

11. FULL APPLICATION - DEMOLITION OF FARM BUILDINGS AND THE ERECTION OF TWO NEW FARM BUILDINGS, WITH ASSOCIATED BUILDING OPERATIONS AT PUMP FARM, SCHOOL LANE, WARLOW, (NP/SM/0123/0037) /ALN

APPLICANT: PEAK DISTRICT NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

1. Summary

2. Pump Farm is owned by the National Park Authority as part of the Waslow Moors Estate.
3. The proposals are to demolish an existing range of livestock and storage buildings and infill a slurry lagoon, to be replaced by new livestock and storage sheds.
4. An agricultural need has been demonstrated based on plans to change the farm from a dairy unit to a beef rearing enterprise.
5. The development would conserve and enhance the landscape and the Warslow Conservation Area and would have ecological benefits.
6. The application is recommended for conditional approval.

7. Site and Surroundings

8. Pump Farm is located on the south eastern edge of the village of Warslow. Access is gained from School Lane to the north. The property consists of a farmhouse, a range of traditional farm buildings to the east of the house and a range of modern farm buildings to the south. The property is within the Warslow Conservation Area.
9. The application site edged red encompasses the existing modern sheds and yard to the north east, together with a slurry store which sits to the south west. Part of a small outbuilding to the north west of the farmhouse is also included.
10. Pump Farm is owned by the National Park Authority as part of the Warslow Moors Estate. The traditional buildings to the north of the farmhouse were converted following planning permission in 2017 and are now used as a base for the Authority's Ranger Service.
11. The Peak District Moors Special Protection Area (SPA), South Pennine Moors Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Leek Moors SSSI lie approximately 1.4km to the north of the application site. The nearest point of the Peak District Dales SAC lies approximately 2.4 km to the south. The Hamps and Manifold Valleys SSSI is approximately 500m to the east at its nearest point.

12. Proposals

13. The current proposals have arisen from a plan to update the farm complex and to let the farm (and farmhouse) on a 7-year farm business tenancy. Historically the farm was run as a dairy farm and then more latterly for beef and sheep. For the future the farm will be let as a livestock holding with the primary enterprise being beef (i.e. suckler cows and beef rearing).
14. The submitted Design and Access statement explains that the 'modern' farm buildings comprise of a group of buildings which have been constructed organically around a timber framed building. They are now largely unfit for purpose. The slurry store has not been used for many years and is not required for the farm in the future.

15. Consequently the current proposals are for:
16. The demolition of the existing arrangement of 'modern' farm buildings and the kennel building as used for the previous dairy cattle enterprise.
17. The demolition of the existing steel portal frame building (eastern three bays).
18. The filling-in of the concrete slurry store to create a yard area.
19. Erection of a new 3 bay steel portal bay storage building (2 bays on the footprint of the existing building and a further bay to the western end) – measuring 18.3m x 9.8m and 4.1m to the eaves.
20. The erection of a new cattle building, measuring 27.4m x 12.2m and 4.2m to the eaves. The building would be open on the north western side.
21. Removal of a walled enclosure adjoining the traditional outbuilding to the north of the farmhouse.
22. Materials for the new buildings would be pre-coated sheeting above concrete panels on the walls and pre-coated sheeting on the roofs. The slurry store would be infilled with materials arising from the demolition of the existing buildings and finished in compacted hardcore. The yard area between the livestock buildings and the storage building would be laid with concrete.

23. RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. **3 year time limit**
2. **Adopt submitted plans**
3. **Existing buildings to be fully removed prior to the new buildings being brought into use.**
3. **Recommendations within the Arboricultural Method Statement at section 6 of the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment by Jon Coe Tree Consultancy Limited shall be fully adhered to. The new trees shall be an even mixture of whips, feathered trees, standard and heavy standards.**
4. **The new tree planting as specified in section 6 of the submitted Arboricultural Impacts Assessment by Jon Coe Tree Consultancy Ltd shall be carried out in the first planting season following completion of occupation of the approved development (whichever is sooner). Thereafter any trees that die, or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced within the next planting season with new tree of an equivalent size and species or in accordance with an alternative scheme to be approved by the National Park Authority.**
5. **With regard to bats, all works to be undertaken in accordance with section 4.4.2 of the submitted ecological appraisal.**
6. **Before works commence on the infilling of the slurry store, details of a new pond on near the site to be submitted and agreed. Pond to be completed before the slurry store is infilled.**

7. **Lighting strategy as detailed in section 4.4.2.3 of the ecological appraisal to be implemented**
8. **Works on trees identified as having bat roost potential should be inspected prior to removal/disturbance by a suitably qualified ecologist.**
9. **Works to take place outside of the bird breeding season unless otherwise agreed.**
10. **Ecological enhancement strategy to be submitted, agreed and implemented.**
11. **Working Method statement in respect of Great Crested Newt to be submitted, agreed and implemented.**
12. **Timber space boarding on south east elevation of livestock building to be brought down to ground level.**
13. **Buildings to be removed when no longer required for the purposes of agriculture**

24. Key Issues

25. Agricultural justification
26. Impacts on the landscape character of the area and Conservation Area
27. Ecological considerations
28. Impact on Trees
29. Residential amenity.

30. History

31. September 1990 – consent granted for erection of slurry store and timber building.
32. August 2008 – consent granted for proposed roofed building to existing agricultural feed areas.
33. December 2017 – planning permission granted for demolition of existing agricultural building and replacement with a modern storage building, and the change of use of the existing traditional building, to provide storage and office facilities for the Estate Ranger Service of the National Park. (NP/SM/1017/1043)
34. October 2021 – planning permission granted for Erection of a new storage building to provide storage facilities for the Estate Ranger Service of the National Park (following demolition of existing agricultural buildings under planning reference NP/SM/1017/1043) – NP/SM/0721/0816

35. Consultations

36. **Highway Authority** – no response
37. **District Council** – no response
38. **Parish Council** – no response

39. **Natural England** – *no objection - subject to appropriate mitigation being secured*

40. *We consider that without appropriate mitigation the application could:*

- *have an adverse effect on the integrity of Peak District Moors SPA & South Pennine Moors SAC.*
- *damage or destroy the interest features for which Hamps and Manifold Valleys SSSI &*

41. *Leek Moors SSSI have been notified.*

42. *In order to mitigate these adverse effects and make the development acceptable, the following should be secured:*

- *Confirmation of the total capacity of the proposed livestock building*
Your authority must undertake a HRA for the proposal, ruling out an adverse effect on the integrity of the Peak District Moors SPA and South Pennine Moors SAC.

43. **Authority's Ecologist** – no objections subject to conditions.

44. **Authority's Tree Officer** – no objections subject to all tree works and tree protection to be in accordance with Arboricultural Method Statement and specifications for new trees to be planted.

45. Representations

46. None received.

47. Main Policies

48. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, L1, L2, L3

49. Relevant Local Plan policies: DMC3, DME1, DMC12, DMC13

50. National Planning Policy Framework

51. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) replaced a significant proportion of central government planning policy with immediate effect. The Government's intention is that the document should be considered to be a material consideration and carry particular weight where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date. In the National Park the development plan comprises the East Midlands Regional Plan 2009, the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and saved policies in the Peak District National Park Local Plan 2001. Policies in the Development Plan provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. It is considered that in this case there is no significant conflict between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and more recent Government guidance in the NPPF with regard to the issues that are raised.'

52. Paragraph 115 of the Framework says that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks and that the conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations and should also be given great weight.

53. Core Strategy

- 54. Policy DS1 sets out the Development Strategy for the National Park. Agricultural development is acceptable in principle in the open countryside outside of the natural zone.
- 55. Core Strategy policy GSP3 states that development must respect, conserve and enhance all valued characteristics of the site and buildings that are subject to the development proposal.
- 56. Core Strategy policy L1 states that development must conserve and enhance valued landscape character, as identified in the Landscape Strategy and Action Plan and other valued characteristics.
- 57. L2 states, amongst other things that development must conserve and enhance any sites, features or species of biodiversity importance and where appropriate their setting.
- 58. Core Strategy policy L3 requires that development must conserve and where appropriate enhance or reveal significance of archaeological, artistic or historic asset and their setting, including statutory designation and other heritage assets of international, national, regional or local importance or special interest.
- 59. Core Strategy Policy CC1 states that development must make the most efficient use of land, buildings and natural resources and take account of the energy hierarchy.

60. Development Management Policies

- 61. Policy DMC3 expects a high standard of design that respects, protects and where possible enhances the natural beauty, quality and visual amenity of the landscape.
- 62. Policy DMC8 seeks to protect the character and appearance of Conservation Areas.
- 63. Development Management Policy DME1 allows for buildings and structures necessary for the purposes of agriculture provided that they are functionally required and close to the main group of buildings wherever possible and in all cases relates well to existing buildings and landscape features; are not in isolated locations requiring obtrusive access tracks, road or services; respect the design of existing buildings and building traditions; avoid adverse effects on the area's valued characteristics and avoid harm to the setting, fabric and integrity of the Natural Zone.
- 64. DMC12 states that with regard to protected species development will only be permitted where significant harm can be avoided and the conservation status of the species is maintained and the need for and the benefits of the development clearly outweigh any adverse effect.
- 65. DMC13 seeks to protect trees put at risk by development and requires that sufficient information be submitted to enable impacts to be properly considered.
- 66. Further advice is provided within the Authority's Adopted SPD on Agricultural Developments. Advice is also provided within the Authority's Historic Farmsteads Guidance.

67. Assessment

68. Principle of Development

- 69. Policy DS1 allows for agricultural development in principle. Policy DME1 is directly

relevant and requires applications to provide information to demonstrate that the proposed development is functionally required. If development is justified then DME1 B. requires buildings to be well sited, not require obtrusive tracks, respect the design, scale and mass of existing buildings and building traditions and avoid harm to the valued characteristics of the area.

70. Agricultural Justification

71. Pump Farm is owned by the National Park Authority as part of the Warslow Moors Estate. The farm was previously tenanted but was vacated in November 2019. The farm is now back in the direct control of the PDNPA, and since 2019 the land has been let-out on seasonal grazing and mowing licence arrangements to local farmers.

72. As stated above the existing buildings have developed in a piecemeal fashion and the submitted information states that they are not suitable for the future planned use of the farm as a beef rearing enterprise. We are satisfied from the information provided that there is an agricultural justification for the proposed development, in accordance with policy DME1.

73. Impact on the Landscape Character of the Area and the Conservation Area

74. The existing modern farm buildings at Pump Farm are not prominent from the main B5053 to the north because they are screened by other buildings and by intervening vegetation cover. Parts of the buildings are visible however from within the Conservation Area from School Lane to the west, and across fields from public rights of way that run to the east, west and south of the farmstead. Whilst they are modern industrial scale sheds, and they do not contribute the character of the area, they are typical features of a modern working farm and are seen against the backdrop of the built edge of the village to the north and other similar farmsteads in close proximity. The slurry pit is not visible at all because it is surrounded on three sides by trees and on the east side by the buildings.

75. Both of the new proposed buildings would be positioned further to the south west than the existing buildings that they will replace, however the new livestock building would partially overlap the footprint of the already developed area of the slurry pit and so would not result in any expansion of the operational area of the farmstead. One bay of the proposed storage building would extend to the south west beyond the footprint of the existing building, but again this is an area that is already enclosed and hard surfaced. Consequently in terms of siting, our view is that the proposed development would not cause harm over and above the existing situation by virtue of encroachment into the more open part of the Conservation Area to the south west.

76. The existing livestock sheds have a haphazard massing and arrangement of roofs and a jumbled mixture of materials and detailing. The new livestock building would be significantly smaller in footprint than the existing collection of sheds and the overall ridge height would be lower than the tallest part of the existing group. This, together with its simpler massing and design would represent an enhancement over the existing situation. It has been agreed that the timber space boarding on the south east elevation of the livestock building (that faces out over the open fields) will be brought down to ground level in order to further reduce the visual impact of the building.

77. Whilst a number of the trees around the slurry store would be removed (as discussed later), the retained trees, together with proposed new planting to the north and south of the new yard area means that that any visual impacts would be effectively mitigated.

78. With regard to demolition of the walled enclosure that abuts the small outbuilding to the north west of the farmhouse, a Heritage Impact Assessment has been submitted which

confirms that the enclosure is of 20th century origins and abuts an earlier cowhouse. It has no architectural or historic merit and negatively impacts on the traditional cowhouse and the wider setting of the barn. The demolition of the enclosure would enhance the Conservation Area.

79. The existing access would continue to be used and would remain unaltered.
80. In conclusion the development would conserve and to some extent enhance the landscape character of the area and the significance of the Warslow Conservation Area in accordance with policies L1, L3, DME1 and DMC5.

81. Ecological Considerations

82. Air Quality

83. Manure stores, slurry lagoons and livestock sheds are a major source of emissions of ammonia which is directly toxic to vegetation and especially to lower plants (mosses, liverworts and lichens). Ammonia is also a major contributor to the deposition of nitrogen, which reduces habitat biodiversity.
84. Natural England identified that the interest features of surrounding designated sites (SAC, SPA and SSSIs) may be sensitive to impacts from aerial pollutants. Screening information has now been provided by the agent and Natural England are satisfied that subject to the buildings having a capacity of no more than 70 cattle (which the applicant has confirmed will be the case), then the development would result in a reduction in ammonia concentrations and nitrogen deposition.
85. Overall the Authority's ecologist has concluded that the development will not have an adverse effect on the Peak District Moors SPA, the South Pennine Moors SAC or the Peak District Dales SAC and will in fact have a positive impact compared to the existing situation as a result of the reduced stock capacity and enhanced management.

86. Protected Species

87. An Ecological Impact Assessment has been submitted with the application. The report details habitat and protected species surveys including bat activity surveys. It is reported that bats are unlikely to be present within the buildings subject to this application. However a brown long eared bat roost was found in the traditional barn adjacent to the structure to be demolished (north west of the farmhouse). Site specific working method statements are recommended in order to avoid any impacts upon the bats. This can be required by condition.
88. Twenty six trees are proposed for removal. A sycamore tree and a horse chestnut tree are identified as having bat roost potential. A condition that requires the trees to be inspected prior to any removal/disturbance is required. Thirty five native species broadleaved trees will be planted to replace those lost.
89. Filling in the slurry pit would impact the foraging behaviour of soprano pipistrelle on the site as a result of two individuals seen foraging continuously over the disused slurry pit during the surveys. Provision of a new open water body on or near to the site would allow or this foraging habitat to be replaced. This can be required by condition.
90. With regard to great crested newt, A disused slurry pit, now filled with water, proposed to be filled in and built upon was the only body of water present on site. Whilst it was not considered likely to provide suitable breeding requirements for great crested newts, the slurry pit scored

91. Average on the Habitat Suitability Index. Therefore a condition to require a working method statement to mitigate the risk is necessary.
92. With regard to breeding birds, disused nests were identified on the site and so the Authority's ecologist has recommended that works should take place outside the bird breeding season.
93. To compensate for loss of habitat for bats, birds and Great Crested Newt and to provide net gains for biodiversity in line with the NPPF, a condition to require an Ecological Enhancement Strategy detailing features set out in Section 4.5 of the Ecology report is necessary.
94. In conclusion subject to the conditions outlined above the proposals would conserve and enhance protected species in accordance with policies L3 and DMC12.
95. Impact on Trees
96. An Arboricultural Impact Assessment report has been submitted with the application. The report confirms that the proposed development would result in the loss of 26 trees. The largest of these is in a structural condition that is not safe for retention in proximity to the adjacent building – its removal would be required regardless of development. The remainder of the trees for removal are from a dense belt of trees around the edge of the disused slurry pit. These trees were planted approximately 30 years ago. None are special and most are low quality – some are leaning, many are slender due to laterally suppressed growth, and several are in a collapsed condition.
97. The best of the surveyed trees is a mature sycamore just south of the proposed new cattle shed. The position of this shed was revised at design stage, such that the extent of rooting area incursion is now acceptable. The tree should not be harmed provided that the recommendations of the report are adhered to.
98. Thirty five new trees would be planted in clearly defined areas, to mitigate for the tree losses and to screen the new hardstanding area.
99. In conclusion it has been demonstrated that, subject to the method statement contained within the report being adhered to, the requirements of policy DMC13 are met.
100. Impact on Amenity
101. The new buildings would be around 36m to the south of the Authority's ranger base within the former traditional barns. These buildings are used as offices and meeting rooms in connection with the management of the wider Warslow Moors estate. Given the fact that both elements are within the Authority's ownership and control and the nature of the use of the existing modern farm sheds, it is not considered that the new buildings would have any adverse impact on the continued use of the ranger base, and in fact would improve the relationship to some degree as the new buildings would be slightly further away.
102. Other than Pump Farm farmhouse itself, the nearest residential dwelling in third party ownership is School House, some 70m to the north west, but due to the separation distances and the presence of an intervening public highway it is not considered that there would be a detrimental impact on the amenity of the occupants of this property. The proposals therefore accord with policies GSP3 and LC4 in these respects.
103. Climate Change Mitigation

104. A climate change statement is included with the application. It states that any steel work from the demolition will be re-cycled and re-used. The timber framed building will be relocated to another farm and so re-used. The hardcore from the demolition of the buildings will be used to fill in the slurry store. The buildings would not need to be heated and energy efficient light bulbs would be used for internal lighting.

105. The proposals would also contribute to climate change mitigation through facilitating a less intensive farming operation at the site.

106. With regard to the nature of the development, these measures proposed are considered to be compliant with policy CC1.

107. Conclusion

108. In conclusion there is a functional requirement for the proposed agricultural development, which would conserve and enhance the landscape character of the area and the Warslow Conservation Area. All other material considerations have been adequately addressed, and subject to conditions the application is recommended for approval.

109. Human Rights

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

111. **List of Background Papers** (not previously published)

112. Nil

113. Report Author and Job Title

114. Andrea Needham – Senior Planner - South