

9. FULL APPLICATION – DEMOLITION OF EXISTING CABINS AND OFFICE FLOORSPEACE, EXTENSION TO EXISTING INDUSTRIAL BUILDING, WORKS OF HARD AND SOFT LANDSCAPING AND OTHER WORKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSALS (NP/DDD/1123/1329) P. 6009

APPLICANT: TIDESWELL WELDING SERVICES LTD

Summary

1. The application proposes construction of a single storey extension to the south and larger extension to the north of the existing Tideswell Welding Services building, with the latter exceeding the ridge height of the existing building by 1m. The site is located in open countryside for the purposes of the development plan.
2. The proposal would result in a substantial expansion which is not modest in scale compared to the existing use and building. It therefore conflicts with relevant policies for employment expansion in the countryside and would harm the character and appearance of the site and landscape character of the National Park.
3. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.
4. The accompanying Appropriate Assessment report concludes there will not be any unacceptable impacts on the integrity of the designated interests.

Site and Surroundings

5. The application site lies in a relatively remote location to the north of Pittlemere Lane on Tideswell Moor, around 2.3km north of Tideswell. The site is clearly outside of any designated settlement (Policy DS1) and is in open countryside.
6. The application site comprises 1.6 ha of land. The boundary takes in the existing portal frame industrial building occupied by the applicant which is in use as a steel fabrication workshop and was granted planning permission in 2016 subject to conditions.
7. The site boundary also includes an additional strip of land south east of the building and rising land and woodland to the north which were not included in the 2016 permission.
8. Since planning permission was granted a number of structures have been erected on the site to the side, front and rear of the workshop, including a reception and office area at the south corner of the site. The structures have not been granted planning permission and therefore appear to be unauthorised, although it is unclear when they were first constructed.
9. It also appears that areas of woodland to the north of the building and along the south east edge have been cleared, although new planting looks to have been implemented further south of the latter location. A thin strip of planting is present along the west boundary although this appears more limited than the approved landscaping scheme for the 2016 permission.
10. Other parts of the site appear to be in use for outdoor storage. Access is via a track from Pittlemere Lane. The nearest neighbouring property is Bushey Heath Farm which is located approximately 230m to the east.
11. The site lies within the catchment of Unit 70 and 71 of The Wye Valley SSSI, a component site of the Peak District Dales Special Area of Conservation (SAC).

Proposal

12. The application proposes demolition of the existing extension to the south of the workshop and replacement with a wider single storey extension. A larger extension is proposed to the north of the building.
13. The Location Plan also shows a larger area of land within the red line boundary compared with the 2016 permission and consequently proposes the change of use of this additional land to general industrial use (Class B2).
14. The application form lists the existing floorspace of the building as 483m² and proposes demolition of 68.4m² of the building and a net additional floorspace of 346m². The forms state this would provide a gross new internal floorspace of 829m².
15. However, the workshop approved in 2016 had a gross internal floor space of 361m². The calculation on the forms therefore includes the unauthorised extension south of the building and other structures on site.
16. Considering the total gross proposed floorspace (829m²), this therefore represents an increase of more than 100% that of the original building.
17. The extension to the north would be a portal steel framed building to be used as a workshop. Whilst set back from the existing principal elevation, the ridge of the building would be 1m higher than the host building. The extension's construction would require a considerable cut of 1,035m³ into the landform and erection of a retaining wall. Fill would be deposited further north and along the western site edge.
18. The extension to the south corner of the building would accommodate a reception, offices, toilets and a store. The application also seeks retention of an external storage area to the north east of the existing building, which is unauthorised.
19. The application states the extension is required to support the operation of the business in taking on larger contracts, installing enhanced technology and machinery, providing adequate on-site facilities and to implement new health and safety measures.
20. Externally the extension roof and walls would be clad in corrugated metal sheeting (juniper green) to match the existing, with lower walls formed of natural limestone on the south west elevation and concrete blocks on the remaining walls. Photovoltaic panels are proposed on the south plane of the existing building.
21. A revised landscaping scheme has been submitted showing native tree and shrub planting along the western site boundary and planting of species rich grassland.

RECOMMENDATION:

22. **That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:**
 1. **The proposed extensions are of a substantial scale in a remote location in the countryside and would result in a harmful visual and landscape impact. The development would not conserve or enhance the site or secure the future management of the valued characteristics of the site and adjoining land contrary to policies GSP1, GSP3, L1, CC1, E2, DMC1, DMC3 and DME7 and the National Planning Policy Framework.**

Key Issues

23. Whether the proposed development is acceptable in principle.
24. The impact of the development upon the local area and the landscape, trees and biodiversity of the National Park.

History

25. NP/DDD/1121/1200: Proposed extension to existing industrial building – Refused 23rd March 2022.
26. NP/NMA/0417/0368: Non-material amendment to NP/DDD/0915/0888 - walls constructed of masonry blockwork where concealed by ground level in lieu of rubble limestone – Accepted 2nd May 2017.
27. NP/NMA/1116/1182: Non-Material amendment on NP/DDD/0915/0888 - Move planed amenities block from the interior of the building to the exterior, back right-hand corner – Accepted 5th January 2017.
28. NP/DIS/0516/0464: Discharge of conditions 3, 4, 5 and 7 from planning consent NP/DDD/0915/0888 (Landscape planting, foul drainage, noise attenuation and access widening.) – Conditions partly discharged 30th June 2016.
29. NP/DDD/0915/0888: Erection of steel fabrication workshop on previously developed land – Approved 18th February 2016.

Consultations

30. Peak District National Park Authority Archaeology: Response confirmed no comments to make on the application.
31. Peak District National Park Authority Landscape: Initial response raised queries around the volume and treatment of materials being removed and tipped, removal of scrub, detail within the LVA including assessment of visual effects and proposed landscaping.

Further landscape comments raised an objection due to the prominence of the existing site within the landscape, with the proposal being significantly more prominent. The response also raises concerns regarding the existing landscaping present on site.

Final comments awaited on the updated landscaping scheme and assessment.

Note - These and other responses below from internal consultees are expected in time for officers to update members at the Committee.

32. Derbyshire County Council Highways: No highway safety objections.
33. Derbyshire County Council Flood Team: No response received to date.
34. Tideswell Parish Council: Support the application and the improvements it will make to a local business. No concerns raised with the application.
35. Natural England: No objection. It is not considered the development would have significant adverse impacts on statutorily protected nature conservation sites or other designated sites.
36. Peak District National Park Forestry: Unable to comment on the application due to

absence of an arboricultural report, impact assessment, tree protection measures and method statement. Final comments awaited on submitted tree information.

37. Peak District National Park Ecology: No objection subject to mitigation secured by conditions. Final comment awaited on updated plans.

38. Derbyshire Dales District Council: No response received to date.

Representations

39. A total of 14 representation have been received in support of the application. A summary of the relevant material considerations raised by the responses is set out below:

- The business needs additional space to support its productivity and to comply with health and safety laws.
- The business provides important jobs, apprentices and skills for local people, including younger people. It should be allowed to thrive in such a location.
- The workforce and business support the local economy through using other local services and proximity to other businesses which are used, or served, by Tideswell Welding Services.
- Activities taking place outside the building will be able to be carried out internally.
- The amenity of nearby properties will not be impacted as the area is so isolated.
- The site owner has developed and enhanced the existing, which does not negatively impact the surrounding area, though planting and other works.
- Visual impacts would be limited, particularly from wider views and compared with other developments nearby.
- The applicant has a focus on ecology and sustainability. The scheme will limit ecological impacts and deliver environmental benefits through planting.
- The proposal would reduce the carbon footprint of the business.
- The location prevents the need for vehicles, including larger vehicles, to travel across the Peak Park due to proximity to other businesses which the site serves.
- The business continuation will support innovation to combat climate change.

Main Policies

40. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, DS1, L1, L2, CC1, E2

41. Relevant Development Management policies: DM1, DMC1, DMC3, DMC11, DMC12, DMC13, DMC14, DME7, DME8, DMT6

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

42. The NPPF was revised in December 2023 and is a material consideration which carries particular weight where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date.

43. The development plan for the National Park comprises the Core Strategy 2011 and Development Management Policies 2019. Policies in the development plan provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for determining this application. In this case there is not considered to be a significant conflict between prevailing policies in the development plan and the NPPF guidance.

44. Paragraph 182 states great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these matters. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and heritage are also important considerations and should be given great weight.

Peak District National Park Core Strategy

45. GSP1, GSP2 – These policies set out the broad strategy for achieving the National Park’s objectives, and jointly seek to secure national park legal purposes and duties through the conversion and enhancement of the National Park’s landscape and its wildlife and heritage.
46. GSP3 – 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 and design in accordance with the National Park Authority Design Guide and impact on living conditions of communities.
47. DS1 – Sets out what types of development are acceptable in principle spatially in the National Park. Countryside extensions to existing buildings are acceptable principle.
48. L1, L2 – Development must conserve or enhance the landscape character and biodiversity of the National Park and other than, in exceptional circumstances development that has a harmful impact will not be permitted.
49. CC1 – Development must make efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and resources, consider the energy hierarchy, be directed away from flood risk areas and achieve the highest possible standards of carbon reductions and water efficiency.
50. E2 – Proposals for business development in the countryside, 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 that 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.
 - d. Proposals to accommodate growth and intensification of existing businesses will be considered carefully in terms of their impact on the appearance and character of landscapes.
 - e. Ancillary retail operations must be small scale and principally offering for sale goods which are produced at the premises (see also policy HC5).

Peak District Development Management Policies

51. DM1 – Sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development in the context of National Park Purposes.
52. DMC1.A – In the countryside, any development with a wide scale landscape impact must provide a landscape assessment. 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.
53. DMC3 – Where developments are acceptable in principle, design is required to be of a high standard which 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. Particular attention will be paid to siting, scale, form, mass, levels, height and orientation in relation to existing buildings and character and the degree to which buildings and their design reflect or complement the style and traditions of the locality as well as other valued characteristics of the area.
54. DMC11 – In considering if 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. B) states 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.
55. DMC12 – 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.
56. DMC12.C – For 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.
57. DMC13.A – Planning applications should provide sufficient information to enable their impact on trees, woodlands and other landscape features to be properly considered in accordance with 'BS 5837: 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations' or equivalent.
58. DMC13.B – Trees and hedgerows, including ancient woodland and ancient and veteran trees, which positively contribute, either as individual specimens or as part of a wider group, to the visual amenity or biodiversity of the location will be protected. Other than in exceptional circumstances development involving loss of these features will not be permitted.
59. DMC13.C – Development should incorporate existing trees, hedgerows or other landscape features. Where this cannot be achieved the onus is on the applicant to justify the loss of trees and/or other features as part of the development proposal.
60. DMC13.D – Trees, woodlands and other landscape features should be protected during the course of the development.

61. DMC14 – Development presenting a risk of pollution or disturbance including soil, air, light, water or noise pollution, or odour that could adversely affect residential amenity or the amenity, tranquillity, biodiversity or other valued characteristics of the area will not be permitted unless adequate control measures are put in place to bring the pollution within acceptable limits.
62. DME7 – The policy deals with expansion of existing industrial developments which in the countryside, will only be permitted where:
- a. It is of a modest scale in relation to the existing activity and/or buildings; and
 - b. The scale and type of development can be accommodated without adversely affecting the residential amenity and valued characteristics of the area or traffic safety and circulation;
 - c. It does not adversely affect, and wherever possible, secures the enhancement of the site as well as the future management of the valued characteristics of the site and adjoining land; and
 - d. Consideration is given to the possibilities of conserving and enhancing landscape character by using, modifying or extending existing buildings.
63. Part C states that in all cases, impacts on residential amenity and valued characteristics from operating hours, lighting and noise will be considered.
64. DME8 – Where employment development is acceptable in principle, it will only be permitted where every practicable means is used to minimise any adverse effects on the valued characteristics and amenity of the surrounding area. Particular attention will be paid to visibility from vantage points, site access, site layout and use of space around buildings, storage of vehicles and other equipment, landscaping and other screening and whether in the landscape proposed it is an appropriate method to mitigate adverse landscape impacts, and noise and proposed times of operation. Where necessary, planning conditions will restrict future growth and intensity.
65. DMT6 – For business parking, additional parking provision should be of a limited nature whilst being appropriate to the size of the development proposed and accounting for the location and visual impact of parking.

Assessment

Principle & Landscape Impact

66. Policy DS1(c) allows for extensions to existing buildings in the countryside. Policy E2(d) states proposals to accommodate growth and intensification of existing businesses will be considered carefully in terms of their impact on landscapes.
67. Whilst the extension to an existing building is therefore accepted in principle under DS1(c), Development Management Policy DME7.B states that in the countryside, expansion of existing industrial development will only be permitted where (i) it is of a modest scale in relation to the existing activity and/or buildings and (ii) the scale can be accommodated without adversely affecting the valued characteristics of the area.
68. The existing building was granted planning permission as an exception to policy in 2016 with a floorspace of 361m². A small toilet block (approx.14m² gross internal area) was later approved as an amendment.
69. However, there is now an extension to the south of the building and further structures to the side and rear, with the application stating the site now has a floorspace of 483m². Considering the net increase from the building approved, the unauthorised floorspace should not be taken into account in considering the cumulative increase of floorspace

proposed.

70. Combined, the proposed extensions would see an increase in gross internal floorspace to 839m² which is more than double that approved for the original building in 2016.
71. It is recognised the applicant has reduced the scale of the proposed extension and total cumulative floorspace of the site from the 2021 refusal from 990m² to 829m² and set back the north extension 4.8m from the front elevation of the existing building.
72. However, the north extension remains only 1m shorter in width than the host building whilst to ridge it is 1m taller. The main views of the building and principal elevation from the west would therefore see an extension which is similar in width and greater in height than, and therefore dominates, the original building.
73. The extension to the south also has a considerable width and extends across part of the frontage of the existing building. This further challenges the dominance of the building and contributes towards the intensification of industrial development on site.
74. The site is in a remote countryside location. Whilst building extensions in the countryside are acceptable in principle under DS1, the extension would not comply with DME7.B(i) which is clear the scale of such extensions must be modest in relation to the existing building.
75. Turning to DME7.B(ii) it is also considered the scale and type of development would adversely affect the valued characteristics of the area and consequently would also conflict with E2(d) which requires that landscape impacts of business growth are considered carefully.
76. A Landscape & Visual Assessment (LVA) confirms the site lies within National Character Area 52: White Peak and local 'White Peak' Landscape Character Area and the 'Limestone Hills and Slopes' Landscape Character Type (LCT), with the 'Limestone Plateau Pastures' LCT in close proximity to the south west and west.
77. Due to rising levels and the woodland to the north, visibility of the site is largely from the west, south and east. The LVA assesses that impacts on visual receptors closest to the site along Pittlemere Lane, footpath Tideswell FP 23 / 24 (approx. 550m west of the site) and New Farm residents (350m south west) in Year 1 of the development would be 'minor adverse' and all other impacts as 'negligible adverse' or 'neutral'.
78. At Year 15 with proposed landscaping, the LVA assesses impacts on Pittlemere Lane (western and far eastern approaches) and footpath Tideswell FP 23 / 24 as 'minor beneficial' and elsewhere negligible beneficial-neutral.
79. The PDNPA Landscape Officer has queried the LVA and in particular its assessment of impact on visual receptors SCP2 (Pittlemere Lane) and SCP4 (footpath Tideswell FP 23 / 24) which are considered to be more significant, particularly at Year 1.
80. In this respect, it is recognised some representations have been received in respect of the existing and proposed impact of the development and planting on site undertaken by the site owner. However, whilst the 2016 approval included a landscape scheme which was agreed by condition, the existing landscaping on site appears to be less than and therefore does not reflect what was approved.
81. It is considered the existing screening and baseline condition of the site would have been improved should planting have been carried out in accordance with the 2016 approval, which required planting or seeding to be carried out within the first planting seasons following completion or occupation of development. The condition reason stated that due to the countryside location of development, the condition went to the

heart of the permission as it was required to mitigate the impact of development.

82. Further trees appear to have been cleared to the south east of the building, with newer tree planting established December 2020 – January 2021 south of that area.
83. As it is, the existing building is prominent in the landscape, particularly from western viewpoints along Pittlemere Lane, footpaths Tideswell FP 23 / 24 and the A623 and views from the east on Pittlemere Lane through the remaining trees to the south east.
84. Following discussions with the agent and the response received from the landscape officer, an updated LVA has been submitted alongside an updated Landscape Masterplan.
85. The Masterplan (Rev E) proposes an increase in tree and shrub planting on the site compared with the details that were originally submitted, including native tree and shrub planting on the south east and western boundaries.
86. There would be some fill along the western edge to create a planted embankment which would add further height to the landscaping. This seeks to reflect the approach of the previous landscaping scheme approved under NP/DIS/0516/0464, where an existing area of raised land was retained, although the area currently appears to be more level.
87. Final comments on the amended landscape scheme and LVA are awaited from the landscape officer and a verbal update will be provided at planning committee.
88. Notwithstanding this and whilst the submitted landscape scheme shows native tree planting on the west boundary and planting of further trees to the south east, this would take a significant time to mature leaving long-term prominent views particularly from the south and west.
89. It is considered the extensions would represent an intensification of industrial development on the site, with the northern extension in particular appearing more dominant than the existing building leading to a development with a greater visual impact which would be prominent within the landscape.
90. The intensification of industrial development would lead to an adverse impact on the valued characteristics of the landscape character described by the LVA as a remote, sparsely populated landscape formed of gently undulating limestone plateau.
91. It is acknowledged the existing business offers many benefits in terms of skilled local jobs and supporting other local businesses and supply chains and that a number of representations have been received to that effect, including from Tideswell Parish Council. It is also recognised as outlined by the application submission and representations that the business has an operational need for expansion to comply with health and safety regulations and to complete and take on larger work requests.
92. Notwithstanding those benefits and the representations received in support of the application from third parties and the Parish Council, Policy GSP1 is clear that all development shall be consistent with the National Park's legal purposes and where there is irreconcilable conflict between those purposes, the Sandford Principle will be applied and the conservation and enhancement of the National Park will be given priority.
93. As outlined above, the proposed extension to the existing business clearly conflicts with DME7 of the Development Management Policies Plan as it does not represent a modest scale of development with regard to the existing building.

94. Consequently, it is considered the development would lead to adverse impacts towards the valued characteristics of the landscape of the National Park and would conflict with Policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L1, E2 and DME7.

Trees

95. An area of young trees planted December 2020 – January 2021 lies to the south of existing young – semi-mature tree planting on the south east site edge, with the latter appearing to have been reduced considerably since the 2016 approval.
96. The existing single storey extension to the south is a steel cabin which appears to be raised slightly from the ground level but sits over the roots of and very close to the trees to the south.
97. Additional information was requested from the applicant in respect of the development and impact on trees, as the plans suggested the extensions to the south and north, where there would be cut into the landform, would lead to the removal of some trees.
98. The applicant has now provided a tree survey and tree protection plan detailing the impact of the development on trees, which includes the loss of around 20 young trees on the southern boundary and further trees to the north due to the northern extension and excavation to accommodate a retaining wall.
99. Following receipt of the tree survey, tree constraints plan and tree protection plan, final comments are awaited from the PDNPA tree officer. A verbal update will be provided following receipt of final comments.

Ecology

100. An Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) is submitted which confirms the site has been surveyed in March and June 2023.
101. The development would result in the loss of some existing other calcareous grassland and loss of woodland with the EclA advising that in order to ensure no net loss, the loss of the grassland associated with a grass verge to the north of the existing building will need to be replaced. The report also suggests replacement trees would be required.
102. The PDNPA Ecologist response confirmed that provided sufficient mitigation is provided the development could be accepted from an ecology perspective. This would include a detailed management plan for implementation of the landscape masterplan, avoidance of tree clearance during nesting bird season and sensitive lighting.
103. An updated ecology report and BNG calculations have now been submitted, which confirm replacement planting shown by the Landscape Masterplan Rev E would provide a net increase in habitat units of 13.94% and 70.03% hedgerow units.
104. A restriction of use of the quarry for storage would be required due to the potential for bat roosts being present in the quarry rockface. The latest cut and fill plan (Rev B) shows the fill of 738m³ material would be deposited close to the quarry rockface and restored as calcareous grassland habitat. Final comments are awaited from the ecologist in relation to this and the updated ecology details.

Heritage

105. Bushy Heath farmhouse and its barn are approximately 230m south east of the site and are Grade II Listed. There are some limited views of the south east elevation of the existing building from Bushy Heath Farm through existing trees although views of the development from the farm and its setting would remain similar to these existing

glimpsed views. The proposal would therefore not lead to unacceptable impacts towards the setting of Bushy Heathy farmhouse and its barn.

Noise & Amenity

106. Concern was raised under the 2016 application about potential noise pollution associated with the site activities which had the potential to harm the tranquillity of the National Park and residential amenity, with the nearest residential property being Bushy Heath Farm. Noise mitigation measures were secured by condition.
107. It is understood there have been no noise complaints in relation to the site activities. Whilst there would inevitably be noise associated with steel manufacturing associated with the new workshop, this is likely to be similar to that already generated by the existing buildings.
108. Subject to appropriate noise mitigation measures being implemented as part of the development it is not considered the development would result in additional noise or activity that would harm residential amenity.
109. However, it is unclear if the expansion would lead to additional movements of large vehicles associated with transportation of larger items off site and there are concerns the associated activity could harm the tranquillity of the site and surrounding countryside.

Flood Risk & Drainage

110. The site lies in Flood Zone 1 and is at low risk of flooding. Whilst the application site exceeds 1ha (in which case a Flood Risk Assessment is usually required) it is recognised the extent of physical works excludes much of that area and subject to appropriate drainage the development is acceptable in terms of flood risk.
111. The application forms reference an existing septic tank which would be replaced by a package treatment plant. Its replacement is therefore supported as there are concerns over the installation of the existing septic tank, with National Planning Guidance stating in the interest of the water environment a septic tank should only be approved where a mains connection or package treatment plan is not practical or viable.
112. However, it must be noted that the septic tank appears to be unauthorised and does not reflect the package treatment plant previously approved as part of the 2016 consent.

Sustainability

113. Policy CC1 requires the efficient and sustainable use of land alongside the highest standards of carbon reductions and water efficiency. Whilst the sustainable benefits of proposal associated with measures such as photovoltaic panels, fabrication of the steel building frame on-site and other measures in the Sustainability Statement are recognised, the proposal would be a substantial extension in a relatively remote location within the National Park. The development would increase activity at the site and likely vehicle movements in relation to deliveries and exports.

Conclusion

114. This application proposes extensions to the existing welding facility at the Old Lime Kilns, Pittlemere Lane. Whilst the social and economic benefits that the proposal would achieve in terms of supporting a local business, local skilled jobs and wider benefits to the local economy are recognised, the existing site lies in a remote and unsustainable countryside location.

115. The extensions are neither modest or subservient and represent a significant extension to the scale of the business which would harm the character and appearance of the site and wider landscape character of the National Park.

116. The development is therefore contrary to the development plan and having taken account of all material considerations, the application is recommended for refusal.

Human Rights

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

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

Nil

Report Author

Hannah Freer – Planner – North Area