

6. FULL APPLICATION – DEMOLITION OF DERELICT OUTBUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION OF TWO BEDROOM DETACHED DWELLING WITH FRONT GARDEN TO STREET AND SMALLER PRIVATE AMENITY SPACE TO REAR AT SITE OF FORMER NATWEST BANK, BAMFORD (NP/HPK/0125/0061 WE)

APPLICANT: DR DANIEL HALE

Summary

1. This site benefits from an extant planning permission for the erection of a two-storey dwelling.
2. As a result of its scale, orientation and detailed design, the proposed house would have a negative impact on the visual amenity of the area and harm the Bamford Conservation Area. It would also have a harmful impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. It would therefore fail to conserve and enhance the valued character of the built-environment and its immediate setting.
3. The application is recommended for refusal on this basis.

Site and Surroundings

4. The site is located at Fidlers Well which is situated in the centre of Bamford village adjacent to The Green and within the Bamford Conservation Area. This is a small site on the eastern side of The Green which is adjacent to an attractive landscaped area with large gritstone troughs which abut its western boundary. There were two single-storey buildings on the site, which were previously used as a branch of the NatWest Bank. One of these buildings has subsequently been demolished and site clearance works commenced.
5. There is no vehicular access to the site. Access is via a small flight of stone steps off Fidlers Well.
6. The site has several direct neighbours, including Lea House which fronts directly onto the site and shares a common boundary, and 1 Fidlers Close to the south. On the opposite side of The Green is Moor Farm, a Grade II listed building.

Proposal

7. This application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the remaining structures on site and the construction of a detached market dwelling house with associated garden and amenity space.
8. The proposed dwelling would be comprised of two elements. Fronting onto The Green would be a two-storey building measuring 6.5m in height to the ridge, 7.5m in length with a gable width of 5.1m. Extending from the rear on the northern end of this building at a perpendicular angle would be a three-storey element. This part of the building would measure 8.6m in height to the ridge, 6.5m in length and feature a gable width of 6.5m.
9. The dwelling would feature a front lawn and a small rear amenity space enclosed by the two elements of the building.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

1. **The design, scale, form, and massing of the proposed development would erode the setting of The Green and Filders Well which and harm the significance of the Bamford Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP2, GSP3, L3 and HC1 and Development Management policies DMC3, DMC5, DMC8 and DMH6. The harm identified would be less than substantial but would not be outweighed by public benefits and therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework.**
2. **The proposed development would be overbearing and have an unacceptable harmful impact upon the residential amenity of occupants of neighbouring properties contrary to Core Strategy policy GPS3 and Development Management policy DMC3.**

Key Issues

- Principle of development;
- Design and impact on heritage assets;
- Impact on residential amenity;
- Other matters.

History

10. 2001 (NP/HPK/110/1145 - Demolition of bank and part of outbuilding and erection of 2-bedroom dwelling – Granted conditionally
11. 2003 (NP/HPK/080/2129 – Erection of dwelling – Granted conditionally
12. 2007 (NP/HPK/1007/1016 – Renewal of 2003 permission – Granted conditionally
13. 2010 (NP/HPK/0510/0457) – Renewal of 2003 permission – Granted conditionally
14. 2012 (NP/HPK/0811/0828 - Removal of conditions 2, 12 and 13 on NP/HPK/0510/0457 – Granted conditionally.

NB: This application has been confirmed to have been lawfully implemented and is therefore an extant planning permission which could be carried out.

15. 2013 (NP/DIS/1013/0932 - Discharge of condition 4 - amended ground floor and first floor layout on NP/HPK/0811/0828 – Discharged
16. 2014 (NP/HPK/0813/0673) - Demolition of the former bank building and the erection of an open market dwelling (amended design) and implementation of the approved landscaping scheme – Granted conditionally

Consultations

17. Highway Authority – No objection from a highway safety perspective. Recommended a condition requiring the submission of a Construction Management Plan to ensure that the construction of the dwelling does not detrimentally impact adjacent properties and also conditioned the provision of secure bicycle storage on site.
18. Borough Council – No response to date

19. Parish Council – Support:

Despite acknowledging that already-existing on-street parking congestion at this location will cause the lack of off-street parking in the application to be problematic, the Council was supportive of the application, which has been thoughtfully and considerately designed, on what has long been a challenging site to develop.

On a point of detail, the Council wishes to see, before construction commences, a detailed Method of Work statement in regard to cramage of plant and materials over the Council's adjoining land.

20. PDNPA Ecology – No objection subject to conditions and informative notes:

If the demolition is to be undertaken during the bird nesting period (March-August), a pre-commencement check for nesting birds should be undertaken by a suitably qualified ecologist.

A precautionary approach to the clearance of any vegetation and existing material/brush piles from the site is recommended.

The ecological enhancement of the site is welcome and the applicant may wish to consider incorporating bat roost features into the development. Such enhancements would provide biodiversity net gain in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2023). Integral features are preferred as they provide more permanence. See Section 4.2.5 of the Bat Survey Report and Bats and Buildings 2012 for further recommendations and guidance. Bat roost features should not be illuminated. It is also recommended that 'bat safe' roofing membrane is used.

Nesting opportunities would also be welcomed for birds as an additional enhancement. Such enhancements would provide biodiversity net gain in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2023). Enhancements can include features for birds such as house martins or a swift box/brick. See Swift Bricks: The 'Universal' Nest Brick – by Dick Newell | CIEEM and Nest cups – House Martin Conservation UK & Ireland for further guidance.

21. PDNPA Tree Officer – No objection

Representations

22. 9 representations were received during the determination of the application.

23. 5 representations supported the proposed development. They raised the following matters:

- Sustainability credentials of new scheme is better than the approved dwelling;
- Positively contributes to the conservation area;
- Architecturally designed design;
- The relationship with the next-door property works better;
- Good boundary treatments on the frontage;
- Site is an eyesore;
- Commitment to reviving the historic wells with harvested rainwater;
- Native bee friendly planting and sustainable water management;
- Dwelling would enhance the site and village;
- Improved design.

24. 4 letters of objection were submitted. They raised the following matters:

- Design is awkward and at odds with design guide, in particular by the virtue of the overly complex, awkward roofline;
- Massing effect and loss of light/overshadowing on Lea House;
- Negative impact on the street-scene through depriving the street scene of the attractive frontage to Lea House which is on a popular route through the village;
- Questions whether the planning permission has lapsed and whether the site would be better utilised for a small-scale commercial use;
- Concerns that the submitted information is misleading;
- Negative impact on the outlook for properties on Fidlers Well and Fidlers Close;
- Too tall;
- Over development of a small site.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

25. 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.

26. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a material consideration and carries particular weight where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date. In particular Paragraph 189 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.

27. 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 the NPPF.

Relevant Development Plan Policies

Core Strategy

28. 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.

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. Bamford is a named settlement.

31. 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.
32. 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.
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.
35. Policy HC1 states 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:
 - 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.

Development Management Policies

36. Policy 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.
38. Policy DMC7 – Listed Buildings. Planning applications for development affecting listed buildings and/or its setting should be determined in accordance with policy DMC5 and clearly demonstrate how their significance will be preserved and why the proposed development and related works are desirable or necessary.
39. Policy DMC8 - *Conservation Areas*: This states that applications for development in a Conservation Area should assess and clearly demonstrate how the character or appearance and significance of the Conservation Area will be preserved or enhanced.
40. 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.
41. 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.
42. Policy DMH6 - *Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use*. Re-development of previously developed land for housing will be permitted provided that:
- i) the development conserves and enhances the valued character of the built environment or landscape on, around or adjacent to the site; and
 - ii) where the land is inside or on the edge of a Core Strategy policy DS1 settlement, and subject to viability, an element of the housing addresses local need for affordable housing potentially including starter home or custom or self-build housing provision.

Assessment

Principle of development

43. The development site was the location for a NatWest Bank branch which closed in the 1990s. Since the bank's closure, the site has been vacant. Historically, there were two buildings on site, and one of these buildings was demolished and that section of the site cleared in connection with planning permission NP/HPK/0811/0828.
44. That permission remains extant and the site could be re-developed in accordance with the approved plans. It should be noted that a later planning permission was granted on site (NP/HPK/0813/0673); however, it is unclear whether this permission was commenced within the three-year implementation date.
45. The development site meets the definition of previously developed land as defined by Annex 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework. While the site is relatively small, it is nevertheless a detracting influence in the street-scene in the centre of Bamford.
46. Policy HC1 states that exceptionally, new housing can be accepted where, in accordance with policies GSP1 and GSP2, it is required in order to achieve conservation or enhancement in settlements listed in core policy DS1. Bamford is a named settlement within policy DS1.
47. Development Management Policy DMH6 expands on the above, stating that re-

development of previously developed land for housing will be permitted provided that:

- i) the development conserves and enhances the valued character of the built environment or landscape on, around or adjacent to the site; and
- ii) where the land is inside or on the edge of a Core Strategy policy DS1 settlement, and subject to viability, an element of the housing addresses local need for affordable housing potentially including starter home or custom or self-build housing provision.

48. As noted, the site has extant permission for an open market dwelling. This is a significant material planning consideration which establishes the principle. In any event the application for a single dwelling does not need to demonstrate why it could not deliver affordable housing.

49. Therefore, the proposed development is acceptable in principle and should be approved if the proposed design is acceptable and if the development is acceptable in all other respects. Crucially, the enhancement of the site would need to comply with Core Strategy policy GSP2 which states *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.*

Design and impact on heritage assets:

50. The submitted design features a L-shaped arrangement, wherein the street-facing building features a 2-storey element. The proportions of this element are reflective of a traditional cottage, featuring a low-eaves height, traditional roof-pitch, and appropriate gable width. It's overall massing appears to sit comfortably with the surrounding street and responds to the mix of smaller, traditional properties surrounding The Green.

51. Conversely, the proposed section of the building which runs perpendicular to the street-facing element substantially increases the overall massing of the proposed dwelling and would contribute to an overly complex and dominating form. The perpendicular section of the building is significantly taller than the street-facing element. For comparison, the street-facing element would feature an overall height of 6.5m when measured from the finished floor-level, whereas the other section of the building would measure 9m when measured from the finished floor level at the front of the site (8.6m when measured from the finished floor level).

52. In addition to this, the proportions of this section of the building are not reflective of the local character. The length of the building would be approximately 6.6m and the gable would measure approximately 6.5m giving a square plan form at odds with the rectangular vernacular building plan form. Coupled with the height of the building, this would create a very tall and narrow structure. The Peak District vernacular typically features properties with a horizontal proportion, and this is certainly the prevailing character of properties surrounding The Green.

53. The proposed height and width of the dwelling would also create overly steep asymmetrical roof-pitch which would be fully visible from the street-scene on The Green. The pitch of the front section would be 40 degrees and the rear 50 degrees, both significantly steeper than the local tradition of around 33 degrees for slate roofs. It should be noted that there are properties in the locality which feature steep roof-pitches; however, these are more modern.

54. The Design Guide (2007) outlines 6 principles which would help ensure that new buildings are designed in sympathy with the local tradition. The first three are:

1. Keep to a simple plan and roof shape;
 2. Keep to a narrow gable width;
 3. Keep the eaves as low as possible.
55. As submitted, the proposed dwelling would conflict with the first and third principles through the introduction of a complex built-form, steep roof-pitch and overly tall form.
56. The site is relatively small, measuring approximately 197sqm. Therefore, separating the building into two distinct elements creates a design with a disproportionately large form and massing which would appear out of scale on the small site and would also have an unduly dominating effect on the street-scene to the detriment of the visual amenity of the area.
57. The street-facing element would feature an irregular frontage comprised of openings of varying sizes. The properties surrounding The Green are predominantly older, vernacular buildings of utilitarian character. The properties typically feature uniform and formal frontages arranged in a symmetrical way. The proposed frontage would therefore poorly relate to its setting.
58. The taller element of the proposed dwelling would feature a (near) flat roofed dormer window. Our design guidance makes it clear that adding dormers to a design and especially flat-roofed dormer is generally unacceptable and it points out that even traditional, gabled dormers are not generally a feature of the Park and are therefore best avoided unless they are part of the building tradition in the village.
59. Officers therefore consider the dormer in this case to be a poor design feature which would give the appearance of an altered dwellinghouse, as opposed to a consolidated design which would be expected for new dwellings. It would be a visual and conspicuous feature, particularly when viewed from the south and from Fidlers Close.
60. The west facing gable would feature 2 windows and a door. This would weaken the solid-to-void ratio for this elevation wherein gable ends are typically left blank. Whilst this is a relatively small deviation from the local character, it should be noted that the gable end would form a feature in the street-scene by virtue of its scale and orientation. Cumulatively, this would further pull the building away from the local character and create a dwelling which would be visually strident and contrast with the locality.
61. The property would be constructed with gritstone and blue-slate. These are the prevailing building materials within Bamford and there are no concerns with the proposed material palette.
62. For the above reasons, the proposed detailed treatment of the dwelling would not be of a high standard that respects, protects or enhances the visual amenity of the site, street-scene and settlement as a whole. It is therefore in conflict with policy DMC3 and adopted design guidance.
63. The development site is in the Bamford Conservation Area. It is also in the setting of Moore Farm, a Grade II listed building, in addition to several non-designated heritage assets such as Lea House and the stone troughs at Bamford Green (HBSMR monument). The impact of the proposed development on the significance and setting of these heritage assets are a key consideration.
64. The site is located off The Green, a triangular shaped open-space within the centre of the Conservation Area which was created to commemorate the Diamond Jubilee of Queen Victoria in 1897. This section of the Conservation Area features a relatively low

density comprised of traditional buildings at varying angles and orientations.

65. There are some features which detract from the historic character of the Conservation Area, such as the properties at Fidlers Close; however, the area largely retains its character. Buildings such as Moore Farm (Grade II) and Lea House, in addition to features such as the Troughs, contribute towards the historic interest of the conservation area.
66. The development site is on the opposite side to The Green from Moore Farm. Given this separation distance, it is considered that the proposed development would not have a harmful impact on the setting of this designated heritage asset.
67. The proposed development would be in very close proximity to Lea House, with the large 9m section of the building being located approximately 7.6m from the property's frontage. This would conceal much of the frontage of Lea House and detract from the contribution it makes towards the Conservation Area.
68. Furthermore, the height and width of the west facing gable would be a dominant feature in the street-scene in very close proximity to The Green. The non-traditional design features would become visually strident and erode from the well-preserved historic core of the Conservation Area.
69. Therefore, the siting of the building would have a harmful impact on the setting of Fidlers Well and The Green which form the centre of the village and this would amount to less than substantial harm to the significance of the Conservation Area, in addition to several non-designated features which themselves contribute to the setting of the designation.
70. Policy DMC5 outlines that development of a designated will not be permitted if it would result in any harm to, or loss of, the significance, character and appearance of a heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), unless:
 - i) for designated heritage assets, clear and convincing justification is provided, to the satisfaction of the Authority, that the:
 - a) substantial harm or loss of significance is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss; or
 - b) in the case of less than substantial harm to its significance, the harm is weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.
71. It is noted that the proposed development would find a viable use for an empty and deteriorating plot in the centre of the conservation area. It would also facilitate the removal of a poor-quality building and restoration of the boundary walls near the wells. However, when viewed in the balance, it is considered that these identified public benefits would not be outweighed by the harm to the significance of the Bamford Conservation Area. These benefits could be equally realised by developing an alternative design.
72. Therefore, the proposed development is in conflict with policies L3, DMC5 and DMC8 in addition to Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
73. The proposed development would not conserve and enhance the valued character of the built environment. It would fail to achieve the conservation or enhancement of a DS1 settlement. It would also fail to provide 'significant overall benefit to the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area'. The proposed development is

therefore in conflict with policies GSP2, HC1, and DMH6.

Impact on residential amenity

74. The development site features several immediate neighbours. To the north is Lea House, to the south is 1 Fidlers Close and to the east are the properties at Fidlers Close.
75. As mentioned, the taller section of the proposed building would be situated in front of Lea House. For comparison, the finished roof level (to the ridge) of Lea House is 186.46m AOD, while the finished roof level of the proposed development would be 187.1m AOD. The building would be approximately 0.7m from the shared boundary and approximately 7.6m from the frontage of Lea House. The height to the eaves would measure approximately 4.5m when measured from the floor levels of Lea House' garden. The walling would span from beyond the south-eastern edge of Lea House' existing garden shed and end at the point where the property's trellis ends. A site inspection found that this would span from Lea House' south-eastern windows and finish beyond the central doorway and upstairs window.
76. The application has been supported by a Daylight and Sunlight Report which assesses the impact of the proposed development on the daylight and sunlight of neighbouring properties. It found that the proposed development would result in some reductions to individual windows but the amount of daylight received within each of the neighbouring habitable rooms would be excess of the Building Research Establishment (BRE) criteria. The sunlight assessment to neighbouring windows and the assessment of overshadowing to neighbouring gardens also showed compliance with the BRE criteria
77. Notwithstanding the conclusions of the Daylight and Sunlight Report, Officers have significant concerns that the proposed development would be overbearing and dominating on the shared boundary.
78. The proposed development would result in a 4.5m blank wall being constructed within 0.7m of the shared boundary which would span over half of Lea House' frontage and much of its garden. In addition to the walling, the proposed roofing angle of this section of the property is steep and while it would slope away from the neighbouring property, its angle would offer limited relief from the overbearing influence. The impact would be most prevalent when in the garden; however, it would also impact the outlook from the middle and eastern windows of Lea House.
79. It is acknowledged that this application proposes to move the property further away from the shared boundary with Lea House compared to the extant permission. The extant permission (NP/0811/0828) shows the property immediately on the boundary.
80. On the other hand, however, the extant permission is for a lower building, approximately 1.8m tall when measured from the finished floor level of Lea House compared with the 4.5m eaves of this proposal. The extant scheme also features a shallower roof-pitch and would be located in the most north-easterly portion of the site. Therefore, the impact of the proposed development on the residential amenity of Lea House would be substantially greater than the extant permission.
81. The proposed overbearing influence and dominating impact on the shared boundary would amount to an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of Lea House. This would be in conflict with policies GSP3 and DMC3.
82. The proposed development would also feature windows which would overlook the shared amenity space surrounding the properties at Fidlers Close; however, this is

shared amenity space which is already overlooked by many dwellings. Therefore, this would not amount to an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of these properties.

Other matters

83. The Highway Authority raise no objections to the development from a highway safety perspective. To minimise disruption for neighbouring properties during the construction phase, they have suggested that a Construction Management Plan be conditioned. They also recommended a condition requiring sheltered bicycle storage to promote sustainable travel, in addition to an informative note referencing Considerate Constructors scheme.
84. This application has been supported by a Preliminary Ecology Assessment (PEA) and a Bat Survey Report. The PEA found moderate suitability to supporting bat roosts, and advised that avoidance and mitigation measures would be required in relation to nesting birds and amphibians. It recommended ecological enhancement measures, in addition to a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to mitigate the impact of development on onsite biodiversity.
85. The Bat Survey Report, which included dusk emergence surveys, recorded no roosts within the building on site. The surveys found bats using the site and concluded it to be of local value to bat populations. Whilst some habitat will be lost on site, it is considered that this is of sub-optimal value to bats, and significant impacts will be avoided as a result of more suitable habitat being located to the northeast of the site and surrounding residential gardens on all aspects of the site. It recommended avoidance, mitigation and compensation measures.
86. Therefore, subject to the submission and approval of a CEMP and compensatory measures, in addition to compliance with precautionary measures, the proposed development would not have an impact on the biodiversity interest on and surround the site, nor protected species.
87. The proposed development is exempt from statutory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG).
88. The proposed development would have regard to the energy hierarchy and reduce the need for energy through its orientation, solar gain, materials, airtightness and natural ventilation. It also proposes on site heat pumps and solar panels. It is acknowledged that the development would have extremely high sustainability credentials. It would therefore go beyond the requirements of CC1.

Conclusion

89. The development site has extant planning permission for an open-market dwelling and therefore the principle has been established. Applications for the re-development of previously developed land are required to demonstrate that they would conserve and enhance the valued character of the built environment or landscape on, around or adjacent to the site.
90. The proposed design has a massing and form which is not reflective of the street-scene nor local vernacular, in addition to a height which would dominate the locality and conservation area. The proposed development would therefore fail to conserve and enhance the valued character of the built-environment and would have a negative impact on the significance of the Bamford Conservation Area.

91. The proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of Lea House as a result of the proposed developments orientation, proximity to site boundary, height and form. The proposed dwelling would be overbearing to the residents of Lea House and despoil their outlook from the property's south-facing windows.

92. For the above reasons, the proposed development is in conflict with design and heritage policies DMC3, DMC5, DMC8 in addition to policy DMH6 and Core Strategy policy GSP2 which requires *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.*

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