

**6. FULL APPLICATION – REPLACEMENT DWELLING AT KEEPERS COTTAGE, MOORSIDE LANE, POTT SHRIGLEY, SK10 5RZ (NP/CEC/0324/0285), WE**

**APPLICANT: MR AND MRS JOHNSON**

**Summary**

1. This application seeks consent for the demolition of the existing dwelling on site and replacement with a significantly larger, four-bedroomed property.
2. The existing dwelling is a non-designated heritage asset being an early to mid-19<sup>th</sup> century gamekeeper's cottage historically associated with the nearby grade II\* listed Shrigley Hall and Lyme Park.
3. Development Management Policy for replacement dwellings, DMH9, advises, among other criteria, that the replacement of a dwelling will be permitted provided that the dwelling to be replaced does not have cultural heritage significance, and is not considered to contribute positively towards the valued landscape character or built environment in which it is located.
4. Keepers Cottage is a non-designated heritage asset whose historic relationship with Shrigley Hall and Lyme Park makes a positive contribution to the built-environment of this section of the Peak District National Park. Therefore, this application is not acceptable in principle.
5. The proposed replacement dwelling is also significantly larger than the existing. DMH9 requires larger replacement dwellings to demonstrate significant overall enhancement to the valued character and appearance of the site itself, and the surrounding built-environment and landscape. The design of the proposed replacement dwelling would not contribute to any enhancements to the locality. It would result in a dwelling which has a more dominant impact on the landscape with a design that relates poorly to its immediate setting on the edge of moorland.
6. On this basis, the application is contrary to policies DMH9, GSP2, L3, and DMC5 and is recommended for refusal on this basis.

**Site and Surroundings**

7. Keepers Cottage is a relatively isolated dwelling, on Moorside Lane, off Bakestonedale Road, Pott Shrigley. It is close to the western boundary of the National Park. The house is adjacent to Moorside Lane and fronts on to it.
8. The exact age of the property is unknown; however, it is believed to date from between 1840-1848 identifying it as an example of an early Victorian gamekeepers' cottage and a non-designated heritage asset historically associated with the nearby grade II\* listed Shrigley Hall and Lyme Park.
9. The house is a low two storey stone cottage with a stone slate roof. It has a whitewashed front elevation and is of a traditional design and appearance featuring a central doorway with 3 light windows either side on the first and first floor. There are chimneys at either side of the property of differing design and size.

10. The property has been altered over time and now features a side extension on the southern elevation (which is unpainted), and a rear extension. Both of these features are natural stone faced with matching stone roof tiles. All windows are modern 3-light uPVC casements.
11. The property is immediately adjacent to footpaths 244/FP10/2 and 244/FP/03 which follow the route of Moorside Lane, in addition to 244/FP2/1 which runs past Keepers Cottage to the east.
12. The property is in close proximity to the boundary of Lyme Park, which is grade II\* listed park and garden and conservation area.

### **Proposal**

13. This application seeks full planning permission for the demolition and replacement of the existing dwelling.
14. The replacement dwelling would be larger in height, length and volume than the original building. It would be faced in natural gritstone walls under stone slate roof with gritstone detailing.
15. The proposed property would feature a pitched roof porch on its principal elevation. The window frames would be composite comprised of 2-lights on the windows either side of the porch, and 3-light windows on the southern extent of the property. All windows would feature a horizontal glazing bar.
16. The property would feature a large rear pitched roof element. To the rear of this would be a single-storey lean-to.
17. The submitted Climate Change Statement advises that the building would feature sustainable building materials, in addition to utilising sustainable and highly efficient fixtures. It makes a cursory reference to what renewable energy technology *could* be installed, but does not propose any.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

**That the application be REFUSED for the following reason;**

1. **The proposed development would result in the loss of a non-designated heritage asset which is characteristic of the local building tradition and cultural heritage of the locality. There are no material planning considerations which outweigh the harm resulting from the loss of the asset. It is therefore contrary to policies GSP2, L3, DMC5, DMH9 and the National Planning Policy Framework.**
2. **The proposed replacement dwelling would be of a scale, form and detailed design which does not respect the local building tradition and which is contrary to the Authority's policies, notably policies DMC3 and DMH9, and the Authority's design guidance.**
3. **The proposed dwelling would be of a form and scale that would have a harmful impact on the character of the site and its setting, including views from the nearby footpaths. It is therefore contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP1 and L1.**

4. **Notwithstanding the submitted details, the proposal does not adequately address the requirements of policies CC1 and DMH9 in respect of climate change and sustainable design.**

#### **Key Issues**

- Principle of development;
- Impact on heritage assets;
- Design and impact on the landscape;
- Other matters.

#### **History**

18. 2022 - Erection of Agricultural Building, Creation of Yard Area, Alterations to Access. Erection of Retaining Walls, and Rebuilding of Store (NP/CEC/0222/0213) – Granted conditionally June 2023.
19. 2023 - Demolition of existing house and construction of a new dwelling (NP/CEC/0122/0080). Refused April 2023 due to loss of a heritage asset, inappropriate design, impact on landscape and insufficient climate change and sustainability mitigation.

#### **Consultations**

20. Pott Shrigley Parish Council – No objections
21. Cheshire East Strategic Transport – No objection
22. Cheshire East Amenity – No comments
23. Cheshire East Air Quality – No objection subject to a condition requiring an Electric Vehicle Infrastructure plan to be submitted and agreed in writing which requires the installation of a single Mode 3 compliant Electrical Vehicle Charging point.
24. Cheshire East Contaminated Land – No objection subject to conditions on testing materials to be used in the garden/soft landscaping, and the reporting of any previous unidentified contamination on site to the Local Planning Authority.
25. Cheshire East Environmental Health – No comments to make.
26. PDNPA Tree Conservation Officers – No comments to make.
27. PDNPA Ecology – No objection following receipt of the update Protected Species Survey. Suggested bat crevice boxes in the building fabric, rather than separate boxes.
28. PDNPA Built Environment – Objection. The building is certainly of local importance and forms an important part of the historic moorland landscape. Its demolition would equate to the total loss of a non-designated heritage asset. This would be contrary to planning policies and contrary to the first purpose of the national park. Therefore, the application should be refused.

#### **Representations**

29. 7 representations were received during the course of the application. 6 representations supported the application citing the following reasons:
- The property is in need of works, particularly due to the bowing front wall;
  - The sustainability benefits of re-building the property with modern insulation and fixtures;

- The design and materials are in keeping with the landscape;
  - Property has already been heavily altered over time and question whether it has heritage value at all;
  - Issues around damp and mould;
  - Similar design to the existing dwelling.
30. One representation was received by the Campaign for Rural England which objected to the proposed development for the following reasons:
- The applicant agrees with the Authority's position that the property is a non-designated heritage asset. The proposed development would result in substantial loss of the asset, and the contribution it makes to the local character and distinctiveness;
  - The design of the replacement would not constitute an improvement, being large, pastiche and bulky;
  - No overall enhancement to the valued character and appearance of the site or surrounding environment and landscape;
  - No material planning considerations are appropriately demonstrated in detail;
  - Recommends that if the Authority are minded to support the development, a re-design is submitted which is the same scale and massing of the existing dwelling;
  - Requests that PD rights would be removed, and measures are taken to ensure that the development is carried out should the heritage asset be demolished.

### **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**

31. 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.
32. 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.
33. 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**

34. 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.

35. 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.
36. DS1 - *Development Strategy*. Sets out that most new development will be directed into named settlements.
37. 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.
38. L2 – *Sites of biodiversity or geodiversity importance*. Development must conserve and enhance any sites, features or species of biodiversity importance and where appropriate their setting.
39. L3 - *Cultural heritage assets of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic significance*. Development must conserve, and where appropriate, enhance or reveal the significance of historic assets and their setting, including statutory designations and other heritage assets of international, national, regional or local importance or special interest. 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.
40. Policy CC1 states that development must make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources.

#### Development Management Policies

41. 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.
42. DMC5 - *Assessing the impact of development on designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings*. provides detailed advice relating to proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings, requiring new development to demonstrate how valued features will be conserved, as well as detailing the types and levels of information required to support such proposals. It also requires development to avoid harm to the significance, character, and appearance of heritage assets and details the exceptional circumstances in which development resulting in such harm may be supported.
43. Policy DMH9 – *Replacement dwellings*. States that the replacement of a dwelling will be permitted provided that the existing dwelling is not of heritage or local landscape value. All proposed replacement dwellings must enhance the valued character of the site itself and the surrounding built environment and landscape, reflecting guidance provided in adopted guidance. Larger replacement dwellings should demonstrate significance overall enhancement to the valued character and appearance of the site itself, the surrounding built environment and landscape. In all cases the replacement dwelling must not create an adverse impact on neighbours' residential amenity. In all cases the replacement dwelling must exhibit high sustainability standards.

44. Policy DMT8 – *Residential off-street parking*. States off-street car parking for residential development should be provided unless it can be demonstrated that on-street parking meets highway standards and does not negatively impact on the visual and other amenity of the local community. This should be either within the curtilage of the property or allocated elsewhere.
45. Policy DMC8 – *Conservation Areas*. Applications for development in a Conservation Area, or for development that affects its setting of 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 and enhanced.
46. Policy DMC9 – *Registered parks and gardens*. Planning applications involving a Registered Park and Garden and/or its setting will be determined in accordance with policy DMC5.
47. Policy DMC12 – *Sites, features or species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance*. 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.
48. Policy DMC14 – *Pollution and disturbance*. Outlines that development will only be permitted where, upon cessation of a permitted use, the appropriate removal of any pollutants arising from development can be assured.

## **Assessment**

### **Principle of Development**

49. Development Management policy DMH9 allows for the replacement of a dwelling subject to specific criteria. In all cases, policy DMH9 requires the replacement dwelling to achieve an enhancement. DMH9 allows for dwellings which are larger than the ones they replace but there is a requirement that the replacement dwelling results in a significant enhancement of the site, surrounding built environment and landscape. The principle of a replacement dwelling is therefore acceptable, but only if the proposal meets the criteria set out in policy DMH9 and in other relevant local policies.
50. Assessing policy DMH9 in detail, Part A says that the replacement of a dwelling will be permitted provided that the dwelling to be replaced is not listed individually or as part of a group listing, is not considered to have cultural heritage significance and is not considered to contribute positively towards the valued landscape character or built environment in which it is located.
51. This application has been submitted with a Statement of Significance which provides an overview of the site's history, occupants and evolution over time, in addition to providing an overview of the author's interpretation of the building's historic significance.
52. The submitted Statement of Significance outlines that Keepers Cottage was likely built between 1857-1861 as part of the Shrigley Estate. It also advises that the property is not depicted on the 1848 Tithe map. However, your Officers contest these points, as the property is apparent on the 1848 Tithe map, and potentially even the 1840 OS map. The property was owned by Thomas Legh, who also owned Lyme Hall, indicating a connection to Lyme Park. Notwithstanding these points, it is accepted by both parties that the property is early-mid 19<sup>th</sup> century and has a historic tie to either the grade II\* Shrigley Hall, or the grade II\* Lyme Hall/Lyme Park and their associated moorland and parkland.

53. The Statement of Significance explicitly acknowledges that the property is a non-designated heritage asset, with its setting being identified of “high significance” *as it is located within an historic estate landscape that has remained largely unchanged from at least the early nineteenth century.*
54. As such, Keepers Cottage has an identified cultural heritage significance, and makes a positive contribution towards the landscape and built environment in which it is located. On this basis, the proposed development is not acceptable in principle as advised by policy DMH9.A. The presumption is therefore to refuse this application.
55. Notwithstanding the above, this report will go on to assess the impact of the proposed development on the heritage assets and the landscape, in addition to identifying any potential material planning consideration which may outweigh the presumption for refusal of this planning application.

#### Impact on heritage assets

56. Keepers Cottage is a traditionally built early 19<sup>th</sup> century gamekeepers’ cottage and is identified as being both valued vernacular and a non-designated heritage asset which derives its significance from its aesthetic value, in addition to its historical relationship with the wider moorland landscape setting in connection with the nearby landed estates.
57. This application seeks planning permission for the complete demolition of the non-designated heritage asset, and the construction of a new dwellinghouse in its place. This would result in the complete loss of a heritage asset.
58. Policies L3 and DMC5 provide the overarching policy principles relating to heritage assets, with policy L3 advising that development should conserve, enhance and reveal the significance of heritage assets.
59. Policy DMC5.F advises that development of a non-designated heritage asset will not be permitted if it would result in any harm to, or the loss of, the significance, character and appearance of a heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting); unless:
- for non-designated heritage assets, the development is considered by the Authority to be acceptable following a balanced judgement that takes into account the significance of the heritage asset.
60. The supporting Statement of Significance advises that the property is of low historic significance due to it being much altered with the original plan form lost, the principal elevation of the frontage facing Moorside Lane remodelled and almost all original fixtures and fittings removed.
61. The application is also supported by a Structural Report, which advises that the front elevation of the building is bowing, and there is no easy way to tie the wall back to the floor joists, and the roof lacks triangulation and the purlins are over-spanned by a significance margin. The Report concludes that given the size of the roof, and the magnitude of the lean in the front wall, combined by the lack of foundations under the main walls, there is no other option than to rebuild the front wall in its entirety and remove the main roof covering, rafters and purlins.

62. The Statement of Significance advises that the building is of low historic significance with all original fixtures stripped, with heavy emphasis placed on the fact that the building is a modest worker dwelling from the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. Responding to this, officers note the Statement of Significance shows a largely intact planform to the main range, as well as historic floors and doors. In such a humble and utilitarian dwelling, it would be unlikely to find much more.
63. With regard to the Structural Report, it is noted that the report has not been carried out by a CARE-accredited structural engineer, so the ongoing conservation of the building's significance has not been a key consideration in the preparation of this report. In addition to this, whilst there may be some defects in the building, the proposed complete demolition of the building appears disproportionate to the defects identified.
64. Notwithstanding the above, policies L3, DMC5 and DMH9 make no explicit reference to the structural stability of heritage assets as a justification for their complete loss.
65. Consequently the points raised by the Statement of Significance and the Structural Report are considered to hold very little weight in the determination of this application. The low level of historic significance identified within the Statement of Significance, in addition to the finding of the Structural Report, provide no mitigating factors to justify the complete loss of the heritage asset.
66. In addition to the significance of the heritage asset itself, it is also important to consider the impact of the proposed development on the setting of Lyme Park, which is both a grade II\* park and garden and designated conservation area. As such, policies DMC8 and DMC9 are engaged as well as those in the NPPF.
67. While the site is not located in the designated parkland, it nevertheless lies within its setting being sited approximately 330m west of the designations. The parkland is bound by a drystone wall; however, the parkland characteristics extend beyond this wall, so while it has a set boundary, its influence extends beyond it. There are several rights of way which provide access to Lyme Park, in addition to a large swath of open access land immediately to the north of the site which extends into Lyme Park.
68. As already mentioned, the current property makes a positive contribution to this edge of moorland setting, with its scale and design being representative of an early 19<sup>th</sup> century gamekeepers' cottage.
69. The loss of the former gamekeepers' cottage would have a small but harmful impact on the setting of the adjacent parkland designations through the loss of a building which is culturally and historically tied to its history.
70. The loss of the property would also amount to less than substantial harm to the setting of Lyme Park grade II\* park and garden and Lyme Park Conservation Area. These are both designated heritage assets. Paragraph 208 of the NPPF advises that where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including where appropriate securing its optimum viable use.
71. The following section of this report will assess the design and impact of the development on the landscape, and then go on to assess any public benefits or material considerations which weigh in favour of the development.
72. Should no material planning considerations or public benefits be identified, then the proposed development should be refused due to conflict with policies L3, DMC5, DMC8, DMC9 and the National Planning Policy Framework.



### Design and impact on the landscape

73. The proposed replacement dwelling would be a two-storey structure constructed from natural gritstone under a stone slate roof. The principal elevation would measure 13m , the height to eaves would measure 4.85m, the height to ridge would measure 7.4, and the width of the gable would measure 7m. This is compared to the host property which measures 12.7m in width (~Original front - 9.8m when excluding the side extension), 3.75m to the eaves, 5.3m to the ridge and features a gable width of 5.4m (excluding the catslides and rear extensions).
74. The existing property, whilst small, is characteristic of its former function as a workers dwelling in a remote, moorland setting. In contrast, the design of the proposed replacement dwelling is considered inappropriate and contrary to design guidance. The proposed detailing on the primary elevation is inappropriate, appearing to utilise a symmetrical double-fronted property, but with an elongated frontage to the south featuring 2 large, 3-lighted windows. This gives the property both an inappropriate asymmetrical appearance and an inappropriate contrast between the square 2-light window, and the larger, more horizontal 3-light windows.
75. The rear projecting gable element is also overly long, being as wide as the gable of the proposal, and would dominate the property. It would also result in the property having an inappropriate massing and form, with the extent of roofing being visible on the landscape.
76. Overall, the scale of the replacement dwelling is concluded to be inappropriate. It would appear as an overly-large rendition of a farmhouse which could be found anywhere in the National Park, and does not relate to its immediate surrounding in any capacity beyond its building materials. On this basis, it is considered that the proposed development fails to comply with design policies DMC3, in addition to supporting design guidance.
77. Crucially, as the replacement dwelling is substantially larger than the current property, part C of policy DMH9 is engaged which requires the replacement dwelling to demonstrate significant overall enhancement to the valued character and appearance of the site itself, and the surrounding built environment and landscape.
78. As already noted, the proposed development would not be compliant with DMH9C as it would not represent an enhancement to the site itself through the siting of an inappropriately designed and scaled property. The loss of the existing building on site would result in harm to the built environment of the area.
79. With regard to landscape, the proposed dwelling would have a negative impact on its valued characteristics. The site sits within the enclosed gritstone upland, an area of the Dark Peak landscape which is characterised by:
- High rolling upland with some steeper slopes;
  - Permanent pasture and rough grazing enclosed by gritstone walls;
  - Straight roads with wide verges of grass and, in some places, heather;
  - Scattered gritstone farmsteads with stone slate roofs and some relict quarry and coal mining sites;
  - Trees grouped around farmsteads for shelter.

80. Whilst not a farmstead, the existing property does feature a stone slate roof, and is surrounded by trees. As such, it provides a positive contribution to the landscape character it sits within.
81. It is acknowledged that the proposed dwelling would retain these features; however, as noted, the proposed dwelling would be significantly larger than the existing. This would invariably have a larger and more dominating impact on the landscape, particularly by the elongated frontage and large spans of roofing.
82. By virtue of its more dominating impact on the landscape, the proposed development would not conserve, nor contribute towards an enhancement of the landscape. Accordingly, it falls very short of the requirement for a 'significant enhancement' to the valued character and appearance of the site itself, and the surrounding built environment and landscape.
83. Therefore, the proposed development fails to comply with policy L1 and DMH9. C.

#### Other matters

84. Policy L2 and DMC12 requires development to enhance the biodiversity interest of the site and requires development to comply with legislative provisions relating to protected species.
85. This application has been supported by a Protected Species Survey which includes several bat emergence surveys. The surveys identified that bats are present on site for foraging and commuting, but found no roosts. On this basis, the report concluded that there is no requirement for the development to be carried out under a Natural England License, nor require any mitigation.
86. The Survey recommends that crevice boxes be installed on trees surrounding the site.
87. The PDNPA Ecologist has reviewed the survey and confirmed that the findings are suitable. They advised that should permission be granted, crevice spaces should be provided within the building itself, as opposed to installed on surrounding trees. If this application is recommended for approval, a scheme for crevice spaces within the fabric of the building will be conditioned.
88. Policy CC1 requires all development to make the most sustainable and efficient use of land and buildings. This is expanded upon in policy DMH9.E which states that replacement dwellings must display high sustainability standards.
89. As noted, the proposed replacement dwelling would be constructed using sustainable construction methods with high efficiency fixtures. While the Climate Change Statement makes a reference to the potential for solar equipment, ASHP, and grey water recycling, none of this is actually proposed within the application.
90. The lack of renewable infrastructure, coupled with the carbon intensive process of knocking down an existing property, including its embodied carbon, indicates that the proposed development does not exhibit 'high sustainability standards', as required by part E of policy DMH9.
91. Therefore, the proposed development is contrary to policy CC1.
92. The nearest property to Keepers Cottage is Park Moor Cottage, approximately 300m to the north. The proposed development does not propose any alterations or extensions to

the curtilage of the property. On this basis, there would be no detrimental impact on the residential amenity of nearby properties.

93. The property has sufficient space for off-street parking. It is therefore compliant with policy DMT8.

#### Planning Balance

94. Paragraph 209 of the NPPF and policy DMC5 require the effect of development on a non-designated heritage asset to be taken account of in determining planning applications. It states that applications directly affecting non-designated heritage asset should make a balanced judgement on the harm to the asset, taking into consideration the scale of harm or the loss and significance of the heritage asset.
95. As noted, this development would result in the total loss of a non-designated heritage asset. As such, consideration to any material planning considerations which weigh in favour of the development needs to be balanced against the total loss of the asset.
96. This report has assessed the proposed development, and has identified that the proposal would not result in significant enhancements to the National Park's special qualities. It would result in a poorly designed property which is inappropriately scaled, massed and detailed. In addition to this, the proposal would have a harmful impact on the valued characteristic of the Dark Peak landscape through the loss of a feature of valued character and historic merit. Accordingly, there are no material planning considerations which weigh in favour of the scheme.
97. In addition to this, the proposed development would result in less than substantial harm to the setting of the adjacent grade II\* listed park and garden and conservation area. Paragraph 208 of the NPPF states that where a proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits arising from the scheme. As noted, this application would not result in any public benefits. As such, great weight should be given to the designated asset's conservation.
98. Accordingly, the proposed development would result in a high degree of harm via total loss of a non-designated heritage asset, in addition to a small degree of harm to the setting of two designated assets. There are no public benefits, nor material planning considerations which would outweigh the harm to the significance of these assets.
99. The proposed development would harm the cultural heritage of the National Park. This is in direct conflict with the first statutory purpose of the National Park, which is *to conserve and enhance the natural and cultural heritage of the area*.
100. It is therefore in conflict with policies GSP1, GSP2, L1, L3, DMC5, DMC8, DMC9, and DMH9, in addition to the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### Conclusion

101. This application seeks planning permission to demolish and replace the property known as Keepers Cottage. The property is an example of early 19<sup>th</sup> century architecture, and is historically tied to the landed estates in this section of the National Park. As such, it has been recognised by the Authority and applicant as a non-designated heritage asset.
102. The replacement of dwellings is permitted in principle, subject to the proposal not having historical significance. As such, the proposed development is not acceptable in principle.

103. The proposed development would lead to harm to the cultural heritage of the National Park, in addition to the siting of an appropriately designed and scale dwelling in the open countryside, which would have a harmful impact on the valued characteristics of the National Park landscape. It would therefore not result in significant overall enhancement the valued character and appearance of the site itself, and the surrounding built environment and landscape.
104. There are no material planning considerations, nor public benefits, which would outweigh the harm to the special characteristics of the National Park. On this basis, the proposed development would be in direct conflict with the National Park’s first statutory function.

### **Human Rights**

1. Any human rights issues have been considered and addressed in the preparation of this report.
2. List of Background Papers (not previously published)
3. Nil

Report author: Will Eyre, North Area Senior Planner