of pollution or disturbance including soil, air, light, water or noise pollution, or odour that could adversely affect any of the following interests will not be permitted unless adequate control measures are put in place to bring the pollution within acceptable limits.
 160. Policy DMR3 A says that where self-catering accommodation is acceptable outside of designated settlements, its use will be restricted to no more than 28 days per calendar year by any one person.
 161. DMT3 B says that development, which includes a new or improved access onto a public highway, will only be permitted where, having regard to the standard, function, nature and use of the road, a safe access that is achievable for all people, can be provided in a way which does not detract from the character and appearance of the locality and where possible enhances it.
 162. DMT6 is relevant for business parking and says that new or enlarged car parks will not be permitted unless a clear, demonstrable need can be shown. Additional parking 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.
 163. DMU1 says that new or upgraded service infrastructure for new development will be permitted subject to the requirement that full details are provided in the planning application and it: does not adversely affect the valued characteristics of the area; and any new land use does not commence prior to the appropriate delivery of the services.

164. DMU2 B says that infrastructure services to new development or improved services to existing uses should be placed underground.

Supplementary planning documents (SPD) and other material considerations

165. The adopted climate change and sustainable building SPD provides detailed guidance on construction methods and renewable technologies along with a framework for how development can demonstrate compliance with policy CC1.
166. The adopted design guide SPD and supporting building design guide provides detailed guidance on the local building tradition within the National Park and how this should be utilised to inform high quality new design that conserves and enhances the National Park.
167. The adopted transport design guide SPD provides detailed guidance on the design of transport infrastructure including access layouts, parking and future technology such as electric vehicle charge points and autonomous vehicles.
168. The Conversion of Historic Buildings SPD was adopted in April 2022. This SPD sets out guiding principles for converting historic buildings for new uses to support policy DMC10.
169. Historic England has produced guidance on enabling development (Enabling Development and Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 4, June 2020), including the need for market testing, expert reporting of a schedule of repair costs and appropriate viability assessment establishing the conservation deficit.

Assessment

Principle

170. The application proposes the conversion and extension of the former lodge to create holiday accommodation along with the erection of a wedding venue, further holiday accommodation and associated landscaping, access drives and car parking on the site.
171. This is a resubmitted application following the refusal of a similar proposal in October 2021. The application is accompanied by an extensive range of documents which support the proposal and which seek to address the objections raised when the previous application was refused. Officers have engaged with the applicants and their agents to establish “common ground”. For clarity, the supporting Planning Statement sets out the following changes or additional information that has been provided in response to the refusal of application NP/S/0620/0511 (these are repeated without comment at this point in this report):
- *Information on visitor accommodation demand in the Peak District National Park and identifying an opportunity for maximising the tourism offer in the Peak District (addressing Reason for Refusal 1 concerning the proposals being in the public interest).*
 - *Amendments to increase the degree of retention of existing fabric, historic floorplan, and incorporation of building remnants into the proposed scheme, as well as updated heritage assessments and recommendations for actions/conditions to best preserve Thornseat Lodge’s heritage value (addressing Reason for Refusal 2 concerning Thornseat Lodge’s heritage status).*
 - *Further supporting information to provide assurances regarding the acceptable degree of impact that the proposals would have on the landscape character within and beyond Thornseat Lodge (addressing Reason for Refusal 3 concerning impact on landscape character).*

- *A suite of measures to be introduced and maintained upon commencement of the construction and subsequent operation of the proposed new use of Thornseat Lodge, pursuant to encouraging sustainable transport choices and offsetting concerns regarding the sustainability of the site including, the use of sustainable construction methods and materials, the installation of a biomass district heating system and EV points (addressing Reason for Refusal 4 concerning site location and sustainable development objectives).*
172. A total of seven residential units are proposed through conversion and new building which would be occupied as holiday accommodation (six in the lodge and one in another building). The holiday accommodation is intended to be operated separately from the wedding venue but would be available to be booked by members of the public attending a wedding and it is likely that they will be booked together when there is an event.
173. The wedding venue would be built in the location of a former stable block. The former stable block has been demolished for a long time, with only the external walls of the yard remaining. The wedding venue would therefore be within a range of new buildings which would reinstate the former courtyard massing, but with a glazed roof over the central area of the yard between the buildings. The wedding venue would have capacity for up to 150 guests. New internal driveways and an 80-space car park would be created for the wedding venue.
174. The site is located in open countryside on the edge of Bradfield Moor and 2.2km west of Low Bradfield. The site is adjacent to the Peak District Moors Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Peak District Moors Special Protection Area (SPA) and Dark Peak Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).
175. Given the scale of the development and the potential impact upon the landscape, biodiversity and cultural heritage of the National Park, it is considered that the development falls with the definition of “major development” within the National Park.
176. Core Strategy policy GSP1 E says that major development should not take place other than in exceptional circumstances and will only be permitted following rigorous consideration of the criteria in national policy.
177. National policy is set by paragraph 177 of the NPPF which states that planning permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. 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; and
 - c) Any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.
178. Policy DS1 allows for other development and alternative uses to secure effective conservation and enhancement but policy GSP2 says that proposals intended to enhance the National Park should not undermine the achievement of other Core Policies such as RT1, RT2 and E2.
179. Paragraph 208 of the NPPF says that we should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which

would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies.

180. The primary justification for the proposed development relates to the poor condition of the former lodge building and that the development is required to achieve the conservation and enhancement of the lodge and its former stable block.
181. Local and national policies make a clear presumption against the proposed major development unless exceptionally the development meets the tests set out by the NPPF and can be justified on the basis that overall it is in the public interest. A development of this scale and nature should only be accepted if it can be seen to provide benefits such as the conservation and/or restoration of historic assets without causing unacceptable harm. This requires a balancing of the various aspects of the proposed development. The key issues therefore are the impact of the proposed development upon the landscape, biodiversity and cultural heritage of the National Park and whether the development would be acceptable in all other respects.
182. Core Strategy policy DS1 and policy RT2 allow in principle for the change of use of a traditional building to holiday accommodation. However, policy RT2 states that new build holiday accommodation (such as the proposed bunkhouse) will not be permitted.
183. Core Strategy policy RT1 allows for recreation development. However, development proposals must encourage understanding and enjoyment of the National Park and be appropriate to the National Park's valued characteristics. New development for a wedding venue in open countryside would therefore not be in accordance with our adopted recreation strategy.
184. The Authority's development strategy seeks to direct new business development to named settlements within the National Park but makes exceptions for small scale business development in smaller settlements, farmsteads or groups of buildings in sustainable locations. These exceptions are set out by policy E2. The proposal is for major development and is therefore not small scale business development envisaged by policy E2.
185. Furthermore, this site is located in open countryside with the nearest public transport link being bus connections to Sheffield from Low Bradfield a 3km walk away along Dale Road or Windy Bank which are narrow lanes with no pavement for pedestrians. Therefore, new business development on this site would not be in accordance with policy E2 A or E2 C which says that business use in an isolated existing or new building in the open countryside will not be permitted.

Justification for enabling development

186. Paragraph 208 of the NPPF says that we should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies.
187. Historic England has produced guidance on enabling development (June 2020) and this is a relevant material consideration in the assessment of the proposals. The advice is that the case for enabling development rests on whether a conservation deficit can be established. This is the amount by which the cost of repair (and conversion to optimum viable use if appropriate) of a heritage asset exceeds its market value on completion of repair or conversion, allowing for appropriate development costs.

188. The advice says that market testing is required to explore the possibility of different owners or different uses providing an alternative to enabling development, thereby reducing the need for or scale of enabling development needed. Evidence is also required as to whether public or charitable grant funding or ownership could displace or at least reduce the need for enabling development.
189. The harm done by enabling development contrary to other planning policies is likely to be permanent and irreversible. After consideration of all reasonable alternative means to secure the future of the asset, enabling development is therefore likely to be a last resort.
190. The sums of money generated through enabling development are provided to directly solve the conservation needs of the place. The amount of enabling development that can be justified will be the minimum amount necessary in order to address the conservation deficit and to secure the long-term future of the asset.
191. Historic England advise that an enabling development proposal can only be considered for approval if it provides benefits that outweigh the disbenefits, and where we are confident that the scheme would secure the conservation of the heritage asset. This involves assessing the position now and considering the asset's future. It is good practice to take the decision in the light of a realistic view of the consequences of refusal. Equally, a proven conservation deficit may not automatically lead to a grant of planning permission, where the disbenefits of failing to comply with other planning policies are considered to outweigh the benefits of conserving the heritage asset. This is particularly important in the proposals for Thornseat Lodge.
192. In assessing the proposals, officers have concluded that the proposed development would result in harm to the significance of the heritage asset, albeit at a reduced level from the previously refused scheme, particularly in respect of the main building. If permitting the proposed development would not secure the future conservation of the Lodge then there is no justification for granting planning permission for development that otherwise conflicts with planning policies.
193. Notwithstanding this conclusion, it is necessary to examine the case for enabling development.
194. The applicant has not carried out any market testing. The property has not been marketed for sale and therefore the possibility of different owners providing an alternative to the proposed development has not been explored. The applicant has not explored whether public or charitable grant funding or ownership could displace or at least reduce the need for enabling development. This has been discussed with applicants and their position is that they have experience in carrying out this type of development and although the building was bought by the applicant's family many years ago, it is now owned by a different business in their ownership. They believe that the viability appraisal report sets out the options and their respective viability, regardless of the ownership.
195. The Planning Statement explains that the conservation deficit assessment has been informed by the conservation structural survey that was undertaken in support of previous application. An extract of the viability assessment is included below to demonstrate the outcome of the respective assessments. The assessment appraises a total of twelve development options, as follows:
 - Option 1 Holiday lets - Full restoration of the lodge as it currently exists externally and internally (walls to follow 1979 floor plan issued by SCC as far as possible + historic features retained/restored as far as possible).
 - Option 2 Holiday lets - Full external restoration of the lodge; internals rebuilt.
 - Option 3 Holiday lets - Full external restoration of the lodge; internals rebuilt + single storey rear extension.

- Option 4 Holiday lets - Full external restoration of the lodge; internals rebuilt + two storey rear extension.
 - Option 5 Full external restoration of the lodge; internals rebuilt + two storey rear extension +stables wedding venue.
 - Option 6 Full external restoration of the lodge; internals rebuilt + two storey rear extension +stables wedding venue + bunkhouse conversion.
 - Option 7 Full external restoration of the lodge; internals rebuilt + two storey rear extension+stables wedding venue + bunkhouse conversion + engine room conversion.
 - Option 8 Full external restoration of the lodge; internals rebuilt + two storey rear extension +stables wedding venue + bunkhouse conversion + engine room conversion + poolhouse + beauty parlour conversion.
 - Option 9 Market housing - Full restoration of the lodge as it currently exists externally and internally (walls to follow 1979 floor plan issued by SCC as far as possible + historic features retained/restored as far as possible).
 - Option 10 Market housing - Full external restoration of the lodge; internals rebuilt.
 - Option 11 Market housing - Full external restoration of the lodge; internals rebuilt + single storey rear extension.
 - Option 12 Market housing - Full external restoration of the lodge; internals rebuilt + two storey rear extension
196. These were appraised to identify an optimum viable use. The Planning Statement says that the combination of the appraisals serves as a sequential approach to determining the viable use of the site that is closest to that preferred by policy/officers, i.e. the optimum viable use. The deduction of the estimated construction costs from the estimated Gross development Value (GDV) helps to establish the conservation deficit that will guide the optimum viable use for Thornseat Lodge. The conservation deficit is defined in Enabling Development and Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 4, produced by Historic England, as the amount by which the cost of repair (and conversion to optimum viable use if appropriate) of a heritage asset exceeds its market value on completion of repair and conversion, allowing for all appropriate development costs.
197. When the previous application was considered, officers were concerned that we did not have enough information to determine if there is a conservation deficit or whether the proposed enabling development is the minimum amount required to address the deficit. Therefore, it was not possible to accept that the application would justify enabling development, taking into account the advice on enabling development from Historic England.
198. That issue has now been addressed, to some extent, by the submission of the Viability Assessment report, but it is important to see this as a consideration to take into account rather than the sole determining factor; the fact that the report considers one option to be the only viable option does not necessarily mean that it is acceptable from a planning policy perspective. Whilst the Planning Statement concludes "*that the principle of the proposed scheme is acceptable on the grounds of facilitating, at a minimum, the conservation of the Lodge without compromising the valued character of the wider area*", officers consider that there are still sufficiently strong concerns about the impact of the proposed development that the decision cannot be driven solely by the viability report conclusions.
199. In a recent meeting with the applicants and their agent there was a discussion about the assessments made in the Viability report. Officers acknowledged the report and did not challenge the assumptions on which the conclusions were based; it would be possible for the Authority to commission its own viability assessment, but it is considered that this

would only be necessary if there were significant concerns about the accuracy assumptions or analysis in the submitted report. The officers' approach was that the viability report provides a useful basis for understanding the options and the relative viability, but as noted above, it does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that this application must be approved. It was noted that although the report concludes that a single dwelling, or a small number of apartments have been ruled out as not being viable, experience elsewhere in the National Park has shown that there are developers or individuals who are prepared to take on buildings without seeking to meet their costs in the short or medium term, particularly with regard to single houses, seeing them as rare opportunities to acquire historic properties in desirable locations. That can only be tested by marketing Thornseat Lodge.

200. At that meeting, officers also discussed with the applicants an alternative scheme that is more likely to be supported. This is set out in more detail below, after the consideration of impacts.
201. Finally on this issue, when the previous application was considered, the report set out the recent history of the site, referring to paragraph 196 of the NPPF which says that where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision. The Lodge was last occupied as a children's home, which closed around 1980. It is understood that it was used by a local group as a place for families on low incomes to stay in the early 1990s. Photographs on Sheffield City Council's website dated 1986 show the Lodge in good condition with all elements including roofs, windows and the rear extensions intact.
202. However, it is clear that after the building was no longer in use it began to deteriorate. Photographs on our file show that by 2005 the roof to the single storey element had collapsed along with parts of the rear projecting two-storey element, although the decorative copings to the single storey element and many windows and doors remained intact, as was the main roof. We subsequently received enquiries from concerned members of the public about the deteriorating state of the building and photographs on file from 2008 to 2019 show continued deterioration including continued collapse of the main roof, loss of the decorative copings to the single storey element and damage to most windows and doors
203. The site appears to have been sold by Sheffield City Council in 1994 to Hague Plant Excavations Limited. It is not clear what the condition the building was in 1994 but given photograph evidence from 1986 and evidence that the building may have continued to be occupied in the early 1990s it is likely that the building was in a better condition than shown on photographs taken in 2005.
204. The site was sold to the applicant Thornseat Lodge Limited in 2018. Two of the active directors of Thornseat Lodge Limited were active directors of Hague Plant Excavations Limited in 1994.
205. The submitted planning statement says that after many years of neglect the building has become derelict to the extent that not only is its appearance enormously degraded, but also many elements have structurally failed. Considering the evidence set out above, we agree with this assessment.
206. It is clear that the building has significantly deteriorated. This is primarily due to lack of regular maintenance that a viable long-term use would provide. The building also appears to have been a target of theft and vandalism. It is unclear what the intentions of the previous owners of the site were or what measures have been put in place to secure or maintain the structure. Some temporary structural interventions appear to have been attempted but the continued deterioration of the building has not been arrested.

207. We did not receive any planning applications or pre-application enquiries for development until shortly after the applicant purchased the site in 2018. Security fencing and cameras have been erected on the site to deter any further theft or vandalism.
208. It is clear that the building has been neglected for a considerable amount of time and this has contributed to the deteriorated state of the heritage asset. It is not possible to ascertain the intentions of the previous owners of the site, but it is clear that there have only been limited attempts to maintain or secure the building or to seek planning permission for a viable use for the site (until the applicant purchased the site).

Impact on former lodge and its setting

209. Thornseat Lodge is a 19th century shooting lodge set in a designed ornamental landscape. The lodge is in very poor structural condition and has partially collapsed and the remains of several outbuildings, including a stable yard that served the main house are located within its grounds. These outbuildings are in varying state of survival from complete ruin with very little surviving above ground level, to almost complete standing buildings. The whole complex is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset of regional significance.
210. The application is supported by a Heritage Statement that describes the significance of the heritage assets and includes appropriate background research, consultation of the historic environment record and map regression. The Heritage Statement meets the requirements of policy DMC5 and paragraph 194 of the NPPF in relation to the supporting information required.
211. The site and a number of its buildings are in very poor condition and it is important to state that in principle a development providing a viable use that secured the conservation and enhancement of this heritage asset and its long-term future would comply with the Authority's policies and would be welcome.
212. The exterior and interior of the Lodge are of historic interest because they illustrate both the mid-19th century 'shooting box' and the later gothic enlargements carried out in the late 19th century (including the tower and timber bargeboards etc.). To the rear, the extensions were of subservient single-storey form. Internally, the plan form (despite more recent collapse of internal walls) still reflects the stages of development of the Lodge. Decorative internal architectural features including skirtings, cornices, door and window architraves and moulded panelling beneath windows still survive in places.
213. Therefore, the external form and detailing, the surviving internal decorative features and the internal plan form of the Lodge make an important contribution to the significance of the building and are essential parts making up its historic integrity.
214. Given the condition of the building, it is inevitable that parts of the structure will need to be demolished and re-built to facilitate conversion. The application is supported by a structural report which concludes that the building is in structurally poor condition and needs a detailed and sequenced strategy of temporary works to remove failed elements and stabilise fabric and that these works are urgent to prevent further loss and deterioration.
215. When the previous application was refused, Officers had concerns that the proposals would retain only the south-east (front), north-east (side), north-west (side) and part of the north-west (rear) facades of the Lodge. The remaining external and internal walls, floor and roof would have been demolished and re-built. Internally the historic plan-form would have been totally lost, including the central and south-west chimneybreasts, the original

external 1850s walls between the earliest and later parts of the building and some significant internal decorative features.

216. The revised application has sought to address some of these concerns and the plans show that more of the original internal walls and features, such as architraves and skirting boards. As a result, the scheme is now considered to be more sympathetic and, given the condition of the building, it would probably retain as much of the original building as possible. The Authority's Senior Archaeologist acknowledges these revisions, noting that these changes are welcomed, and represent a greater retention of the features and fabric that contribute to the significance of the building. This reduces the level of harm to the historic interest of the building. She adds that some minor change to external elevations of the building to allow new access arrangements are still required, with a small number of additional doors/windows. This, along with the loss of most of the interior, will result in some harm to the historic and architectural interest of the building.
217. A rear extension is still proposed, but with a change in materials to what was originally proposed. She concludes that this represents a high level of change to this elevation and its historical form and appearance, but it is acknowledged that the affected elevation, as a rear elevation with considerable alteration and less architectural interest, this elevation is of lesser significance relative to the quality of the front and side elevations of the building, so although some harm will result, it is an elevation where there is more capacity for change. Given its current condition, it is difficult to see how more of its layout could be retained.
218. It is acknowledged that because of the current condition of the building, the development would result in retention of only the main facades, but this includes the main elevation facing Mortimer Road. The rear elevation would be significantly rebuilt and extended. The proposed two storey rear extensions would have a more contemporary appearance which does not follow the architectural style of the historic lodge. The existing rear elements are low, subservient elements, but the proposed extensions would be relatively dominant additions and the proposed fenestration would not complement the historic character and appearance of the Lodge. Although there is a case for making an architectural distinction between the new and the old, if Members are minded to accept the application in principle, officers would recommend further discussions with the applicant/agent to provide a more traditional detailing.
219. With regard to the new courtyard development to provide the wedding venue, the Heritage Statement demonstrates that the buildings of the stable yard were demolished before the 1962 Ordinance Survey (OS) map. Therefore, these buildings have not been present on the site for at least 58 years.
220. The application describes the proposed development as restoration of historic stable block. However, the proposed development is for an entirely new building on the site of the historic stable yard, together with a glazed roof over the yard itself.
221. The Heritage Statement suggests that the new wedding venue building would help to reinstate its context as part of a larger complex rather than being an isolated villa, and so would have a limited positive effect on the setting and significance of the lodge. The Authority's Senior Archaeologist disagrees with this conclusion. She advises that the remains of the stable block and the other historic structures across the site are clear evidence that the lodge was at the core of the wider complex and is not simply an isolated villa. The archaeological and historic evidence and interest of the site attest directly to this. The ruins of the former stable yard are an authentic historic element of the Lodge site. Other than the remains of the building at the site, there is no evidence of the historic massing and scale of the buildings. The proposed development is for a new building that is conjectural, albeit partly based upon other historic examples.

222. She concludes that replacing an authentic historic element of the Lodge which retains the legibility of its historic function and relationship to the Lodge, the historic massing and scale of which is unknown with a conjectural modern structure would fundamentally compromise the core significance of the remains of the stable yard. The groundworks associated with the proposed new building on the site would result in the complete loss of archaeological interest of the historic remains. This is the highest possible level of harm to a feature, which contributes to the significance of a heritage asset of regional significance, which is fundamental to understand the historic development and function of this heritage asset.
223. The proposal to erect a new bunkhouse building on the ruinous structure to the south west of the stable yard would have a similar impact resulting in the complete loss of archaeological interest of the historic remains. The historic function of this ruinous structure is unknown. The development would also incorporate standing outbuildings including a historic garage / grain store, the 20th century engine house and a modern garage to the rear of the Lodge. The proposal is to retain the relatively modern garage structure which has no heritage significance or value. It detracts from the historic form and interest of the site, and its removal would be considered to be a benefit.
224. The plans show that there would be alterations to the existing building known as the Engine House for conversion into a ceremony space, working with the existing building envelope and apertures. This would result in only very minor changes to fabric and character and very minor harm to its significance.
225. In general design terms, the proposed wedding venue has been designed using single and two storey buildings constructed from stone with pitched roofs around the former yard. However, the whole of the formerly open yard would have a glazed roof formed by a series of parallel roofs abutting the flat roof of the entrance foyer, which would give an urban appearance unrelated to the historic yard.
226. The Senior Archaeologist notes that changes within the grounds of Thornseat Lodge will result in both harm and enhancement. The infilling of the swimming pool, restoration of the historic access drive and maintenance of the grounds are all positive outcomes and will enhance the significance of and experience of the site. The creation of a new access drive and the car park would change the original design of the grounds, and change how they were intended to be utilised and experienced and will therefore result in a degree of harm to the significance of the site, but overall this is minor in scale.
227. Generally, taken together, the proposal for the courtyard and ancillary buildings, the proposed tarmac driveways, and surfaced car park would be significant new or altered features within the designed landscape surrounding the Lodge which would cause some level of harm to the significance of the Lodge, its outbuildings and the grounds contrary to policies GSP3, L3, DMC3, DMC5, DMC10 and the NPPF. Whilst some change would be acceptable to achieve an appropriate restoration and beneficial use of the lodge, the current scheme goes beyond what is considered to be acceptable in terms of its scale.

Landscape impact

228. The proposal is for a significant development on a site in a relatively isolated location on the edge of Bradfield Moor, this location being a consequence of the original use of the building as a shooting lodge. The development has the potential to have a harmful landscape impact not only due to the potential visual impact of new development and activity but also due to the potential impact upon dark skies and tranquillity, which are both important characteristics of the local landscape and underpin the defined special qualities for the National Park.

229. Policy L1 is clear that development must conserve and enhance valued landscape character and DMC1 A requires applications to provide a landscape assessment with reference to the Landscape Strategy and Action Plan. A landscape assessment (LVA) was submitted with the last application but our Landscape Officer raises significant concerns and disagreed with its conclusions. The application was subsequently refused and reason for refusal 3 stated: *“The development would harm valued landscape character, as identified in the Landscape Strategy and Action Plan and tranquillity and dark skies. The development is therefore contrary to policies L1, DMC1, DMC3, DMC14 and the National Planning Policy Framework.”* The revised application includes a revised LVA, which now includes an additional viewpoint (PV10) following the clear felling of a substantial area of woodland to the south-east of Dale Dike reservoir. The LVA provides a detailed assessment of the site and its setting in the landscape. It concludes that the landscape sensitivity of the site is derived from a combination of value and susceptibility and is considered to be medium for the site overall. The Zone of Theoretical Visibility and viewpoint analysis concludes that the site is identifiable by its tree canopy from all distances, but that the rising topography, boundary drystone walls, shrub and tree canopy prevent views into the site from all but the immediate short-range views. Thornseat Lodge is partially visible from a variety of ranges but does not form a dominant visual component in any view.
230. The site is located within the Dark Peak and specifically within the moorland slopes and cloughs as defined by our adopted landscape strategy. Land to the north and east of the site is improved grassland quickly becoming open moorland, which is open access land and designated as Natural Zone.
231. This landscape is characterised by steep slopes and cloughs rising to open moorland on the high plateau above, with widespread rough grassland and heather moor, grazed by sheep. This is a wild unsettled landscape with exposed views over lower ground.
232. The land to the west and north of the site reflects this character but the former lodge while originally created to facilitate shooting on the adjacent moorland was designed with landscape grounds and there is woodland within the site to the west of the lodge comprising conifer plantation, mature broadleaf trees and dense rhododendron.
233. The applicant’s LVA concludes that overall, the proposed development would be contained and sit discreetly within the existing site and long-term visual effects would be neutral. Initially there would be very localised negligible adverse visual effects on the immediate views from vehicles passing the site entrance on Mortimer Road and the nearby public right of way. Protection and enhancement of the most significant landscape features and sensitive design would result in long-term negligible beneficial effect on landscape features, a long-term neutral effect on landscape character, a long-term minor beneficial effect on the sites character.
234. In response to this, officers acknowledge that the majority of new development including the wedding venue, internal access roads and car park would be contained within the existing wooded area which would visually contain the development viewed from the road. However, there would be more open views from open access land on higher ground to the north-west where the mass of the proposed wedding venue and car park would be more noticeable.
235. In addition to this, there is still an outstanding concern about the potential impact of the use of the proposed wedding venue in this highly sensitive location. Tranquillity and dark skies are a particularly valued characteristic of the National Park, especially in the more remote wilder parts, such as moorland edges. This is an issue which is highlighted in the response from the CPRE, which has commissioned research into the importance of tranquillity in the countryside. In these sensitive locations even relatively low levels of

noise can be subjectively intrusive. The proposed wedding venue would have an intended capacity of 150 people. Gatherings of this number of people have the potential generate noise from celebrations and vehicle movements even if music can be contained.

236. The applicant has submitted a noise impact assessment with this revised application. The assessment recommends various modifications which have been implemented, regarding noise to the courtyard/stableyard including: the fitting of timber doors to the archway, a solid roof to the whole of the main dining room/ stage/ bar area, and a glazed roof to the internal courtyard. Whilst these are all necessary, together with active noise management measures, it is inevitable that a use of this scale and nature will create noise disturbance in an otherwise very quiet area. This will often be at night, but also during the days and at weekends, when others are visiting the area for the purposes of quiet enjoyment. This is a problem inherent in the use and one which would be exacerbated by vehicle movements and the disturbance associated with that.
237. The landscape is also relatively undeveloped with dark skies, a valued characteristic of the landscape, and very little light pollution. In response to this concern, the application includes a detailed lighting scheme has been submitted. However, given the scale and nature of the proposed wedding venue it is still considered highly likely that the development could generate light pollution, especially from the glazed courtyard, outside lighting to the terrace and car park and from vehicle movements during times of darkness. Given the current very low levels of light in this area, this would be harmful.
238. Given the potential impact of the development, we consider that the application would fundamentally conflict with the established landscape character of this part of the National Park contrary to policies GSP3, L3, DMC1 and DMC3.
239. As set out earlier in the report a range of works within the grounds of the Lodge are proposed to facilitate the proposed development. These include alterations to the existing access and drive, the creation of new access drives and car park. No detailed existing site plan has been submitted and therefore it is not possible to make an informed assessment of the proposed works.
240. The submitted landscape plan outlines how the site would be treated but no detailed proposals of how the woodland and grassland would be managed have been provided. Even within the existing wooded setting and with additional planting, the proposed driveways and surfaced car park would be expansive, intrusive and urbanising additions within the designed landscape surrounding the Lodge, as would the terracing around the wedding venue and the tarmac hardstanding around the Lodge itself.

Impact upon trees

241. A key aspect of the site is the existing woodland and our landscape strategy and action plan states that the management and enhancement of woodlands is a priority within this landscape.
242. A tree survey has been carried out and the report submitted with the application. The report identifies that the site is largely covered by plantation woodland, mature broadleaf trees and dense rhododendron. The plantation woodland is mostly conifer species with self-sown native and naturalised broadleaf species distributed throughout. The rhododendron, a non-native invasive species is found in a large area to the northern end of the site.
243. The scheme is supported by a landscape framework. A Woodland Management Plan has also been prepared, to ensure enhancements which are proposed to the wider woodland can be successfully delivered. The proposed development would involve the removal of a

number of existing trees to form a new access road and car parking to the south-west of the stable block. 23 category C (low value) trees are proposed for removal, many which are suppressed, leaning or with other defects, with low life expectancies resulting from being within a plantation which has not been thinned or managed. No category A (high value) or category B (moderate value) are proposed for removal and these are retained and protected on site. A further 17 U category (unsuitable for retention) trees are to be removed. It would also provide an opportunity to remove Rhododendron. The scheme includes planting of native trees, shrubs, and understorey planting. The LVA states that the design aims to minimise the impact on the existing vegetation, improve the character of the site and provide screening for the proposals.

244. The Authority's Tree Officer has no objection to the proposal relating to trees, based on the submitted plans.
245. If permission were granted, we would recommend that replacement planting, removal of invasive species and on-going management of the woodland on site forms part of a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP), which is discussed in more detail in the next section of the report.

Impact upon biodiversity

246. The application site is in close proximity the Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) Special Protection Area (SPA), South Pennine Moors Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the Dark Peak Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).
247. The proposal development is not directly connected with or necessary for the management of the European Site. Therefore, due to the proximity of the application site to European Sites we are required by regulation 63 of the Habitats and Species Regulations to determine whether the proposal is likely to have a significant effect on any European site and proceed to the Appropriate Assessment stage of the regulations where significant effects cannot be ruled out. This is also a requirement of policy DMC12.
248. The application is supported by a shadow habitat regulation assessment (sHRA), bat and bird surveys and noise assessment. The sHRA concludes that subject to mitigation measures to mitigate potential impacts from noise (during construction and operation) and illumination impacts and risk of fire from fireworks and sky lanterns that the development would not have a likely significant effect upon the SAC and SPA.
249. Natural England agreed with the conclusions of the sHRA submitted with e previous application and concluded that the development would not have a likely significant effect upon the SAC and SPA. We have undertaken an assessment of likely significant effects under the Habitats Regulations and recommend that this is adopted by the Authority (this is the subject of a separate report).
250. For the same reasons it is concluded that the proposed development would not damage or destroy the interest for which the SSSI has been notified. If planning permission is granted, we would recommend that planning conditions were imposed to require the submission and approval of a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) and a bat and bird mitigation plan before development commences along with planning conditions to prohibit the release of fireworks of sky lanterns (and similar devices) and to require noise mitigation measures to be implemented and complied with.
251. We would also require a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) to be submitted, approved and implemented. This would cover longer term management of the site and therefore would need to be secured by a planning obligation entered into by the applicant before planning permission was granted.

252. Subject to these planning conditions and planning obligation we are satisfied that the development would not harm designated sites in accordance with DMC12 A.
253. The survey reports submitted with the application do identify habitat and protected species within the application site that would be affected by the development including bats, birds and a loss of bracken bed where the car park would be located.
254. The surveys propose mitigation in the form of integrating bat and bird boxes into the development and the wider site. The reports also propose mitigation in the form of additional tree and hedge planting around the proposed car park and buildings, the implementation of a CEMP and a management plan for trees, reducing rhododendron and providing deadwood habitat, which could form part of the LEMP.
255. The reports provide detail about mitigation for bats and birds and recommends that the CEMP and landscape management plan be subject to planning conditions requiring submission and implementation.
256. DMC11 B states that development will not be permitted if applicants fail to provide adequate information including details of any mitigating or compensatory measures and details of provisions for the beneficial future management of the nature conservation interests of the site. We are concerned about the level of detail provided but on balance consider that suitable mitigation and enhancement could be secured through the approval of a CEMP and LEMP, along with provision of bat and bird boxes.
257. Therefore, the application demonstrates that the development if appropriately managed and operated would conserve and enhance biodiversity on site and at nearby designated sites. The application is therefore in accordance with policies L2, DMC11, DMC12 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Justification for major development

258. The application falls within the definition of major development by virtue of its scale and potential impact. Core Strategy policy GSP1 says that major development should only be allowed in exceptional circumstances following the criteria set out in national policy. Paragraph 177 of the NPPF says that permission should be refused for major development in the National Park other than in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest.
259. The justification for the development is primarily advanced on the basis that it is required to restore and enhance the Lodge and its former stable yard. In principle this could be a justification for allowing what is otherwise major development. However, we have established that the development would result in harm to the significance of the Lodge, its former stable yard and their setting and that the development would harm the landscape character and tranquillity of the National Park. Although the revised scheme has addressed some of the concerns set out in the previous refusal, particularly in respect of the main lodge, there are still significant concerns about the impact of the development of the former courtyard/stable yard area and some of the ancillary buildings and about the scale of the wedding/events use.
260. Consequently, the application does not establish an overriding need for the development in this location or demonstrate that the creation of the proposed wedding venue is the only means of achieving conservation and enhancement of the site and the key buildings. It should be acknowledged that the revised application has sought to address the objections that led to the refusal of the previous application and that in respect of the retention of more of the original Lodge it is much more sympathetic. The development would also

result in benefits to the local economy both during construction and operation; however, local businesses and the general public benefit significantly from the valued characteristics and recreation opportunities that the National Park affords so any harm to these is a negative consideration.

261. In accordance with paragraph 176 of the NPPF we must give great weight to the conservation of the valued characteristics of the National Park. Having considered this case against the criteria set out in national policy, it is concluded that, on balance, the development would not be in the public interest and therefore that exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify the proposed major development.

Sustainable building and climate change

262. Core Strategy policy CC1 and our adopted climate change and sustainable building SPD are relevant. CC1 makes clear that in order to build in resilience to and mitigate the causes of climate change all development must make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources, take account of the energy hierarchy and achieve the highest possible standards of carbon reductions and water efficiency. CC1 E says that non-residential major development above 1000m² must achieve a Buildings Emission Rate at least 10% less than the Target Emissions Rate.
263. Paragraph 154 of the NPPF says that new development should be planned for in ways that can help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions such as through its location, orientation and design. Paragraph 157 of the NPPF says that local planning authorities should expect new development to take account of landform, layout, building orientation, massing and landscaping to minimise energy consumption.
264. The proposed wedding venue would have a capacity for up to 150 people and the development has been designed with an 80 space car park. The site is located in open countryside and a significant distance from any public transport links, the closest being hourly bus routes in Low Bradfield approximately 3km walk from the site. The location of the site and the quantity of parking proposed indicates that the majority of visitors, if not all, would visit the site by private car.
265. The location of the development would therefore be inherently unsustainable, reflecting part of the reasoning why our policies direct economic development to named settlements and only allow for major development in exceptional circumstances. The location of the development would not help reduce greenhouse gas emissions contrary to CC1 A and paragraph 154 of the NPPF.
266. The revised application now provides an energy and sustainability report. It provides details of design measures that would help to meet the policy requirements in this respect. In relation to the renewable and low carbon technologies, it is recommended to combine the fabric first approach with the addition of a biomass boiler for this development. Initial energy SAP calculations based upon the outline design has been undertaken. The addition of the biomass boiler combined with the fabric first approach gives the development a very low carbon emission figure.
267. The biomass boiler would be housed in a new building. The applicants are providing a similar installation to provide heating at the Low Bradfield water treatment works development, which they are currently carrying out. When officers met the applicants recently it was agreed that there is no scope for wind turbines on this site, given its landscape setting and solar panels would not be appropriate on the historic buildings or within the grounds, other than possibly a small number in better screened locations, which would reduce their effectiveness. The possibility of ground source and air source heat pumps could still be explored.

268. Although the revised application is better than the previous application in this respect, officers consider that additional measures could be incorporated if the development is accepted in principle.

Transport and highway safety

269. Due to the scale and nature of the development it has the potential to give rise to a significant number of vehicle movements. Following comments from the Transport Policy Officer in the previous application (regarding the capacity for a mini bus services, parking space numbers, provision of designated disabled parking space numbers, EV points, the requirement for secure cycle storage if cycling is to be promoted and analysis of existing traffic flows in the absence of TRICS data), the Transport Statement and Travel Plan have been reviewed and a revised Transport Statement has been submitted.
270. The plans within the transport statement show that safe access can be provided with adequate visibility splays onto Mortimer Road and that there is space within the site for all delivery and service vehicles to turn before returning to the highway. The existing access will be improved to incorporate formal kerb radii and an improvement in the alignment for vehicles waiting at the give way. The existing segregated access and egress routes through the woodland have been retained. There are no issues with regard to the safety of the access point onto Mortimer Road.
271. As set out above the proposed alterations to the access, appear to include widening the existing historic access and the removal of walling and gateposts. This appears to be to facilitate one of the new internal driveways. The removal of these features would detract from the character and appearance of the site as set out earlier in the report contrary to policy DMT3 B.
272. The Transport Statement proposes a total of 80 car parking spaces calculated on the basis that two visitors sharing a car plus spaces to accommodate a maximum of 10 staff. The amount of parking proposed is within our adopted standards bearing in mind the size of the development proposed. The statement assumes that all visitors would be by private car with a maximum of 75 cars for guests. The statement says that trips are likely to occur predominately outside the traditional network peak hours or at weekends and therefore would not result in any material impact on highway capacity.
273. The Parking Standards call for accessible parking spaces to be provided at minimum of one additional space for every 25 standard parking spaces and therefore 3no. accessible spaces will be provided within the total, in a location close to the events venue with level access. Eight Electric Vehicle Charging Points (EVCPs) will be provided (10%) with the ducting infrastructure provided to allow a further 8no. to be converted in due course as demand dictates. One of the EVCPs will be provided to be used by the accessible parking spaces.
274. Given the location of the site and the distance to public transport links the assumption made in the transport statement that most visitors will attend by private car is reasonable. However, it is unclear on what basis the assessment concludes that trips are likely to occur outside peak hours. Weddings can commence at a range of times from morning to late afternoon and it is not uncommon for guests to arrive and leave throughout the day. Weddings and receptions also regularly take place during the week.
275. The application is located in open countryside where there is a presumption against the proposed development. Visitors to the development would be very likely to only access the development by private car. The application proposes a substantial car park on that basis.

276. A Travel Plan has been submitted with the application. The Travel Plan says that the operators will ensure that access to the site is as sustainable as possible. Sustainable travel initiatives such as the provision of EVCPs, cycle storage and the minibus will be included within publicity material produced for the development. The plan says that they will ensure that publicity material including any website, brochures etc is kept up to date.
277. The travel plan also does not include any proposed targets or monitor able actions and does not undertake to survey travel behaviours. The travel plan does highlight cycling as a means for employees to access the site but highlights the remote setting of the site as a barrier. The Travel Plan does consider other possible measures such as car sharing or the provision of a bespoke mini-bus shuttle service and at the recent meeting the applicants explained that events such as weddings lend themselves to the use of taxis and minibuses which would reduce the use of individual cars. The Authority's Transport Policy Planner is now satisfied that the Transport statement addresses some of the concerns he raised in the previous application. However, the site is relatively remote so a development of the scale proposed would inevitably generate traffic and is in an inherently unsustainable location.
278. The site has reasonable access to the wider highway network via Mortimer Road. However, it is likely that a number of guests would travel from the direction of High and Low Bradfield along Dale Road and Windy bank which are popular with recreational users. These are narrow lanes with no pavement for pedestrians.
279. There is still a concern that the development would fail to encourage sustainable transport and would exacerbate the impact of traffic in an environmentally sensitive location contrary to core policy T1. The application would not encourage behavioural change or achieve a reduction in the need to travel, contrary to Core Strategy policy T2.

Flood risk and drainage

280. A flood risk assessment and drainage strategy has been submitted with the application in accordance with the NPPF. The whole site is located within Flood Zone 1 which has the lowest flood risk. The Environment Agency has no objection in regard to flood risk and we agree with the submitted assessment that the development will be directed away from flood risk areas and not pose a risk of flooding in accordance with policy CC1 C.
281. Core policy CC5 C and paragraph 165 of the NPPF requires development to incorporate sustainable drainage systems to deal with the run-off of surface water. A sustainable urban drainage strategy (SUDS) has been submitted as part of the flood risk assessment designed to attenuate a 1 in 100 year (+40%) event.
282. In the original resubmission the Sheffield LLFA had concerns about building over a watercourse and the method of disposal of surface water. However, those concerns have now been addressed through the submission of a detailed drainage strategy and the LLFA has no objections and recommends that full details of the proposed surface water management for the site are secured by an appropriate condition.
283. Accordingly, the submitted scheme would meet the requirements of policies CC1 and CC5. A planning condition would be required to secure the submission of construction details and implementation in accordance with policy DMU1.
284. Foul drainage would be to a private package treatment plant on site. The nearest main sewer is some 2.7km away and therefore we accept that it would not be practicable or viable to connect to the main sewer. A planning condition would be required to secure the submission of construction details and implementation in accordance with policy DMU1.

Other issues

285. The nearest neighbouring property is Warden's House located 25m to the north-west of the Lodge building. Given the distance from the development to Warden's House there are no concerns that the development would be overbearing or lead to any significant loss of light or privacy to occupants. The development would also be contained within the site with dedicated access and parking and therefore visitors to the development would be unlikely to trespass on the neighbouring property.
286. The submitted noise survey demonstrates that provided that noise from the development would not be harmful to the amenity of occupants of Warden's House as they would be limited to at or below existing background noise levels. This is if mitigation is implemented including noise insulation, noise control systems for amplified music and speeches and hours of operation. If permission were granted planning conditions would be necessary to secure this mitigation in accordance with policies DMC3 and DMC14.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

287. Thornseat Lodge is a non-designated heritage asset of regional significance. The Lodge building is in a very poor state of repair. The proposed major development is contrary to development plan policies but is justified by the applicants on the basis that the development is required to conserve and enhance the lodge and therefore that major development is required in the public interest to enable enhancement of the Lodge and its former stable yard.
288. The revised application has addressed some of the concerns raised when the previous application was refused, particularly with regard to the fabric of the original lodge. However, the development still proposes a large wedding venue in the open countryside on the edge of designated moorland. In principle a development which conserves and enhances the historic assets on the site would be acceptable if the benefits outweigh any harm; this could include a development with visitor accommodation and possibly a smaller wedding venue.
289. An option that was discussed with the applicants at the recent meeting was to restore the lodge and to use this as both accommodation and the main wedding venue, with the courtyard development being restricted to buildings on the footprint of the original buildings and use as visitor accommodation and possibly other uses ancillary to the main use. This would be a smaller, more contained wedding venue, similar to those seen in other historic houses and buildings in the National Park and surrounding areas. The viability report would suggest that this form of development would not be viable, but it has been put to the applicants on a without prejudice basis.
290. The applicants have also offered to cease the use of the Foxholes site, near Low Bradfield, if the current application is approved. That site has been used for many years under permitted development rights and involves the erection of a large marquee on a prominent hillside site above the village and close to listed buildings. This is a material consideration and one which would be beneficial to that site and its setting. It is not considered to be sufficient to overcome the current objections to the application, but if there was a smaller scheme it should be considered. A section 106 agreement would be required to secure this and consideration would also have to be given to covering other land in the applicant's ownership in the Bradfield valley
291. For the reasons set out in this report, we conclude that the development would result in unacceptable harm to the significance of the Lodge, its former stable yard and their setting.

Furthermore, the development would harm the landscape character and tranquillity of the National Park and represent an unsustainable form of development.

292. The proposal would therefore not be in the public interest and therefore there are no exceptional circumstances to justify the proposed major development.

293. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the development plan. Material considerations do not indicate that planning permission should be granted. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

Human Rights

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

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

295. Nil

296. Report Author: John Scott (Consultant Planner)