

14. FULL APPLICATION: DEVELOPMENT OF ONE DWELLING, DISUSED QUARRY CHUNAL, CHARLESWORTH (NP/HPK/0723/0810, JRS)

APPLICANT: MR PHILIP BENNETT

Summary

1. The application is for a new dwelling within a former quarry in open countryside within the Natural Zone, on the edge of open moorland, but adjacent to the A624. The proposed dwelling is a contemporary design and of a modest scale. However, the proposal is considered to be contrary to the policies of the Development Plan in terms of its location. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

Site and Surroundings

2. The application site is a relatively small former quarry located immediately to the east of the A624 Chunal Lane, just south of Chunal and approximately 2.75km south of the centre of Glossop and 4.5km north of Hayfield. The former quarry is on the edge of Chunal Moor, which extends eastwards to the Kinder Scout plateau. It is within the area designated as Natural Zone, together with the adjacent moorland.
3. The site has a narrow entrance on the A624, and then widens out to the shallow basin of the former quarry, with a gritstone rock face to the rear (east). There are trees on the eastern and southern edges of the site. At present there is a timber storage building a small shed and a touring caravan on site. There is also an array of eight solar panels placed against the southern slope at the rear of the site. These buildings, the caravan and the solar panels do not have planning permission, although photographs suggest that the building has been on site for some years.
4. It is understood that the site was used for small scale quarrying works until around 1980 and its stone was used as roofing stone for the area. It covers a total area of 0.56 hectares with the site area being approximately 450 sq. meters. The site is surrounded by a perimeter fence, with a drystone wall along the A624 frontage.
5. There are three statutory designated sites within 1km of the site boundary.
 - South Pennine Moors Special Area of Conservation, immediately adjacent to the site.
 - Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) Special Protection Area for birds, immediately adjacent to the site.
 - The Dark Peak SSSI, immediately adjacent to the site.

Proposal

6. The proposal is to erect a single dwelling on the site.
7. The application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement, and a preliminary ecological assessment. Since submission the applicants have also provided a highway assessment to address the initial response of the Highway Authority and a heritage assessment to address the response from the Authority's Senior Archaeologist.
8. The Design and Access Statement says the following about the proposed dwelling (selected extracts; the whole statement can be seen on the website):

"We want our dwelling to be a "Lifetime Home". A home that is energy independent and construction style suitable for our retirement years. Over more than ten years we have researched and made extensive investigations as to the style of dwelling and building systems that would be suitable in this unique site. Our proposal is for a single-story eco-dwelling of exceptional design, and sympathetic to the surroundings. We would

incorporate the latest developments in solar technology and other energy producing /saving systems. The truly innovative solar smart flower, the state of the art “Sunamp” Super-compact thermal batteries, storing heat and releasing it on demand. (Details of both at the end of this document) Together with ground source heat pumps, water bore hole, extensive Rainwater Harvesting and a “Packaged Treatment Sewage Plant” meaning no services would need to be brought into the site so preserving the natural feel of the area. These advancements in technology now allow for a home completely off-grid and extremely sustainable. This would be a self-build/custom build home.

The green roof proposed for the dwelling will add much needed habitat to the exposed bedrock ground, where even the hardest weeds struggle to exist. The large frontage of the quarry land would be tidied, but basically untouched and native silver birch and blackthorn, hawthorn and other native plants encouraged to grow and self-seed.

We aim to build a highly insulated “off grid” home with the emphasis on sustainability.

On this site a single-story building with a gently arched green roof which mirrors the hillside across the valley and is sympathetic to the surroundings is the answer. A roof design not dissimilar to that on the on PDNPA planning home page. Our preferred construction method is timber SIP. A very sustainable system that would be manufactured to size off-site and fitted together on-site, so greatly reducing build time and site disruption. (<https://www.sips.uk.com/contentfiles/downloads/Download-37.pdf>) Finished in attractive thermally modified timber cladding (<https://www.vastern.co.uk/cladding/brimstone-british-tmt/>) to hint at the agricultural buildings of the area, highly insulated with sustainable high performance materials where possible. A floating floor built on low pillars will minimise groundworks and disruption on the site. Approximate size. 16m x 10m. 4m high. Open plan Living, Dining. Kitchen at front. 2 Bedrooms, Workrooms, Bathroom & Utility room.”

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reason:

- 1. The application proposes the erection of a new dwelling on a site within the Natural Zone, in a small former quarry. There is a strong presumption against development in this location unless there are exceptional circumstances which justify approval. The quarry has become naturalised since operations ceased over 40 years ago and it does not require a development to provide enhancement or remove a non-conforming or inappropriate use. It is therefore considered that for these reasons the proposal is contrary to accord with Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP2, DS 1, HC1 and L1, and DMP policies DMC1 and DMC2. .**

Key Issues

- Whether the development is acceptable in principle.
- Whether the proposal would achieve an enhancement of the site.
- Impact on ecology and biodiversity
- Highway considerations.

History

1951: Ministerial consent granted to continue working an existing quarry.

1960: Planning permission to work quarry to 1970.

1971: NP/CHA/171/3 - Temporary planning permission (to 31 December 1980) for continuation of quarrying. Condition requiring disposal of overburden and waste in previously excavated area.

1980s: Investigation of unauthorised storage on site, correspondence with site owner regarding old vehicle bodies.

1999: Photographs show some low-key storage of building materials, but no buildings.

2011: Photographs show a building in place.

The planning application says that after it became redundant as a quarry it became part of the estate which owned much of the moorland above Glossop mainly used for grouse shooting. The last user ran a log and firewood business, which was the subject of an enforcement enquiry and subsequently moved elsewhere. That owner installed the large wooden gates at the entrance to protect the site from fly-tipping.

Consultations

9. Highway Authority:

Response to revised plans:

You will be aware of the Highway Authority's previous consultation response raised a number of issues in connection with the visibility splays and in the intervening period a number of discussions have taken place to try and resolve the highway issues, which has culminated in the recently submitted revised drawing (RHC-23-208-01), so from a highways aspect the application is now considered acceptable and it is recommended that the following Conditions/Notes are appended to any consent granted:

- 1. No development, including preparatory works, shall commence until the new vehicular to the public highway (A624) has been constructed. The junction shall be laid out in accordance with the approved plan(s) and visibility sightlines of 69m (south) and 141m (north) measured 1m into the nearside edge of the carriageway, as measured from a point located centrally and 2.4m back into the access. The area within the sightlines shall thereafter be kept clear of any object greater than 600mm above the nearside carriageway channel level.*
- 2. The proposed parking shall be provided in accordance with the application drawing for a vehicle to be parked. Once provided, the space shall be retained free from any impediment to its designated use for the life of the development.*
- 3. There shall be no gates or other barriers within 5m of the access/driveway.*
- 4. The proposed access/driveway shall be no steeper than 1:12."*

10. Parish Council:

"Charlesworth Parish Council noted with disappointment that the National Park has made no effort to consult with residents or other potentially affected parties, nor has a site notice been posted. (Officer comment: A site notice was posted on site and there are no immediate neighbours to consult)

This site is a former stone quarry. It is not in active use as a quarry. There is a semi-derelict hut and caravan, a WC block, an array of solar panels and deposits of builders' rubble.

The Parish Council agreed to object to this proposal on these grounds:

- 1. Development of a single dwelling on open moorland within the National Park, without justification in terms of housing need or exceptional design merit, is inappropriate*
- 2. Parish Council believe the creation of additional dwellings, in remote areas, irrespective of who might live in them, conflicts with Core Strategy Policy HC1 and DMP Policy DMH10.*

3. *The proposed style of the dwelling is entirely out of keeping with this part of the National Park*
4. *The use of former quarries for residential purposes would set a dangerous precedent*
5. *Access onto the A624, a fast road and steep hill, with a bad reputation for accidents, is dangerous. The access point to the application site from the north is on the approach to a sharp bend, and from the south, immediately after the sharp bend. Visibility in leaving the site is very limited.*

11. Borough Council: No response.

12. Natural England (extract of key points): No Objection, subject to appropriate mitigation being secured.

“We consider that without appropriate mitigation the application could:

- have an adverse effect on the integrity of South Pennine Moors, Special Area of Conservation and the Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors, Phase 1), Special Protection Area.*
- damage or destroy the interest features for which the Dark Peak, Site of Special Scientific Interest has been notified.*

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:

- An appropriate construction environmental management plan (CEMP) should be established prior to the commencements of any permitted work on site.*
- To ensure that the construction phase of development, should permission be granted, occurs outside of the bird breeding season, typically March through to September.*

We advise that an appropriate planning condition or obligation is attached to any planning permission to secure these measures.

Further advice on mitigation

A Construction Management Plan (CEMP) should be compiled and agreed with the competent authority prior to development works occurring, should permission be granted. Within the CEMP, measures detailing how construction activities will be limited in time, to take place outside of the bird breeding season, should be included. In addition, measures to reduce potential noise levels should also be set out and agreed to reduce the risk of disturbance to SPA birds outside of the breeding season.

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.

Biodiversity Enhancements

Natural England welcomes the proposed biodiversity enhancements as set out within the applicant’s submitted design and access statement. The implementation of a green roof on the proposed development is valued. We would encourage the applicant to use a native planting mix, closely aligned to the species found within the adjoining land, to be implemented and become established on the roof structure. In addition, we acknowledge the planting of native species within the development site. Similarly to the above, we would encourage the applicant to use a native planting mix, closely aligned to the Page 3 of 3 species found within the adjoining land such as dwarf shrub heathland.

13. PDNPA Archaeology: Object due to lack of information:

“The proposed development site is a historic quarry recorded in the Derbyshire Historic Environment record. The origins, date, development and significance of the quarry is currently unknown. No heritage statement has been submitted in support of this application to help the Authority to understand these issues. So, at present I cannot advise on the significance of the site and whether it should be considered a non-designated heritage asset. It is not known if any historic quarried faces survive, any spoil heaps or waste products, or traces of equipment, buildings or and features relating to the quarries use and development, or whether later use of the site has destroyed earlier evidence.

The application is also missing details of the development beyond the proposed house. The details provided about the house suggest that the footprint of the structure could be quite light, requiring little by way of intrusive groundwork. However, a ground source heat pump is mentioned as well as a on site package treatment plant and solar flower, but the location of these and any connecting service runs is not covered. Without such information I cannot advise on possible impacts.

Para. 203 of the NPPF requires planning authorities to take into account the effect (direct and indirect) of an application on the significance of non-designated heritage assets to reached a balanced planning judgement. However, the current application does not provide sufficient information to allow this to take place or to meet the requirements on supporting information of para.194.

Therefore, in the first instance I object to this application on due to lack of information.

An appropriate heritage statement that describes the significance of the site and formally consults the Historic Environment Record needs to be produced in accordance with national and PDNPA guidance and submitted in support of the application. This needs to be prepared by someone with appropriate knowledge and expertise. And, further details of the aspects of the proposed development detailed above is required to allow the assessment of impact.”

In response to this the applicant has submitted further information in the form of a heritage assessment that they have produced themselves. This sets out the quarrying history of the site and concludes that the site is of low significance.

Representations

14. We have received 6 representations, all supporting the application. The representations can be seen in full on the Authority’s website.

15. The representations can be summarised as follows:

- This application is an excellent use of waste land. I walk past the disused quarry as I live locally the eco home would be well hidden from the road. I have a recycling company so anything green is a win for me.
- This application would make excellent use of the land. It will not only enhance the area with a nicely designed eco-property, but also help maintain and beautify the local area as the applicants clearly seem keen to care for the land, encourage native plants and control invasive weeds.
- This application appears to be just what is needed for old unused sites like this one, there are so many in our local area, sadly many used for fly tipping.
- This will be a fantastic transformation to the quarry. It's so good to see many disused quarries in the area given a new lease of life and what a fitting use of the site to become someone's sustainable home.

Main Policies

16. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, GSP4, L1, L2, L3, HC1, CC1, T3, T7.
17. Relevant Development Management policies: DMC1, DMC2, DMC3, DMC11, DMC12, DMT3.

National Planning Policy Framework

18. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27 March 2012. It was last updated in September 2023. The Government's intention is that the document should be considered as a material consideration and carry particular weight where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date. In the National Park the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and those in the Development Management DPD adopted in May 2019. Policies in the Development Plan provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. It is considered that in this case there is no significant conflict between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and more recent Government guidance in the NPPF.
19. 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."
20. Paragraph 120 of the NPPF states that "*Planning policies and decisions should:*
 - (a) *encourage multiple benefits from both urban and rural land, including through mixed use schemes and taking opportunities to achieve net environmental gains – such as developments that would enable new habitat creation or improve public access to the countryside;*
 - (b) *recognise that some undeveloped land can perform many functions, such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation, cooling/shading, carbon storage or food production;*
 - (c) *give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs, and support appropriate opportunities to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land;*
 - (....(d) and (e) omitted, not relevant).
21. Paragraph 78 says that in rural areas, planning policies and decisions should be responsive to local circumstances and support housing developments that reflect local needs. Local planning authorities should support opportunities to bring forward rural exception sites that will provide affordable housing to meet identified local needs, and consider whether allowing some market housing on these sites would help to facilitate this. Paragraph 79 states that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.

22. The National Planning Policy Framework encourages innovative modern design, in paragraph 80, which states:

“80. Planning policies and decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless one or more of the following circumstances apply:

(a) there is an essential need for a rural worker, including those taking majority control of a farm business, to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside;

(b) the development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets;

(c) the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its immediate setting;

(d) the development would involve the subdivision of an existing residential building; or

(e) the design is of exceptional quality, in that it:

- is truly outstanding, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; and*
- would significantly enhance its immediate setting, and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area”*

23. Paragraph 134 of the Framework says that in determining applications significant weight should be given to:

“(a) development which reflects local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents which use visual tools such as design guides and codes; and/or

(b) outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings”.

24. With regard to Habitats and Diversity, paragraph 180 of the NPPF is relevant to this application:

180. “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; c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists; and d) development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity”.

Peak District National Park Core Strategy

25. Policy GSP1 sets out the broad strategy for achieving the National Park’s objectives having regard to the Sandford Principle, (that is, where there are conflicting desired outcomes in achieving national park purposes, greater priority must be given to the conservation of the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area, even at the cost of socio-economic benefits). GSP1 also sets out the need for sustainable development and to avoid major development unless it is essential, and the need to mitigate localised harm where essential major development is allowed.
26. Policy GSP2: *Enhancing the National Park* states that:
- Opportunities for enhancing the valued characteristics of the National Park will be identified and acted upon.
 - Proposals intended to enhance the National Park will need to demonstrate that they offer significant overall benefit to the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area.
 - When development is permitted, a design will be sought that respects the character of the area.
 - Opportunities will be taken to enhance the National Park by the treatment or removal of undesirable features or buildings. Work must be undertaken in a manner which conserves the valued characteristics of the site and its surroundings.
 - Development in settlements necessary for the treatment, removal or relocation of nonconforming uses to an acceptable site, or which would enhance the valued characteristics of the National Park will be permitted.
27. Policy GSP3 sets out development management principles and states that all development must respect, conserve and enhance all valued characteristics of the site and buildings, paying particular attention to, amongst other elements, impact on the character and setting of buildings, scale of the development appropriate to the character and appearance of the National Park, design in accordance with the National Park Authority Design Guide and impact on living conditions of communities.
28. Policy GSP4 says that to aid the achievement of its spatial outcomes, the National Park Authority will consider the contribution that a development can make directly and/or to its setting, including, where consistent with government guidance, using planning conditions and planning obligations.
29. Policy DS1 sets out the Development Strategy for the National Park.
30. Policy HC1 says that exceptionally, new housing can be accepted where the proposals would address eligible local needs and would be for homes that remain affordable with occupation restricted to local people in perpetuity. The provisions of HC1 are supported by policy DH1, DH2 and DH3 of the Development Management Policies, which gives more detailed criteria to assess applications for affordable housing to meet local need.
31. Policy L1 *Landscape character and valued characteristics* states that development must conserve and enhance valued landscape character and valued characteristics, and other than in exceptional circumstances, proposals in the Natural Zone will not be permitted.

32. Policy L2 states that development must conserve and enhance any sites or features of geodiversity importance, and any sites, features or species of biodiversity importance and where appropriate their settings. For international and national sites the relevant legislation and protection will apply in addition to the requirements of policy. As set out in Core Strategy policy L2, the granting of planning permission is restricted for development likely to significantly affect a European (International) site, requiring that an appropriate assessment is first carried out of the implications of the development for the site's conservation objectives. Primary legislation restricts the cases in which exceptional circumstances may justify development, particularly development having a significant effect on the ecological objectives or integrity of a Special Protection Area (classified under the Birds Directive) or Special Area of Conservation (designated pursuant to the Habitats Directive).
33. Policy L3 *Cultural heritage assets of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic significance* states that:
- A. 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 or special interest;
- B. 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 of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic significance or its setting, including statutory designations or other heritage assets of international, national, regional or local importance or special interest;
- C. Proposals for development will be expected to meet the objectives of any strategy, wholly or partly covering the National Park, that has, as an objective, the conservation and where possible the enhancement of cultural heritage assets. This includes, but is not exclusive to, the Cultural Heritage Strategy for the Peak District National Park and any successor strategy
34. Policy CC1 states that development must make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources, taking into account the energy hierarchy and achieving the highest possible standards of carbon reductions and water efficiency.

Development Management Policies

35. The most relevant development management policies are DMC1, DMC2, DMC3, DMC11, DMC12, DMT3

36. DMC1 *Conservation and enhancement of nationally significant landscapes* states:

A. In countryside beyond the edge of settlements listed in Core Strategy policy DS1, 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:

- (i) the respective overall strategy for the following Landscape Strategy and Action Plan character areas; and
- (ii) any cumulative impact of existing or proposed development including outside the National Park boundary; and
- (iii) the effect of the proposal on the landscape and, if necessary, the scope to modify it to ensure a positive contribution to landscape character.

B. Where a development has potential to have significant adverse impact on the purposes for which the area has been designated (e.g. by reason of its nature, scale and setting) the Authority will consider the proposal in accordance with major development tests set out in national policy.

C. Where a building or structure is no longer needed or being used for the purposes for which it was approved and its continued presence or use is considered by the Authority, on the evidence available to it, to be harmful to the valued character of the landscape, its removal will be required by use of planning condition or obligation where appropriate and in accordance with the tests in national policy and legislation.

37. DMC2 *Protecting and managing the Natural Zone* says:

- a. The exceptional circumstances in which development is permissible in the Natural Zone are those in which a suitable, more acceptable location cannot be found elsewhere and the development is essential:
 - i. for the management of the Natural Zone; or
 - ii. for the conservation and/or enhancement of the National Park's valued characteristics.
- b. Development that would serve only to make land management or access easier will not be regarded as essential.
- c. Where development is permitted it must be in accordance with policy DMC3 and where necessary and appropriate:
 - i. permitted development rights will be excluded; and
 - ii. permission will initially be restricted to a period of (usually) 2 years to enable the impact of the development to be assessed, and further permission will not be granted if the impact of the development has proved to be unacceptable in practice; and
 - iii. permission will initially be restricted to a personal consent solely for the benefit of the appropriate person.

38. Policy DMC3A 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.
39. Policy DMC3B 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.
40. DMH6 allows for the re-development of previously development land for housing if it conserves and enhances the valued character of the built environment or landscape on, or adjacent to the site. Paragraph 6.97 of the supporting text to DMH6 says that outside of designated settlements and away from other forms of built development, applications for housing will be assessed against policies DS1 and GSP2.
41. Policies DMC11 and DMC12 require applications to include sufficient information to enable an assessment of impact upon designated sites and protected species. Development must conserve and enhance protected sites and species unless there are exceptional circumstances
42. Policy DMT3 emphasises the importance of safe access to developments.
43. Design Guide

At paragraph 2.15 the Design Guide acknowledges that it is not easy to introduce modern architecture successfully into an area of traditional styles, and advises on use of local materials and good quality workmanship. In paragraph 2.18 it goes on to say that *'it is preferable to find a design solution which reflects or reinterprets the local tradition and is also a product of our time....New modern buildings often fail in design terms when their designers are more intent on current architectural fashion than respecting the context they are working within'*.

The Design Guide states that *"...there are still some basic principles that need to be respected if the new is to harmonise successfully with the old. These relate to the three main characteristics of traditional elevations:*

- *A balance of proportions between the overall shape of the walls and the openings they contain.*
- *A high solid to void ratio in which the wall dominates.*
- *A simple arrangement of openings, usually formal (often symmetrical) in the case of houses, and informal in the case of outbuildings".*

Assessment

Principle of proposed development

44. The application site is located in open countryside where our housing policies would not normally support the erection of new build market housing. It is also within the Natural Zone where there is a strong presumption against any development unless it is required for the management of the Natural Zone; or for the conservation and/or enhancement of the National Park's valued characteristics.
45. The site is a small, former gritstone quarry that sits on the edge of open moorland, immediately to the east of the A624 Glossop to Hayfield road. The quarry ceased

working around 40 years ago and now has no approved planning use. It is understood that the applicants bought it approximately 10 years ago and have since then tidied it up, removed unauthorised tipping, and planted trees and shrubs. It is not known when the timber buildings were placed on site; they were not present in 1999 but the larger one was on site in 2011. The touring caravan and solar panels appear to be more recent.

46. As a former quarry, now partly naturalised, the site is not considered to be previously developed land as defined by the National Planning Policy Framework. This specifically excludes “*land that has been developed for minerals extraction or waste disposal by landfill, where provision for restoration has been made through development management procedures*”. In this case the scale of the quarry was such that when it ceased there were no specific restoration requirements, other than to place any waste arising in the former excavations, but given that the use ceased many years ago and there is now no lawful use for quarrying, tipping or any other use, the site is not considered to be “previously developed” as defined in the NPPF or a “brownfield” site.
47. Development Management Policy DMH6 states that re-development of previously developed land for housing is acceptable in principle provided that it conserves and enhances the valued character of the built environment or landscape. The supporting text to policy DMH6 states that applications for housing on previously developed land in the open countryside will also be assessed against policies DS1 and GSP2. Policy DS1 is our development strategy and directs the majority of new housing to Bakewell and the named settlements. For sites in the countryside DS1C allows for the conversion or change of use for housing or other development and alternative uses needed to secure effective conservation and enhancement. GSP2 sets detailed criteria to consider enhancement proposals against, including the need for development to offer “*significant overall benefit to the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area*”.
48. Policy HC1(C)I of the Core Strategy states that exceptionally new housing can be accepted where, in accordance with core policies GSP1 and GSP2, it is required in order to achieve conservation and/or enhancement of valued vernacular or listed buildings.
49. Paragraph 120 of the NPPF states that “Planning policies and decisions should:
 - (a) *encourage multiple benefits from both urban and rural land, including through mixed use schemes and taking opportunities to achieve net environmental gains – such as developments that would enable new habitat creation or improve public access to the countryside;*
 - (b) *recognise that some undeveloped land can perform many functions, such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation, cooling/shading, carbon storage or food production;*
 - (c) *give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs, and support appropriate opportunities to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land;*
 -(d) and (e) omitted.
50. The key issue therefore is the principle of new development in the Natural Zone including the impact of the proposal on the wilder, undeveloped qualities of the area. The planning assessment needs to consider whether there are any exceptional reasons that may overcome the strong presumption against development in the Natural Zone (which are set out in policy DMC2). In itself the proposal for a dwelling does not meet these exceptional tests which focus on the management and conservation of the area.
51. The application acknowledges that the site is in the Natural Zone but argues that it does not display the characteristics of the Natural Zone, being a former quarry close to the A624. Whilst this may be the case, the site is clearly within open countryside, on the edge of open moorland, close to designated areas. The former quarry has become

naturalised in appearance since extraction ceased over 40 years ago. Since then the vegetation has become more established, softening the edges of the site and generally hiding it from passing views. Any activities that have caused concern have been unauthorised and, given the fact that the site has no planning permission for alternative uses, that is likely to continue to be the case.

52. In these circumstances the site is not considered to be an intrusive eyesore and there is no non-conforming use which could be removed through planning permission for a dwelling. Consequently, it is considered that a dwelling cannot be justified under policies GSP2, HC1 or DMH6 as it does not fall within the definition of brownfield or previously developed land. Without the imperative of the need for significant landscape enhancement there is no justification for a dwelling on this site and it would be contrary to policies GSP1, GSP2, L1, DS1, HC1 and DMC1 and DMC2.

Impact on Landscape

53. As noted above the site sits on the edge of open moorland, but the A624 runs immediately to the west of it. The former quarry floor is not visible from outside the site as the access is relatively narrow and bends slightly. Whilst it can be argued that a single storey dwelling on the site would not have a wider landscape impact, this is not sufficient justification to make an exception to policy and this is an argument that can be made on many remote sites. It also means that any enhancement that can be achieved through development would not offer significant landscape benefit.

Impact on biodiversity

54. The site is adjacent to, but outside, the Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA) and Dark Peak Site of Scientific Special Interest (SSSI). A preliminary ecological assessment has been submitted with the application in accordance with policy DMC11. These designations are the South Pennine Moors Special Area of Conservation, the Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) Special Protection Area, and the Dark Peak Site of Special Scientific Interest. The assessment concludes that as the proposals are limited to the quarry floor and track which are habitats of generally low ecological value with commonly occurring plant species being recorded. It considers that the proposals are unlikely to have significant effects on the surrounding upland heathland habitat.
55. With regard to the Special Protection Area, it concludes that the quarry is unlikely to support the qualifying bird species (short-eared owl, merlin and golden plover), so impacts on these species are not anticipated to be significant. However, during the construction period of the residential dwelling, significant effects cannot be ruled out on two “non-qualifying species of interest” listed in the site’s citation, which includes curlew and lapwing. Three bird species referred to in the site’s citation were recorded during the survey, these were curlew, red grouse and meadow pipit. Whilst these species are unlikely to nest within the quarry, impacts on these species breeding on the adjacent moorland cannot be ruled out. However, the assessment concludes that as the moorland is also immediately adjacent to the A624 Chunal Lane, it is likely any breeding birds on the moorland have a level of tolerance to the noise of passing traffic.
56. Overall, it is anticipated that the “ephemeral habitat” of the quarry floor upon which the dwelling will be built upon will be lost. Ephemeral habitat according to DEFRA’s Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) metric calculator is of ‘low distinctiveness’ and needs to be compensated for if losses occur. The report suggests that a landscaping scheme is required. Should the landscape proposals include habitats that are ‘higher value’ that will likely lead to an overall enhancement of the site’s biodiversity value.

57. Natural England have advised that in order to mitigate the potential adverse effects on the designated areas and make the development acceptable, the following mitigation measures are required secured by condition or planning obligation:

- An appropriate construction environmental management plan (CEMP) should be established prior to the commencements of any permitted work on site.
- To ensure that the construction phase of development, should permission be granted, occurs outside of the bird breeding season, typically March through to September.

58. It is therefore considered that, subject to conditions, the impact of the proposed development on the designated sites can be addressed through conditions and would not be so significant as to justify refusal of the application on these grounds.

Design Considerations

59. The proposal is for a single storey timber construction dwelling with a low arched green roof. As such it is of a relatively contemporary design that does not reflect the local building tradition. It is described in more detail in the Proposals section above. Whilst the proposed design does not reflect the local building tradition for dwellings, it is of a scale, materials and contemporary appearance that would be acceptable on this site if the principle of development was acceptable as it would represent a sustainable form of building, with minimal impact on the ground by virtue of being set on low columns. This would help to avoid any impact on the archaeological and ecological interest of the site.

Sustainable building and climate change

60. Policy CC1 and the NPPF require development to 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. The application provides a Design and Access Statement. The statement sets out how the proposed dwelling would meet the requirements of policy CC1 and our adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Climate Change and Sustainable Building'. The application explains that the scheme is designed to produce a highly sustainable new dwelling, which would include the following measures:

- solar technology and other energy producing /saving systems, including a solar smart flower, a state of the art "Sunamp"
- Super-compact thermal batteries, storing heat and releasing it on demand,
- A SIPS timber construction system
- A green roof
- Water bore hole, rainwater harvesting.
- NB. The ground source heat pump has now been omitted, to avoid disturbing the quarry floor.

The proposal is considered to meet the requirements of policy CC1 in these respects.

Impact on amenity

61. Given the isolation of the site from other dwellings, the proposal does not give rise to any residential amenity issues. The proposal therefore accords with policies GSP3 and DMC3 in these respects.

Highway issues

62. The access to the site is via a relatively narrow access point off the A624 where the national speed limit applies and has very poor visibility for vehicles exiting the site. The initial response from the Highway Authority noted “.... *the access is off a 60mph road, gated, has a substandard surface and no visibility plays have been shown*” and requested additional information to demonstrate that the access could be made safe for use by the development.
63. In response to the concerns expressed by the Highway Authority, the applicant commissioned a highway consultant and has provided details of traffic flows along the A624 and visibility splays that can be created from the existing access. The applicant proposes the following measures to achieve the splays:
- Remove the metal farm gate and posts.
 - Make good the substandard surface of the access road up to the highway dropped kerb.
 - Reduce the height of the wall to less than 0.6m for 10m to the north and 2m to the south.
 - Control any plant growth to less than 0.6m on the 1.7m grass verge between the wall and the highway kerb.
64. The Highway Authority has now responded to this revised proposal and raises no objection, subject to conditions.

Conclusion

65. The application proposes the erection of a new dwelling on a site within the Natural Zone, in a small former quarry. There is a strong presumption against development in this location unless there are exceptional circumstances which justify approval. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case as the development is not essential for the management of the Natural Zone or for the conservation and/or enhancement of the Park’s valued characteristics.
66. The quarry has become naturalised since operations ceased over 40 years ago and it does not require a development to provide enhancement or remove a non-conforming or inappropriate use. Whilst the proposed dwelling would not have a harmful impact on the landscape by virtue of the fact that it would be within the former quarry, this is not in itself sufficient justification to approve the application as it is an argument that can be repeated on many isolated sites. The design of the proposed dwelling is contemporary, and it would create a sustainable and energy efficient dwelling, but similarly this is not a justification for approving the dwelling contrary to these key policies. It is therefore considered that for these reasons the proposal is contrary to accord with Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP2, DS 1, HC1 and L1, and DMP policies DMC1 and DMC2.

Human Rights

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

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

68. Nil
69. Report Author: John Scott, Consultant Planner