

10. FULL APPLICATION – PROPOSED SEASONAL USE OF LAND FOR ECO-CAMPING, SITING OF 3NO. BELL TENTS AND AMENITY FACILITIES ALONG WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS AND PARKING AND LANDSCAPING WITH ASSOCIATED ECOLOGICAL ENHANCEMENTS AND CONSERVATION AT LAND WEST OF EDALE ROAD, BARBER BOOTH, EDALE (NP/HPK/0923/1055, WE)

APPLICANT: MR GEORGE GALBRAITH

Summary

1. This application seeks consent for the change of use of 0.5ha of agricultural land to a campsite. The campsite would feature 3 bell-tents, shower and toilet facilities, and hot tubs. The campsite would be seasonal in nature, operating between 1st April to 31st October. The proposed development is contrary to policy as the bell-tents would be considered against policy RT3 which states that static caravans, chalets, and lodges will not be permitted.
2. This application also seeks consent for alterations to the existing field access onto the development site, in addition to the laying of grasscrete to create parking spaces for a maximum of 4-vehicles. It also seeks consent for the installation of a package treatment plant to dispose of waste-water from the toilet blocks. This application proposes substantial planting across the red line application site, including the infilling of hedgerows and mixed native tree planting.
3. This application also proposes a scheme of ecological enhancements across the wider (blue) area of the site. This has been undertaken in collaboration with Derbyshire Wildlife Trust, who will prepare a management plan and advise on a scheme of improvements to the site.
4. The siting of the proposed bell tents and associated infrastructure is not in accordance with policy RT3. However, in this case the application has demonstrated that visual and landscape impacts would be limited and could be mitigated further by appropriate planting and colour finishes for the tents and infrastructure. The development would also result in other benefits, which although finely balanced weigh in favour of the development. These include benefit to the local economy, employment, and increased opportunity for visitors to understand and enjoy the special qualities of the National Park. Significantly, this application proposes a scheme of ecological enhancements across both the redline and blue area of the site, which will enhance biodiversity in excess of policy requirements.

Site and Surroundings

5. The development site is the northern section of a large field-parcel located off Edale Road in Barber Booth. The site is agricultural in nature, featuring rough grassland. This northern section features mature tree planting and hedgerows on the north, east, and western boundaries. There is no current southern boundary separating the application site from the wider, larger field parcel. The field parcel has a varied topography; however, it predominantly slopes upwards from the south from the valley bottom near the river Noe, up towards the Great Ridge/Lords Seat. There are no public footpaths on the development site; however, Chapel Gate public byway forms the southern boundary of the wider field parcel.
6. The development site is situated close to the hamlet of Barber Booth, with the northern boundary of the site approximately 50m away from the closest residential property, Littlewood. There are additional properties to the north situated around the historic centre

of the hamlet surrounding the Methodist Chapel. To the south-west there is a property approximately 300m away (Manor House), whilst to the south-east there is a property approximately 215m away (Rowlands Farm).

7. The wider land in ownership to the south of the application site features a varied topography, including gullies and streams, in addition to 3 ponds. The applicant created a new pond in 2022 without planning permission. An enforcement enquiry is open, and it is anticipated that the landowner will be submitting a planning application for this imminently.
8. The site has been intensively grazed by Exmoor ponies for the several years.

Proposal

9. This application seeks consent for the change of use of land from agricultural to camping, with the proposed use being seasonal between 1st April to 31st October. When in use as a campsite, there would be 3 “army green” bell tents situated around the northern perimeter of the site. The tents would be accompanied by 3 pieces of ancillary equipment, a shower block, toilet, and hot-tub. These would be located to the rear (or south) of the bell-tents and would be coloured juniper green.
10. In addition to this, the access would be modified to allow for safe entry and exit onto Edale Road by clearing roadside vegetation to achieve visibility spays coupled with the entrance being hard surfaced with tarmac to the gate. The first section of the access would be tarmacked, whilst the access track and parking bays would be grasscrete to allow provision for 4 cars.
11. A footpath link from the north-east corner down the 8m embankment to the road would give pedestrian access to Barber Booth.
12. A package treatment plant would be installed to process waste from the toilet blocks with the outfall discharging via a spillway into the watercourse off the north west side of the site. All other waste, including hot-tub water which would be pumped to a storage tank under the turning area, would be removed from site through a licensed company.
13. In addition to extensive planting across the development site, this application also proposes ecological enhancements to the wider site in collaboration with Derbyshire Wildlife Trust.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons;

1. **The proposed development seeks consent for the installation of 3 bell-tents. These structures are considered to be akin to camping pods, yurts, and shepherd huts which the accompanying text to policy DMR1 advises will be determined against policy RT3.B which sets out that proposals for static caravans, chalet and lodges will not be permitted. Acceptance of this proposal would cause harm by undermining the clear intent of adopted recreation and conservation policies and set a clear precedent for others to follow further undermining policy. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policies RT3 and DMR1.**

Key Issues

- Principle of development;
- Impact on the valued characteristics of the landscape and setting of Edale Conservation Area;
- Amenity;
- Ecology.

History

14. 12th November 2021 – Pre-application enquiry (PE\2021\ENQ\43857) over the use of land for eco-glamping. Officer's responded outlining that the proposal would be acceptable in principle (subject to compliance with policy RT3 and DMR1) and advised that the applicant should submit a Landscape Assessment which primarily looked at the viewpoints from the south. Advised consideration on "clutter" of site, in addition to parking provision and impact on amenity.
15. 6th April 2022 - Proposed seasonal use of land for eco-camping, siting of 3no. bell tents and amenity facilities along with associated access, parking and landscaping. Applicant and agent worked with Officer's to address the landscape impact. Applicant was withdrawn with intention of re-submission with revised information.
16. The site has been subject to many enforcement enquiries, including use of the site as camping and the creation of a pond. The applicant is engaging with the Monitoring and Enforcement Team to address these issues and submit planning applications to try and regularise the retrospective works.

Consultations

17. Derbyshire County Council Highways – No objection subject to 2 conditions and an informative note being added to the decision notice.
18. Edale Parish Council – Support
19. High Peak Borough Council Environmental Health Officer – Raised no concern over noise impact of the development on amenity, nor the proposed water supply (subject to complying with relevant legislation). The Officer did raise some concern over the proposed foul water disposal method; however, additional information was submitted to the Officer and they resolved to make no objection subject to no hot-tub waste water being disposed of through the package treatment plant.
20. Natural England – No objection
21. Derbyshire County Council Lead Local Flood Authority – No comments to make
22. PDNPA Landscape Officer – No objections. After a process of positive engagement with the applicant after their last submission, I am satisfied that my landscape and visual concerns have been taken on board and addressed in the submitted plans.
23. PDNPA Tree Officer – Agree with the recommendations of the Arboricultural Report. No objection subject to compliance with his document.
24. PDNPA Ecology – No objection subject to conditions. Advised that the 'rewilding' area is a separate consideration to the merits of the development itself. The 'rewilding area' is presented in the planning application as a landscape strategy that the applicant has provided to demonstrate additional voluntary biodiversity benefits. There may be wildlife benefits associated with this strategy, however, there is no supporting information that

we have been asked to consider for this area. In particular, in the absence of an adequate wader survey it is difficult to determine whether this landscape strategy would provide a net benefit to wildlife or whether there may be a negative impact on priority species

Representations

25. 29 people made representations on the application. 18 of these representations objected to the scheme, while 10 support the scheme. One representation was a “general comment”.
26. The representations which objected to the application did so on the following grounds:
- Impact on landscape and setting of the conservation area;
 - Impact on residential amenity;
 - Impact on ecology, in particular the red-list species and other protected birds;
 - Concern over the overall need for another campsite in Edale;
 - Impact on hedgerows and trees;
 - Considered the site to be inappropriate for campsite due to no mains sewage, mains electricity or water;
 - Impact on river Noe;
 - Inappropriate access and conflict with other road users;
 - Urbanising influence on the landscape;
 - Concern over future expansion of the site;
 - Questioned how water can be disposed of site with no electricity. Worried about a generator being on site;
 - Concern over ‘greenwashing’;
 - Worried that the site cannot be managed appropriately;
 - Health and safety concerns, including whether the fire service could reach the site;
 - Cumulative impact of campsites across the Edale valley, and a disproportionate number of campsites in Edale compared to other villages;
 - Impact on the character of the area.
27. The letters of support provided the following comments:
- Good sustainable option for people visiting the valley;
 - Increased tourist choice;
 - Good for local businesses;
 - Local employment;
 - Good siting and design.
28. One “general comment” was received by the Peak Forest Angling Club, who own the River Noe. Members of the Club visited the applicant’s existing site and this proposed site to determine the likely impacts on the River Noe. They determined that subject to the infrastructure being installed correctly by a professional and maintained in accordance with the submitted details, there would be no adverse impact on the River Noe.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

29. National Park designation is the highest level of landscape designation in the UK. The Environment Act 1995 sets out two statutory purposes for national parks in England and Wales: Which are; to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage and promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of national parks by the public. When national parks carry out these purposes they also have the duty to; seek to foster the economic and social well-being of local communities within the National Parks.

30. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has been revised (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 particular Paragraph 182 states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.
31. In the National Park, the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and the Development Management Policies (DMP), adopted May 2019. These Development Plan Policies provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. In this case, it is considered there are no significant conflicts between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and government guidance in the NPPF.

Relevant Development Plan Policies

Core Strategy

32. GSP1, GSP2 - *Securing National Park Purposes and sustainable development & Enhancing the National Park*. These policies jointly seek to secure national park legal purposes and duties through the conversion and enhancement of the National Park's landscape and its natural and heritage assets.
33. GSP3 - *Development Management Principles*. Requires that particular attention is paid to the impact on the character and setting of buildings and that the design is in accord with the Authority's Design Guide and development is appropriate to the character and appearance of the National Park.
34. DS1 - *Development Strategy*. Sets out that most new development will be directed into named settlements. Taddington is a named settlement.
35. L1 - *Landscape character and valued characteristics*. Seeks to ensure that all development conserves and enhances valued landscape character and sites, features and species of biodiversity importance.
36. L3 – Cultural heritage assets. Seeks to ensure all development conserves and where appropriate enhances the significance of any heritage assets. In this case the Bradwell Conservation area is the relevant heritage asset.
37. Policy CC1 states that development must make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources.
38. Policy RT3 – Proposals for caravan and camping sites must conform to the following principles:
- a) Small touring camping and caravan sites and backpack camping sites will be permitted, particularly in areas where there are few existing sites, provided that they are well screened, have appropriate access to the road network, and do not adversely affect living conditions.
 - b) Static caravans, chalets or lodges will not be permitted.

Development Management Policies

39. Policy DMC1 – Conservation and enhancement of nationally significance landscapes. In countryside beyond the edge of settlements listed in DS1, any development with a wide scale landscape impact must provide a landscape assessment with reference to the Landscape Strategy and Action Plan.

40. DMC3 – *Design*. Siting, Design, layout and landscaping. Reiterates, that where developments are acceptable in principle, Policy requires that design is to high standards and where possible enhances the natural beauty, quality and visual amenity of the landscape. The siting, mass, scale, height, design, building materials should all be appropriate to the context. Accessibility of the development should also be a key consideration.
41. Policy DMC5 – *Development affecting a heritage asset*. Planning applications for development affecting a heritage asset, including its setting must clearly demonstrate: (i) its significance including how any identified features of value will be conserved and where possible enhanced; and (ii) why the proposed development and related works are desirable or necessary. Policy DMC8 states that applications for development in a Conservation Area, or for development that affects its setting or important views into, out of, across or through the area, should assess and clearly demonstrate how the character or appearance and significance of the Conservation Area will be preserved or enhanced.
42. Policy DMC8 – *Development in a conservation area*. Policy DMC8 requires development in a Conservation Area to assess and clearly demonstrate how the character or appearance and significance of a Conservation Area will be preserved or enhanced.
43. Policy DMC11 – *Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interest*. Proposals should aim to achieve net gains to biodiversity or geodiversity as a result of development. In considering whether a proposal conserves and enhances sites, features or species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance all reasonable measures must be taken to avoid net loss by demonstrating that in the below order of priority the following matters have been taken into consideration:
- i) enhancement proportionate to the development;
 - ii) adverse effects have been avoided;
 - iii) the ‘do nothing’ option and alternative sites that cause less harm;
 - iv) appropriate mitigation; and
 - v) in rare cases, as a last resort, compensation measures to offset loss.
44. Policy DMC12 - Sites, features or species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance:
- A) 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.
 - B) For sites, features or species of national importance, exceptional circumstances are those where development is essential:
 - i) for the management of those sites, features or species; or
 - ii) for the conservation and enhancement of the National Park’s valued characteristics; or
 - iii) where the benefits of the development at a site clearly outweigh the impacts on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest and any broader impacts on the national network of SSSIs.
45. Policy DMR1 – *Touring and caravan sites*. The development of a new touring camping or touring caravan site, or small extension to an existing site, will not be permitted unless its scale, location, access, landscape setting and impact on neighboring uses are acceptable, and it does not dominate its surroundings. Exceptionally, the development of structures may be permitted where these are small, simple, wooden pod structures in woodland locations with minimal landscape impact, or a single shepherd’s hut where this can be located close to the facilities of a farmstead without harm to the natural or historic landscape.

Assessment

Principle of Development

46. This application proposes the change of use of the site to allow the temporary siting of 3no. bell-tents, 3 shower-units, 3-toilet units, 3-water tanks and 3 small hot-tubs on site. As these tents would be erected and maintained by the site operator throughout the open period, the proposal is not for a touring campsite for which there is provision in principle in accordance with policy RT3. A.
47. There is no policy which explicitly examines the suitability of bell-tents, however, RT3. B states explicitly that static caravans, chalets or lodges will not be permitted. The supporting text for policy DMR1 expands on this further by stating that structures such as camping pods, yurts, shepherd's huts etc will be determined against policy RT3.B. The proposed bell-tents are akin to yurts and therefore there is a policy presumption against this type of camping development in the National Park.
48. Policy DMR1. C makes exceptions to this approach in two circumstances. Small simple, wooden pod structures in woodland locations with minimal landscape impact, or a single shepherd's hut where this close to the facilities of a farmstead. The proposal for 3 bell-tents and associated showers, toilets, water tanks and hot-tubs does not fall within either of these two exceptions.
49. It is however noted that the bell-tents and associated infrastructure would only be sited on the land from the start of April to the end of October. Therefore, while the tents would clearly have a degree of permanence and the associated infrastructure, activity and parked vehicles would only be visible on site between these months. In this respect the proposal could be considered to fall between touring tents and permanent structures envisaged by policies RT3 and DMR1.
50. However, the proposed development is not for a touring camping site nor an exception to policy envisaged by policy DMR1. The proposal is therefore in conflict with policies RT3 and DMR1 in principle. The application should therefore be refused unless there are other material planning considerations which indicate it should otherwise be granted.

Impact on the valued characteristics of the landscape and setting of Edale Conservation Area;

51. Policy L1 outlines that development should conserve or enhance the valued characteristics of the landscape. Policy DMC1 outlines that in countryside beyond the edge of settlements, any development with a wide landscape impact must provide a landscape assessment.
52. This application has been submitted with a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). The LVIA assesses the impact of the proposed campsite from 6 local receptors – 2 from Chapel Gate byway to the south of the site, Mam Tor, Lord's Seat, Edale Road and footpath FP4.
53. The LVIA identified 3 viewpoints where the development site would be visible; the two from Chapel Gate, and the viewpoint from Lord's Seat on the Great Ridge. These were the viewpoints which the Authority originally raised concern with on the basis that the proposed tents would be visible from the elevated ground to the south of the site, and would have a harmful impact on the valued characteristics of the landscape through the siting of non-traditional structures on the pastoral landscape of the Edale Valley.

54. In response to these concerns, the Planning Officer and Landscape Officer attended a site visit with the applicant and planning agent. As part of this site visit, the applicant erected all three bell-tents (and associated infrastructure) on site to enable Officers to see the impact of the development when all the structures are in situ. The bell-tents erected on site were coloured army green, after Officers originally raised concern over the contrast between the grazing farmland and wooded setting with the white fabric of the tents.
55. In addition to the tents being installed on site, the applicant also brought on potted sample specimens to give Officers an idea of how the proposed planting and screening strategy would be seen from the identified key receptors. These specimens may not necessary be the species planted if the development is approved, rather they were placed on site to give a general idea.
56. During this site visit, it was determined that while the tents were still visible from Chapel Gate and Lord's Seat, the proposed planting strategy substantially mitigated the impact of the structures on site and allowed them to be more easily assimilated into the local landscape. It also gave the opportunity for the applicant and agent to alter the proposed planting strategy as required to further refine and screen the development from these receptors.
57. Of biggest concern was the impact of the development from Lord's Seat on the Great Ridge, which afforded expansive and panoramic views across the Edale Valley, with the distinct Booths in clear view. During the April site visit, it was demonstrated that the bell-tents would be small, largely concealed elements within the wider landscape. The use of potted specimens did not screen the tents, rather they further allowed the structures to be assimilated into the woodland to the northern boundary of the site.
58. The visit also successfully demonstrated that the proposed site for car-parking on the eastern boundary of the site would be completely concealed from the viewpoints to the north. It is considered that this is an important factor in enabling the character of the field parcel to not be significantly changed.
59. In addition to this, it is also acknowledged that the applicant has undertaken further planting on the southern boundary of the site close to Chapel Gate in collaboration with the Authority's Farming in Protected Landscape team. These were in place during a site visit in December. While these are only samplings at this stage, it is acknowledged that they will grow. Whilst not planted with the explicit intention to screen the site from this footpath, it is acknowledged that they would screen views onto the bottom of the site whilst still enabling longer distance views across the valley.
60. As a result of the site visit and positive engagement with the applicant, the PDNPA Landscape Officer landscape concerns have been resolved.
61. It is acknowledged that the degree of landscape impact is heavily contingent on the proposed landscape and planting strategy. Whilst the Authority has received a plan showing the location of the proposed planting, it is considered that had the recommendation been for approval, a condition would be required to secure a full planting schedule with species breakdown and management plan. The applicant has also stated that they are willing to incorporate heavy or extra heavy standard trees as required to provide instant screening to the site.
62. Once planted, it is considered that the proposed planting across the site would tie well into the existing boundary and belt planting which is common place across the Edale Valley. As such, the planting itself would not appear overly cultivated or domestic.

63. As shown on the proposed plans, all associated infrastructure with the tents would be sited immediately behind each of them. They would be coloured a dark ‘juniper’ green. As a result, they would be largely screened from identified receptors, whilst the colouring of them would assist in them assimilating into the backdrop of the woodland setting on the northern boundary.
64. Officers visited the site in early April before many of the trees had leaves on them. This proposal seeks operation from 1st April; however, it is noted that the leaf coverage in early April would likely be a worst-case scenario. Throughout much of the summer months, the leaf on trees would further assist in screening and mitigating the impact of the proposed development.
65. It is considered that subject to the development being installed in accordance with the proposed plans, and in compliance with a detailed planting scheduled based upon the proposed landscape plan, that the proposed development would not harm the valued characteristics of the landscape. While they still may be partially visible at glimpsed locations from the south, they would constitute small elements within a wider landscape and be successfully assimilated into the northern section of the field parcel.
66. Subject to the above, it is considered that the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on the valued characteristics of the landscape. The scheme only proposes 3-tents, so the maximum capacity of the site would be 6 persons which is considered to be low intensity. The scheme’s seasonal nature, in addition to the proposed landscaping plan, would successfully mitigate any harmful visual impacts of the development. While it may still be visible in glimpsed views, it would constitute a relatively small section of land which would be well related to Barber Booth when viewed from the south. On this basis, it is considered that the proposed development is compliant with policies DMC1 and L1.
67. In addition to considering its impact on the landscape, it is also necessary to consider the impact of the development on the setting of the Edale Conservation Area, as required through policies L3, DMC5, and DMC8.
68. Edale Conservation Area is unusual in that it covers much of the wider valley, as opposed to the historic core of settlements. This is due to the historic relationship between the booths of the valley, in addition to their relationship with the surrounding “enclosed” landscape.
69. Policy DMC8 outlines that consideration should be given to views and vistas into and out of conservation area. The site is entirely screened from within the historic core of Barber Booth by virtue of existing tree coverage. As explored above, the proposed development would not be intrusive or highly visible on the local landscape when viewed from Chapel Gate (which sits within the conservation area), nor Lord’s Seat (which is outside of the designation).
70. The form, design, and external appearance of the tents would contrast the local building tradition as expressed through the architecture of Barber Booth to the north. Notwithstanding this, the structures would be largely screened, thereby minimising any negative impact on the conservation area. It is considered that subject to being installed in compliance with the proposed layout, and an appropriate planting schedule, there would be a neutral impact on the significance of the Conservation Area. In addition to this, it is considered that the relatively low intensity of the site would ensure that the character of the conservation area is conserved as a result of development.
71. On this basis, it is considered that the proposed development is compliant with policies DMC5, DMC8 and L3.

Amenity

72. This application has been supported by a Noise Assessment which assessed the noise impact of the proposed development on nearby properties, including Littlewood (50m to the north), Rowlands Farm (200m to the south-east), and Manor House (300m to the southwest). The modelling utilised a baseline of 3 people (1 per tent) speaking loudly. It found that the noise level at Littlewood would be 21dB, 6dB at Rowlands Farm, and 4dB at Manor House. All of these predicted noise levels fall below the background noise levels for residential rural locations, which vary between 31.5-39.5dBA across the day and night. This means that raised voices from within the campsite would likely be masked by other sources of noise and not be discernible. In particular, it is noted that thick tree coverage, a road, and the River Noe would provide ambient noises to Littlewood to the north, whilst the separation distance between Rowlands Farm and Manor House would mean that conversations on site are not picked up from these locations.
73. Several representations have raised concern with amplified music and light. If this application had been recommended for approval then officers would have suggested a condition requiring a management plan/code of conduct for guests staying at the property, which could also have included restrictions on music and control over external lighting (and indeed other factors including dogs, fires, use of hot-tubs etc). This condition could also have required details of how the code of conduct was used and enforced following the experience gained from completion of the first camping season but before the second.
74. Other representations raised concern over highway safety and conflict of users on Edale Road. These are acknowledged; however, it is considered that due to the size of the proposed development, there would not be a substantial increase in vehicle movements, nor visitors of the site walking from the site to nearby walking trails. In any case, this section of Edale Road is heavily used by ramblers and visitors to the area, so a small increase would be negligible.
75. It is considered that the development can be operated in a way which does not harm the amenity of nearby properties or the tranquillity of the National Park.

Ecology

76. The impact of the development on ecology can be separated into two sections, the development site itself, in addition to the blueline area.
77. With regard to the development site itself, this application has been supported by a Preliminary Ecology Assessment (PEA) as well as a Biodiversity Assessment. The PEA concluded that the site does not feature any habitats of significant value to nature conservation. Similarly, the assessment, in addition to the site walkover, did not find any evidence of amphibians, reptiles, nesting birds, and water voles. It concluded that the development site is not suitable for these species. With respect to bats, it was found that the trees surrounding the site had low potential for roosting bats, and moderate potential for foraging/commuting bats. Subject to effective light control of the site, it is considered there would be no impact on foraging bats.
78. The Biodiversity Assessment examines the extent of habitat loss, modification and enhancement across the development site. The document includes a scheme of proposed habitats weighed against existing habitats on site. The assessment concluded that subject to the enhancements being carried out in accordance with the recommendations, there would be a measurable gain in habitat (area) biodiversity units of 1.4 (+29.40%), and a gain in habitat (linear) biodiversity units of 1.48 (+617.79%). This

significantly exceeds the 10% net-gain as (soon to be) required by the Environment Act 2021.

79. Representations outlined concern over the impact of the development on wading/ground nesting birds, such as lapwing and curlew. In the original application, and in correspondence during this application, the applicant was advised that a wading and breeding bird survey was necessary to determine the potential impacts on these species. Following a site visit, the PDNPA Ecologist advised that given the extent of the site, and the fact that the bell-tents would be located in the northern extent of the site, it is considered that there would be no direct impact on wading birds from the development itself. This would be subject to the installation of a post-and-wire fence which restricts access from visitors (and in particular dogs) onto the southern portion of the site.
80. Subject to the scheme being carried out in accordance with the recommendations outlined with the PEA and Biodiversity Assessment, in addition to suggested comments, it is considered that there would be no harmful impact on biodiversity, and there would be a positive contribution.
81. In addition to the biodiversity net-gain achieved within the redline application site, the submitted details outline that there would be a scheme of “rewilding” undertaken across the wider blueline area of the site (other land in ownership comprising the remainder of the field). Information submitted in support of this element is limited due to it falling outside of the application site.
82. In the Landscape Strategy, it outlines that there would be additional trees planted across the site, including on the western boundary, in addition to the gapping up and reinstatement of hedges. It also states that existing grassland would be allowed to grow and maintained in a conservation-led way. The PDNPA Ecologist advised that whilst it may contribute to ecology enhancements, in absence of supporting information on this section of the site (including the aforementioned breeding and wading bird surveys), it is difficult to ascertain whether this would contribute to enhancements or lead to a detrimental impact on priority species, such as curlew and lapwing, through increased predator presence in connection with trees and hedgerows.
83. The submitted information outlines that the Derbyshire Wildlife Trust has been formally instructed to undertake the ‘rewilding’ of the northern part of the site, and will produce a Land Management Plan for the ongoing conservation works. The Planning Statement advises that the rewilding and Land Management Plan could be secured through a legal agreement if the application is granted permission. However, this document has not been formally submitted with the application, so it has not been available to those commenting on the applications. Therefore, as a result, no weight has been attached to it in reaching the overall planning balance.

Other matters

84. The Highway Authority have confirmed that the proposed access is acceptable and suggested two conditions and an informative. Confirmation on the surfacing proposed for the access between the road and the gate could be reserved by condition. Additionally, it is considered that the proposed grasscrete track and parking area would allow safe access onto the site, whilst minimising the development’s impact on the landscape by allowing it to “green over”.
85. Waste from the toilets, showers and wash basins would be disposed of through a packaged sewage treatment plant (PSTP) into the watercourse in the block of trees on the western boundary of the site. The Environmental Health Officer (EHO) originally raised concern with the fall of the package treatment plant; however, this was resolved

through a slight revision to the Foul Water Drainage Feasibility Study. As the toilet and shower blocks would be removed from site during the off-season, clarification would be required on how this would be achieved when connected to the PSTP.

86. The EHO has explicitly outlined that disposal of the hot-tub water through the PSTP would be unacceptable. The Foul Water Drainage Feasibility Study outlines that the hot-tubs would need to be emptied and cleaned on a quarterly basis. This would be done through a gravity fed system to a storage tank in the north of the site, before being pumped to an underground storage site under the carpark. Whilst this is considered a practical solution, the details of how the water will be pumped from the pump chamber to the holding tank could have been reserved by condition.
87. It is acknowledged that several trees on the northern boundary of the site are ash trees, which are suffering from ash dieback. While there are other trees which provide screening in this location, had the application been supported by officers a condition would have been suggested to secure a management plan to outlines the long-term management of those trees, in addition to any replacement planting as necessary.

Conclusion

88. This application seeks planning permission for the change of use of land from agriculture to campsite. On site there would be three bell-tents, each with a shower, toilet and hot-tub. The structures would be on site between 1st April to 31st October, and removed entirely from site or stored in the existing buildings when not in use.
89. The proposed bell-tents are contrary in principle to policies RT3B and DMR1. The application should therefore be refused planning permission as they do not meet the requirements of the exceptions set out in DMR1C and there are no other material planning considerations that indicate permission should otherwise be granted.
90. The application has however demonstrated that the tents could be accommodated in this sensitive landscape without harm to landscape character or the significance of the Conservation Area. However, these are not exceptional public benefits as they would be required in any case in accordance with relevant development plan policies. It is must however be recognised that the primary concern of policies RT3 and DMR1 is to secure appropriate recreational development which conserves the valued characteristics of the National Park.
91. The development would result in significant enhancement to biodiversity on the application site and in the rest of the land in the ownership of the applicant. This enhancement goes significantly beyond current and future requirements. This, therefore, is a public benefit in favour of the development which carries weight. The development would also result in benefits to the local economy and provide opportunities for members of the public to experience and enjoy the special qualities of the National Park. This would also be a public benefit but of limited weight as such benefits would be commensurate with any recreation or tourism development in the National Park.
92. Notwithstanding the landscape impact and local public benefit, great weight is placed on the policies RT3 and DMR1. In some instances, material planning considerations may outweigh relevant planning policies; however, this should be in exceptional circumstances where the public benefits clearly outweigh the harm to policy. In this instance, it is considered that the public benefits associated with the benefits to the local economy and additional opportunities for the enjoyment to the National Park are not unique to this application. Indeed, the vast majority of recreation and tourist development would achieve this, and policy RT3 and DMR1 explicitly outline that development of this

kind is not acceptable in the Peak District despite the marginal benefits to the local economy and public enjoyment.

93. As such, it is necessary to consider whether the identified biodiversity net-gain is a significant enough material consideration to outweigh the conflict with policy. Policy DMC11 outlines that all development should aim to achieve net-gains to biodiversity. As such, there is already the presumption that all development should achieve some net-gains to biodiversity. It is acknowledged that this application would result in biodiversity net-gains far in excess of what the Authority would typically expect for a development of this scale; however, it is considered that the improvements to this very small site would not present a significant enhancement to the biodiversity in the wider locality to outweigh the harm to policy. Whilst the figures demonstrate a high percentage of net-gain, the accompanying details show that what is actually proposed on site is not substantially different to a typical landscaping plan beyond it being secured for a minimum of 30-years.

94. On this basis, it is considered that there are no material considerations which indicate that a decision should be made contrary to policies RT3 and DMR1. Weight is placed on the proposed biodiversity net-gain, but it is considered that this does not outweigh the significant conflict with policy which outlines that this development is not acceptable in principle, by introducing permanent structures into the open landscape of the Edale valley.

95. The proposed development is recommended for refusal on this basis.

Human Rights

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

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

97. Nil

Report author: Will Eyre, North Area Senior Planner