

**7. FULL APPLICATION – PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF REDUNDANT BUILDING AND REDEVELOPMENT TO FORM A SINGLE DWELLING AT ROSE FARM COTTAGE, GRINDLOW, GREAT HUCKLOW (NP/DDD/0624/0641, WE)**

**APPLICANT: SARAH MYCOCK AND LEE OLLERENSHAW**

**Summary**

1. This application seeks planning permission for the demolition of an existing building at Rose Farm Cottage and the erection of a three-bedroomed dwelling.
2. The building to be demolished is a limestone agricultural building. It is understood to date from the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century; however, it has been heavily altered over time and is in a poor state of repair. Notwithstanding the condition of the building, it is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset.
3. The proposed development would result in the complete loss of the existing building and would not result in any significant enhancements required to justify the erection of a market dwelling in this location, contrary to relevant policies.
4. The application is recommended for refusal.

**Site and Surroundings**

5. The development site is Rose Farm Cottage, located in the small hamlet of Grindlow approximately 450m south-east of Great Hucklow.
6. Rose Farm is comprised of several buildings, including Rose Cottage Farm farmhouse, which sits on the northern side of the yard facing south, several large modern agricultural units which are largely focussed to the east of the farm site, and a large structure which is used as a canine treatment facility.
7. There have been several traditional buildings which have been converted across the site, including one to provide additional accommodation to the farmhouse, and one to provide self-catering accommodation slightly north of the main Rose Farm Site.
8. On the southern side of the yard, facing north, is the application building, a traditional barn constructed from rubble limestone and sandstone dressings. The structure is currently in a poor state of repair, featuring no fenestration or doors in the openings, large sections of walling missing mortar, and a corrugated roof.
9. The site is located in the Great Hucklow and Grindlow Conservation Area. Public footpath Grindlow FP3 runs past the barn, before forking into FP4 and FP5 in the centre of the yard.

**Proposal**

10. The demolition of the application building and erection of a two-storey open market dwelling.
11. The dwelling would be faced in rubble limestone and feature gritstone quoins, surrounds and detailing. Its roof would be clad in natural blue-slate rooftiles.
12. The footprint of the proposed dwelling would be the same as the existing outbuilding. Its frontage would measure 16m and would be 5.5m in depth. It would feature a small 3m lean to from the rear elevation. The building would measure 6.5m in height.

13. On its principal (north facing) elevation, the property would feature 2 doorways to give the appearance of two semi-detached properties. The fenestration of the building would reflect this form with a single ground-floor window and two first floor windows. There would be two chimneystacks to further emphasise the appearance of two semi-detached cottages.
14. To the west of the property would be a small driveway for two vehicles. To the rear of the property would be a walled garden area.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

**That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:**

1. **The development would result in the total loss of a non-designated heritage asset and harm to the setting of the Great Hucklow and Grindlow Conservation Area contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP1, GPS2, GSP3, L3, DMC3, DMC5 and DMC8. The harm identified would be less than substantial but would not be outweighed by public benefits contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework.**
2. **The erection of a market dwelling house in this location is contrary in principle to Core Strategy policies DS1 and HC1 and the National Planning Policy Framework.**

### **Key Issues**

- Whether the development is acceptable in principle.
- Whether the proposed development is would deliver significant enhancement to the landscape, cultural heritage and biodiversity of the National Park.
- Whether the development is acceptable in all other respects.

### **History**

15. 2009 - Conversion of redundant agricultural building to holiday let accommodation (NP/DDD/1109/0929) – Granted conditionally.
16. 2023 - Proposed renovation, alteration of existing structure to form a single dwelling (NP/DDD/0423/0466) – Refused due to impact on the significance of the non-designated heritage asset and setting of the Great Hucklow and Grindlow Conservation Area.

### **Consultations**

17. Highway Authority – No objection to the proposed development subject to condition and informative note.
18. Great Hucklow Parish Council – Support for the following reasons:
  1. *It is one of the few opportunities to provide additional family accommodation within the hamlet of Grindlow.*
  2. *The Parish Council has a policy to support the supply of additional family housing where possible and appropriate within the villages.*
  3. *The application relates to the Rose Farm area within the Hucklow and Grindlow Conservation Area. Previous applications have been granted to convert Rose Farm Cottage which is an unlisted heritage asset of minor importance. It is believed that these are extant but the structure has deteriorated to such a level that any refurbishment will have so little of the original fabric that any heritage value will be*

lost. The current proposal fits well with the Rose Farm conservation group and therefore would be an enhancement to this group and the conservation area as a whole.

In view of the need to provide additional residential accommodation where possible, the Parish Council would request that the Authority considers imposing conditions such that the rebuilt cottage remains part of the Rose Farm planning unit, it can only be used for full time residential use and permitted development rights are removed.

19. Natural England – No objection subject to appropriate mitigation being secured. We consider that without appropriate mitigation the application would:

- damage or destroy the interest features for which the following Sites of Special Scientific Interest have been notified:
  - Cressbrook Dale,
  - The Wye Valley,
  - Waterfalls Meadow,
  - Stoney Middleton Dale and,
  - Bradwell Dale and Bagshaw Cavern.

In order to mitigate these adverse effects and make the development acceptable, the following mitigation measures are required / or the following mitigation options should be secured:

- Discharge released from the Package Treatment Plant (PTP) should be to ground for natural infiltration to occur.

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

Natural England's further advice on designated sites/landscapes and advice on other natural environment issues is set out below.

20. PDNPA Archaeology – As a non-designated heritage asset a balanced planning decision that has regard to the assets significance and the scale of harm needs to be made (NPPF para.209).

Should the planning balance be favourable a condition scheme of building recording is recommended. This should take the form of a programme of building recording to Level 2/3 standard, including controlled demolition with a structural watching brief to allow additional archaeological recording to take place during the deconstruction and demolition of the structure to enable a full record to be made. This can build on the existing heritage statement.

21. PDNPA Ecology – Requested one additional dusk emergency survey due to age of the submitted survey. Also requested mitigation and recommendations to be conditioned.

## **Representations**

22. Three representations were received during the determination of the planning application. Two representations supported the planning application for the following reasons:

- a) Proposal will provide residential accommodation for local people;
- b) Proposed design is in keeping with the local area and retained the character of the original structure;
- c) New building will be more energy efficient;

- d) Current structure is in a bad state of decay and the new building will be an enhancement to the village;
  - e) Alternative to demolition would be further decay for the building which would not benefit anyone.
23. One objection was received by the Ramblers Derbyshire Dales Group for the following reasons:
- a) Grindlow Footpath 3 runs along the access track adjacent to the proposed redevelopment;
  - b) However, in the wider Rose Farm site, Grindlow Footpaths 3, 4 and 5 shown on the Definitive Map are all obstructed by buildings. Diversions are needed for all three FPs. These diversions should be applied for and in place before any development takes place;
  - c) Once this is done, FP 3 should remain unaffected at all times, including the path surface, both during and after any development;
  - d) Consideration should be given to the safety of members of the public using the Right of Way both during and after the proposed works;
  - e) There should be no encroachment of the path. The DCC Rights of Way Team should be asked for advice over the above RoW matters.

### **National Planning Policy Framework**

24. 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.
25. 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.
26. 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 policies in the Development Plan and the NPPF.

### **Relevant Development Plan Policies**

#### **Core Strategy**

27. GSP1- *Securing National Park Purposes and sustainable development*. States that planning applications should secure National Park purposes and sustainable development. It outlines that policies must be read in combination and all development shall be consistent with the National Park's legal purposes and duty. Where there is an irreconcilable conflict between the statutory purposes, the Sandford Principle will be applied and the conservation and enhancement of the National Park will be given priority.

28. GSP2 – *Enhancing the National Park*. Opportunities for enhancing the valued characteristics of the National Park will be identified and acted upon. Proposals intended to enhance the National Park will need to demonstrate that they offer significant overall benefit to the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area. They should not undermine the achievement of other Core Policies.
29. 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.
30. DS1 - *Development Strategy*. Sets out that most new development will be directed into named settlements. Grindlow is not a DS1 settlement.
31. HC1 – *New housing*. Provision will not be made for housing solely to meet open market demand. Housing land will not be allocated in the development plan. Exceptionally, new housing (whether newly built or from re-use of an existing building) can be accepted where:
- A) It addresses eligible local needs:
    - i) for homes that remain affordable with occupation restricted to local people in perpetuity; or
    - ii) for aged persons' assisted accommodation including residential institutions offering care, where adequate care or assistance cannot be provided within the existing housing stock. In such cases, sufficient flexibility will be allowed in determining the local residential qualification to consider their short-term business needs whilst maintaining local residency restrictions for the long term.
  - B) It provides for key workers in agriculture, forestry or other rural enterprises in accordance with core policy HC2.
  - C) In accordance with core policies GSP1 and GSP2:
    - i) it is required in order to achieve conservation and/or enhancement of valued vernacular or listed buildings; or
    - ii) it is required in order to achieve conservation or enhancement in settlements listed in core policy DS1.
- Any scheme proposed under CI or CII that is able to accommodate more than one dwelling unit, must also address identified eligible local need and be affordable with occupation restricted to local people in perpetuity, unless:
- iii) it is not financially viable, although the intention will still be to maximise the proportion of affordable homes within viability constraints; or
  - iv) it would provide more affordable homes than are needed in the parish and the adjacent parishes, now and in the near future: in which case (also subject to viability considerations), a financial contribution<sup>102</sup> will be required towards affordable housing needed elsewhere in the National Park.
32. 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.
33. 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.

34. Policy CC1 states that development must make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources.

#### Development Management Policies

35. 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.
36. 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.
37. 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.

DMC5.F(ii) states that when determining planning applications which would result in the complete loss of a non-designated heritage asset, a balanced judgement is required which takes into account the significance of the heritage asset.

38. 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.
39. 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.
40. 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.

## **Assessment**

### **Principle of development**

41. The proposed development is for the erection of a market dwelling. Policy HC1 states that provision will not be made for housing solely to meet open market demand. It goes on to state that exceptionally, new housing can be accepted where (in accordance with policies GSP1 and GSP2) it is required in order to achieve conservation and/or enhancement of a valued vernacular or listed building, or in a settlement listed in policy DS1.
42. The submitted Heritage Statement identifies the building as a non-designated heritage asset which possess a medium degree of importance. Therefore, if the building was proposed to be converted into an open market dwelling, this would be acceptable in principle. However, the application proposes the demolition of the existing building and the erection of a new dwelling.
43. A Structural Report has been submitted with this application. The findings of the report are somewhat inconclusive, stating that from preliminary observations the building *could* be converted, but concluding:
- It is our professional opinion that the works involved to reuse part of the building seem disproportionate when considering the likely very high costs of the temporary works, and most importantly the health and safety risks. These can be mitigated to a certain degree, but will it will be difficult to remove risk entirely. It is also worth considering that this report has been produced based on a limited visual inspection from ground level. It is very common in our experience when attempting alterations to buildings of such a level of degradation of the building fabric, that it proves to be the case they are even more difficult to work with than anticipated, and ultimately have to be taken down and rebuilt. This is often because the poor quality of mortar means it is not possible to work with sections of masonry wall because stones are found to be completely loose, and the only safe option is to remove the loose section and rebuild. Often finding a sound bedding for the rebuilt section is difficult, as is propping, and entire sections of wall have to be taken down. Given the very poor apparent quality of the masonry at Rose Farm, it would not be unexpected to find this becomes the case.*
44. Officers consider that this conclusion indicates that the building is not capable of conversion into residential use. The proposal is therefore as a matter of fact not a conversion and therefore is not in accordance with policies HC1.C nor DMC10.
45. Accordingly, the proposed development does not meet any of the exceptional circumstances which justify the provision of an open market house as outlined in policy HC1.
46. As the building's extant use is agricultural, it does not meet the definition of previously developed (or brownfield) land as identified in Appendix 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Therefore, policy DMH6 which supports the principle of re-developing previously developed land for housing does not apply in the determination of this application.

47. The proposed development therefore does not comply with the adopted housing policies within the development plan.
48. The submitted Design and Access Statement (DAS) argues that the proposed development would result in an enhancement to the National Park through the removal of a building which does not positively contribute to the locality or the Conservation Area. The DAS argues that the building does not have any *specific, architectural or aesthetic significance being a (relatively speaking) poor example of buildings of this type* and its replacement with the dwelling would constitute an enhancement in accordance with Core Strategy GSP2. This will be discussed in the following section of the report.

#### Whether the proposed development enhances the special qualities of the National Park

49. Notwithstanding the conflict with policy HC1 identified above. Policy DS1 does allow for other development in the countryside which is required to achieve conservation or enhancement of the National Park. Policy GSP2 states that opportunities for enhancing the valued characteristics of the National Park will be identified and acted upon. It goes on to state that proposals intended to enhance the National Park will need to demonstrate that they offer *significant overall benefit to the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area*.
50. Policy GSP2.D outlines that opportunities will be taken to enhance the National Park by the treatment or removal of undesirable features or buildings.
51. As noted earlier in the report, the building is considered to possess sufficient historic interest to be deemed a non-designated heritage asset. This is a conclusion shared by the submitted heritage asset and Officers. In addition to this, the development site is in the Great Hucklow and Grindlow Conservation Area. Notwithstanding the building's current state of repair, the building contributes positively to the setting of the conservation area. The Heritage Statement states that the building *has a strong degree of historic interest, representing either an 'L' plan or two-unit cottage dating from the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century. The survival of this building helps to contribute to these typologies of houses from this period. It is unclear whether this building had originally been associated with a farmstead as a farm workers cottage, or represented a distinct cottage in its own right*. This historical interest contributes to both the property itself, the Rose Farm complex and the wider Great Hucklow and Grindlow Conservation Area.
52. The Heritage Statement also found that the building's use has adapted over time, originally being a cottage and later being adapted to a farm outbuilding. This further contributes to the historical interest of the site, and provides a visual indication of the evolution of agricultural practices in Grindlow.
53. Policy L3 states that development must conserve and where appropriate enhance or reveal the significance of historic assets and their setting. It goes on further to state 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. This policy is expanded upon in policies DMC5 and DMC8 which outline that development which would result in loss of a heritage asset will not be permitted unless a balanced judgement indicates that the development should be approved, taking into account the significance of the heritage asset (including the setting of a conservation area).
54. The proposed development would, as a matter of fact, result in the total loss of the building and its contribution to the setting of the Conservation Area. This is in direct conflict with policies L3.B and would result in harm to the historical significance to the building itself, in addition to the setting of the Conservation Area. The development



therefore would result in harm to the landscape and cultural heritage of the National Park and would not deliver enhancement required by policy GSP2.

55. The DAS argues that removal of the building and replacement with the new dwelling would enhance the setting of the Great Hucklow and Grindlow Conservation Area. Officers fundamentally disagree with this argument. The Heritage Statement advises that the building is of historical interest, and concludes that it is of medium significance with some archaeological and architectural interest, but a strong degree of historic interest.
56. The demolition of the building would result in the total loss of this interest and the contribution it makes to the area. It is noted that public footpath 3 passes directly in front of the development site following the access track. Therefore, the loss of the building would not be localised and would instead have an impact on the public realm. As such, it is considered that the proposed development would also result in less than substantial harm to the setting of the Conservation Area.
57. When considering whether a development would result in 'significant overall benefit' to the National Park, this should be viewed in the context of the National Park's first purpose.
58. Officers consider that the proposed development would actively result in harm to the cultural heritage of the National Park through the demolition of a non-designated heritage asset which contributes to the conservation area's setting. Its replacement with a dwellinghouse would not provide the same contributions, nor mitigate the harm resulting from its loss.
59. Invariably, the proposed dwelling would be in a better state of repair and constructed in high quality and local building materials. The overall form and height of the building is largely acceptable with the proposed detailing mitigating its overly long frontage.
60. Notwithstanding this, it would not contribute to any enhancement to the National Park's special qualities. In addition to harming the cultural heritage of the area, the proposed development would not result in enhancements to either the landscape or biodiversity.
61. The proposed development would not deliver significant enhancement to the landscape, cultural heritage or biodiversity of the National Park contrary to policies DS1 and GSP2. Therefore, there is no justification in principle for the demolition of the existing building or new dwelling house proposed.

### Ecology

62. Due to the age and the quality of the buildings, the impact on protected species, such as bats and owls, is a key consideration in the determination of this application.
63. A Bat and Barn Owl Survey Report was submitted in support of the application. The report was evidenced through five surveys, including a bat roost appraisal, barn owl survey and three dusk emergence surveys.
64. The report concluded that the building had a moderate to high potential for bat roosts. The following dusk emergence surveys found that no bat activity within the building; however, bats were observed foraging and commuting around the site. The survey also found no barn owl activity in or around the site.
65. These initial surveys were carried out in June 2022. As a result of their age, the Authority's ecologist requested an additional dusk emergence survey to assess the current potential for barn owls and bats.

66. A further survey was carried out in August 2024 which reiterated the conclusions of the initial surveys that the building did not provide roosts or habitats for barn owls and bats, but bats were observed in the locality.
67. Accordingly, the proposed development would not have an impact on the interests of protected species. The report outlines a set of mitigation and recommendations, including general prevention measures and additional measures to enhance the local biodiversity surrounding the site, such as bat boxes/tiles/bricks on the building itself which would compensate the loss of potential bat roosting habitats.
68. Subject to the development being carried out in accordance with the submitted Bat and Barn Owl Survey Report, and a scheme of habitat mitigation, which can both be secured through condition it is considered that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on protected species. It is therefore in compliance with policy L2 and DMC12.

#### Other matters

69. The proposed development would have sufficient off-street parking to serve the 3-bedroomed property. Therefore, the development is acceptable on highway amenity and safety grounds.
70. The proposed dwelling would be partially opposite a property known as Rose Barn with approximately 7m between the two properties. As only the western end of the property would be opposite Rose Barn, it is not considered that the development would result in harm to their amenity through either loss of privacy or an overbearing impact. The amenity space of the property would be to the south, and would not have an impact on the residential amenity of any neighbouring properties. It is therefore acceptable on amenity grounds.
71. The proposed development would be constructed using local building materials, sustainable building methods and would feature solar panels on the rear roof slope. This is considered commensurate to the scale of development and in accordance with policy CC1.
72. Natural England advised that the proposed sewage package treatment plant could have an adverse on nearby designated sites. In order to mitigate the adverse impacts on the designated sites, Natural England recommend that discharge from the package treatment plant should be to ground for natural infiltration to occur. It is recommended that the details of the package treatment plant, and its method for disposal, be reserved by condition if this application is approved.

#### Overall planning balance

73. As referenced above, paragraph 209 of the NPPF and policy DMC5 require a balanced planning judgement be made on any proposed development which would result in loss of a non-designated heritage asset. There is also a presumption against harm to designated heritage assets with less than substantial harm weighed against public benefits.
74. The proposed development would not result in significant enhancements to the special qualities of the National Park, and would instead result in significant harm to its cultural heritage through the removal of a non-designated heritage asset which contributes to the setting of the Conservation Area.

75. The proposed dwelling would be open-market and not restricted to local occupation. As such, no significant weight can be afforded to the provision of the dwelling itself.
76. As such, there are no material planning considerations which weigh in favour of the proposed development. Similarly, there are no public benefits which would outweigh the less than substantial harm to the setting of the Great Hucklow and Grindlow Conservation Area.
77. Therefore, when viewed in the overall planning balance, there are no benefits which outweigh the identified harm to the special qualities of the National Park.

### **Conclusion**

78. The proposed development does not meet any of the criteria which justify the provision of an open market dwelling as outlined by policy HC1.
79. The complete loss of the outbuilding would result in harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset, in addition to the setting of the Great Hucklow and Grindlow Conservation Area which is contrary to policies L3, DMC5 and DMC8.
80. As a result of the proposed development harming the cultural heritage of the area and in absence of any identified benefits to its natural beauty and wildlife, the proposed development would not result in any enhancements to the special qualities of the National Park. The proposed dwelling house is therefore not justified under policies DS1 or GSP2.
81. Therefore, when viewed in the planning balance, it is considered that there are no material planning considerations which outweigh the harm to the non-designated heritage asset and the setting of the Conservation Area, nor the lack of compliance with adopted housing policy. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

### **Human Rights**

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

Report author: Will Eyre, North Area Senior Planner