

10. S.73 APPLICATION - FOR THE VARIATION OF CONDITIONS 2 AND 4 ON NP/HPK/0921/1048 AT NEWFOLD FARM, COOPERS CARAVAN SITE AND CAFÉ, UNNAMED ROAD FROM STONECROFT TO GRINDSLOW HOUSE, GRINDSBROOK BOOTH, EDALE (NP/HPK/1123/1343, HF)

APPLICANT: MR MORGAN JACKSON

Summary

1. The application seeks to vary conditions 2 (approved plans) and 4 (landscaping) of an existing planning permission NP/HPK/0921/1048 which was granted for alterations to the existing camp site with associated landscaping, access and parking arrangements.
2. That planning permission was implemented however works relating to new car parking spaces on the southern edge of field 3 have not been carried out in accordance with the approved plans, in part due to an error identified on the approved drawings where landscaping and parking was shown in the same location on separate drawings.
3. This Section 73 application seeks changes to the parking layout and a number of additional car parking spaces, along with changes to landscaping in this part of the site.
4. Having regard to the existing site context and approval, the amendments are not considered to harm the character and appearance of the site, landscape or Conservation Area or result in unacceptable highway impacts. The proposals are considered to accord with the development plan and the application is recommended for approval.

Site and Surroundings

5. Newfold Farm Campsite is located in Edale, just south of the start of the Pennine Way. The campsite includes a café building at the eastern edge near to the access into the campsite from Mary's Lane. A recreation area and reception are located to the east of the site close to the campsite entrance.
6. The wider campsite covers four fields. Field 1 (north east) comprises tents with touring and camper van pitches. Field 2 (north west) has further camping and has permission for camping pods. Fields 3 (south west) and 4 (south east) accommodate tent pitches.
7. Public Right of Ways (PRoW) HP11/18 & 31 extend along the north edge of the campsite, whilst PRoW HP11/20 extends along the south edge along the route of an existing track.
8. The campsite is within the Edale Conservation Area. There are a number of Listed Buildings to the east of the campsite, however the location and nature of works being considered under this Section 73 application are not considered to affect their settings.
9. The nearest residential properties include The Meads and The Hermitage approximately 115m to the south, and properties on Marys Lane 80m to the south east. Properties close to the site entrance include The Limefield to the east, and Western House and Lea House (which is listed) to the north and north east.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. **Accordance with amended plans**

2. **Development carried out in accordance with tree report.**
3. **Development to be carried out in accordance with amended landscape plans, to be carried out in first available planting season following completion or substantial completion of the development.**
4. **Details of any new lighting being installed to be approved prior to installation.**
5. **Details of any new entrance gates to be approved prior to installation.**
6. **New parking spaces within the fields to be surfaced with a grow through material such as 'grasscrete' prior to their first use.**
7. **Development to accord with the details contained in the document 'Measures to Combat Climate Change', including the details of the Travel Plan.**
8. **Revised parking arrangement and surfacing for field 3 and directional signage to be installed within specified timescale.**

Key Issues

10. The impact of the proposed amendments on the valued character and appearance of the site and its landscape setting, including impact upon the significance of the Conservation Area. Impact on neighbouring residents and highway safety.

History

11. NP/HPK/0620/0539: Extensions to shop and cafe, and erection of facilities building at campsite – Approved 2nd March 2021.
12. NP/HPK/0921/1048: Alterations to camp site provision, reception building and associated landscaping, access track and parking arrangements – Approved 14th April 2022.
13. NP/HPK/1222/1567: Section 73 application to alter condition 3 on planning approval No NP/HPK/0393/035 for the Erection of new café and coffee shop with kitchen and toilets to allow extended opening until 10pm every evening – Approved 25th April 2023.

Consultations

14. Derbyshire County Council (Highways & PRow): Initial objection. Concerns about increased vehicle journeys along PRow and safety issue associated with reversing of vehicles. Concerns with management of use of parking spaces by campsite users.

Response to amended plans recognised efforts made to mitigate public safety along the PRow provided signage is clear and vegetation maintained at appropriate height.

Final response confirmed the PRow officer is satisfied with the compromise on parking on field 3 and no objection to the development.

15. Edale Parish Council: Support the application.
16. High Peak Borough Council (Planning): No response.
17. Peak District National Park Authority Archaeology: No objections.
18. Peak District National Park Authority ARow: No response.

19. Peak District National Park Authority Landscape: No response.

Representations

20. 9 letters of objection have been received from 4 objectors, raising the following matters:

Highways, Car Parking & PRow

- Concerns with number of vehicles accessing the campsite. Main village road is not suited to volume of vehicles and is unsafe. Vehicles also continue into village if they miss the turning. Cars use footpath on south edge of campsite and park on edge of footpath and by agricultural barns to the south west of the site;
- PRow is not fit for vehicle activity and is used by other users including walkers and those travelling to school and should remain free of vehicles;
- Cars need to be kept out of the village;
- Core Strategy requires the safeguarding of Rights of Way and the proposal would be contrary to that; Conflict with CST1.E.
- Reference to Policies T1, T7 and DMT6.A;
- Photographs provided to illustrate volume of vehicles using footpath along south of campsite, along footpath to south and by agricultural barns and potential housing of staff in caravans. Photographs also show parking in field 4;
- Non-compliance with the Travel Plan in respect of discounts for rail users;
- Request for investigation of village pedestrian safety;
- EV charging to be made conditioned and operational within set time frame;
- Query whether Open Space Society, Rambler's Association or CPRE consulted. Note - these are not statutory consultees and are therefore not consulted on this application.

Landscape & Heritage

- Removal of trees and hedgerows has exacerbated parking and number of vehicles along a PRow / historic footpath, harming the landscape, character and significance contrary to Policies L1 and L3;
- Development harming the significance of any cultural heritage asset and its setting will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances;
- The development has altered the character and appearance of the PRow visually and audibly and it feels as though the campsite has extended on to the footpath;
- Hedgerows are part of the landscape and should be preserved. The applicant has removed a historic hedge. Comments raised around special connections with landscaping (such as Sycamore Gap). The hedge was loved by tourists and locals, and people associate significance and value to the cultural landscape and trees and hedgerows in the area;
- The removal of trees in Plymouth and Sheffield should not be emulated;
- Visibility of the parked vehicles from Ollerbrook Footpath and Scheduled Monument 'Mam Tor Iron Age Fort'. Visibility of car parking harms views of Grindsbrook from those locations;
- Important for those visiting Edale for their enjoyment and mental health to be able to do so without anxiety of meeting and seeing cars;
- Request for the number of car parking spaces to remain as approved and for all landscaping to be re-instated as it was and for no car park or cars permitted up the heritage public footpath, for safety and landscape purposes;
- Request for ground surface of car parking to be replaced with grass membrane;
- Heritage layout of the five Booths making the Edale landscape should be viewed together as a whole landscape linked via heritage footpaths. A change to any

footpath between booths servers links and divides the booths, harming the landscape;

- More needs to be done to increase and protect hedgerows and trees in Edale;
- Request for Historic England's whole landscape approach to be taken into consideration to conserve footpaths and booths;

Other Matters

- Unclear which condition the application seeks to vary;
- There have been multiple applications on the campsite and they should be considered together cumulatively.

Main Policies

Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L1, L3, RT3, T1, T6

Relevant Local Plan policies: DMC3, DMC5, DMC8, DMR1, DMT5, DMT6

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

21. 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: 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 they carry out these purposes they also have the duty to; seek to foster the economic and social well-being of local communities in National Parks.
22. The NPPF is a material consideration and carries particular weight where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date. 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.
23. In the National Park, the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy (2011) and the Development Management Policies (DMP) (2019). The development plan provides 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

24. GSP1, GSP2: 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.
25. GSP3: 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, including in respect of access, traffic levels and landscaping.
26. L1: Development must conserve and enhance valued landscape character, as identified in the Landscape Strategy and Action Plan, and other valued characteristics.

- 27. L3: Development must conserve and where appropriate enhance the significance of historic assets and their settings. Other than in exceptional circumstances, development will not be permitted where it is likely to harm the significance of any heritage asset.
- 28. RT3: Proposals for caravan and camping sites must conform to the principles set out under the policy criteria. Part C. states provision of improved facilities on existing caravan and camping sites must be of a scale appropriate to the site. Part D. states development that would improve the quality of existing sites, including improvements to access and landscaping, will be encouraged.
- 29. T1: Impacts of traffic within environmentally sensitive locations will be minimized.
- 30. T6: The Rights of Way network will be safeguarded from development. Where a proposal affects a Right of Way, every effort will be made to accommodate the definitive route. Non-residential parking will be restricted to discourage car use and will be managed to ensure the location and nature of car parking does not exceed environmental capacity.

Development Management Policies

- 31. DMC3: Development will be permitted provided it is of a high standard that respects, protects and where possible enhances the natural beauty, quality and visual amenity of the landscape and cultural heritage, with attention paid to siting, scale, impact on landscape features and the wider landscape setting which contribute to the valued character and appearance of the area. Attention will also be paid to vehicle parking.
- 32. DMC5: Planning applications for development affecting a heritage asset must clearly demonstrate its significance and why the proposed development and related works are desirable or necessary. Supporting evidence should be proportionate to the significance of the asset. Development resulting in harm to a heritage asset will not be permitted unless, where less than substantial, the harm is weighed against the public benefits.
- 33. DMC8: Applications should clearly demonstrate how the character or appearance of the Conservation Area will be preserved and enhanced, and should provide information to demonstrate the effect of development on the Conservation Area.
- 34. DMR1: The development of a new touring camping or caravan site, or small extension to existing site, will not be permitted unless its scale, location, access, landscape setting and impact on neighbouring uses are acceptable, and it does not dominate surroundings.
- 35. DMT5: Development that would increase vehicular traffic on footpaths to the detriment of their enjoyment by walkers will not be permitted unless there are overriding social, economic or environmental conservation benefits arising from the proposal.
- 36. DMT6: New or enlarged car parks will not be permitted unless there is a clear, demonstrable need. Where planning permission is required, additional parking should be of a limited nature, whilst being appropriate to the size of development and accounting for its location and visual impact.

Assessment

Impact on character and appearance of the area

- 37. Planning permission was granted for alterations to the campsite at Newfold Farm, reception building and associated landscaping, access track and parking arrangements under NP/HPK/0921/1048. That permission has been implemented, with works undertaken including use of field 1 for touring and campervans, introduction of car

parking in fields 1 and 2, and introduction of car parking to field 3, albeit the work to parking at the edge of field 3 is not fully in accordance with the approved plans.

38. The deviation has arisen in part due to what is understood to have been an error on the approved drawings for NP/HPK/0921/1048. The approved site plan shows parking along the edge of field 3 on the verge to the PRow and shows a one-way in and one-way out system round the site, with vehicles exiting along the track on the south edge of the site.
39. The landscape plan that was approved under NP/HPK/0921/1048 shows verge, tree and hedge planting in the location of the parking spaces on the approved site plan. Parking spaces shown on the landscape plan are located to the north of the planting, preventing vehicles from exiting along the track to the south. The car parking and landscaping positions on the approved plans conflict with one another and are not compatible.
40. Whilst it is understood the applicant no longer wishes to pursue a one-way system of vehicles around the campsite, this is nonetheless shown on the approved plans. Car parking has already been provided in the location shown by the approved site plan under NP/HPK/0921/1048, albeit a greater scale of parking is provided and the surfacing is not in accordance with the approval which requires grass mesh.
41. This Section 73 application seeks to resolve the errors on the plans that form part of the existing approval, and seeks to reflect the intended access arrangements for the site and provision of a number of additional parking spaces.
42. The latest plan for the site no longer shows a one-way access system around the site. The main change relates to the car parking arrangement on the southern edge of field 3.
43. The number of car parking spaces has increased from the approved 14 spaces to 22, in the same position as shown on the approved site plan along the edge of the PRow to the south. The spaces would be accessed from the north east corner of the row of parking, with a sign directing vehicles to turn right through a break in landscaping. Vehicles would then turn left into parking spaces which they could exit in a forward gear. Parking bays and manoeuvring space would be finished in a grass mesh.
44. The accompanying landscape addendum shows that soft landscaping would be moved to the rear (north) of the parking spaces, separating the car parking spaces from the camping field to the north with space at the north west corner left to access the field.
45. It is recognised the siting of car parking spaces along the edge of the PRow is not ideal, as there would be some change to the character and appearance experienced along the footpath. However, this must be considered within the context of the existing permission NP/HPK/0921/1048 and the approved site plan, which shows car parking spaces in the same position. That change is therefore already established. Officers consider that it would be unreasonable to resist the siting of car parking in the position proposed, given that notwithstanding the conflict with the approved landscape plan, parking in that position is shown on the approved site plan.
46. Whilst the additional vehicles would increase the presence of cars to the south of the campsite, the existing permission already allows for the parking of vehicles in this location and the increase in parking spaces at the scale proposed is not considered to unacceptably alter the character and appearance of the area compared with that approval, particularly if finished with a grass mesh and proposed landscaping as is proposed. As outlined below, this change is also experienced in a more intimate setting.

47. As the car parking spaces have already been laid out, it would be necessary to condition that the spaces are finished with a grass mesh or similar within a set timescale, to ensure a timescale for completing the work in a manner which accords with the permission. The grass mesh finish would provide a softer edge to the PRow, particularly once vegetation is established and is therefore important to respect character and appearance.
48. The Section 73 application proposes a landscaping scheme that could be implemented around the location of the car parking spaces. It proposes an area of soft landscaping to the east of the row of parking, similar to the existing approval, with provision made for an access through the landscaping to allow cars to access and egress parking spaces in a forward gear. This access arrangement has been considered necessary by the County Council's PRow officer for safety reasons, discussed further below.
49. There would also be some intervening planting between the parking spaces in addition to the existing retained tree. This would help to soften the overall appearance of vehicles along the track.
50. It is recognised the change between the approved landscape plan and proposed would see less landscaping directly along the edge of the PRow, and that change is regrettable. However, the car parking has already been set out in the location of the spaces shown on the approved site plan under the existing permission (albeit at a greater scale and without the grass cell surfacing).
51. In exploring a solution, officers requested a similar solution to what is now proposed, but with a row of landscaping between the car parking spaces and PRow rather than behind the car parking and manoeuvring area. This would afford screening along the PRow.
52. However, this suggestion was not taken up as this would require vehicles to reverse in the direction of camping pitches creating potential safety issues within field 3. There were also concerns with alternate configurations as this would require a larger area of field 3 to be utilised for parking and manoeuvring. It is recognised both solutions would require car parking spaces to be moved from the location from which they are currently approved under NP/HPK/0921/1048 and given that permission is extant, it would be unreasonable to insist upon this.
53. The plans therefore show soft landscaping planting to the rear (north) of the parking spaces comprising a mix of native trees and understorey shrub planting, reflecting the landscaping mix approved across the site under the original permission. The planting would have the benefit of screening the main camping field from the PRow, and providing screening of the car parking from higher views of the campsite from the north.
54. There is existing tree planting along the south edge of the PRow, which affords screening of the southern edge of the field where parking would be located when viewed from the south on Mam Tor and the Great Ridge walk. The location of parking on the southern edge would also remove the need for cars to park in the main field as was the previous arrangement, where they would be more visible in the landscape.
55. Meanwhile, the planting of trees to the rear of the parking spaces would afford screening of the car parking from views from higher ground to the north, from views from the Open Access Trail in the vicinity of Ringing Roger, The Nab and the Kinder Scout plateau.
56. The amendments are therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of impact within the wider landscape, including impact from the Mam Tor Scheduled Monument, and once the landscaping is established represent an improvement over the original consent when considering views from the north.

57. Experience of the car parking would be in a more intimate setting along the PRoW and would be well screened from wider vantages by the existing and proposed landscaping. The increase in car parking over the existing approval is therefore on balance considered to be acceptable.
58. Taking the above into account, the proposals are considered to accord with Policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L1 and DMC3 of the development plan.
59. The proposals are also acceptable in respect of impact on the Conservation Area, having regard to the existing character of the campsite, existing approval and resultant character along the PRoW, and consideration to the wider historic landscape character and connectivity between booths, as raised by a number of respondents, as the development would be confined to a more intimate area. On balance, the additional car parking with revised landscaping scheme is considered to be acceptable, and the proposals include additional landscaping to be planted with the species mix appropriate to the character of the area. The introduction of a treed boundary to the field would reflect the presence of woodland along boundary edges elsewhere in the area and around the campsite. The proposals therefore accord with Policies L3, DMC5 and DMC8 of the development plan.
60. The additional car parking is a minor increase proportionate to the scale of the wider campsite and the scale, location and associated landscaping is considered to be acceptable in respect of Policies RT3 and DMR1.

Highways

61. An objection was initially raised by the County Council's PRoW officer, due to the increase of vehicle activity along the PRoW and as the parking arrangement as submitted required vehicles to reverse onto the PRoW, creating safety concerns for PRoW users.
62. A number of objections have also been received which raise concerns over the safety of users of the PRoW, due to the arrangement of parking and increase in vehicles.
63. However, officers have had regard to the fact the site plan as approved technically allows for a one-way access around the campsite, and that it was also intended for vehicles accessing fields 3 and 4 to use the track. The existing approval therefore allows for vehicles to utilise the track. There is also access along the track to buildings to the west.
64. The applicant has provided revised plans which show a right-hand turn into the parking area, meaning vehicles can access and egress the car parking spaces in a forward gear. The plan confirms a directional sign would be provided to inform vehicles to turn right. Such a sign can be provided under deemed consent, provided it complies with the relevant criteria under Class 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 2007.
65. The applicant has also confirmed that all visitors to the campsite are required to report to reception on arrival, where they will be advised of where to park and that they must do so in accordance with the directional sign, allowing them to exit spaces in forward gear.
66. Based on the amended plan and arrangement, the PRoW officer has confirmed they are now satisfied the arrangements would be acceptable in respect of impact on the PRoW. The Highways Authority have consequently confirmed they have no objection to the revised arrangements on the site.

67. The proposed arrangement would not encroach onto the PRow and officers do not consider the enjoyment of the PRow would be altered detrimentally over the existing situation, both in respect of the existing approval and access to land to the west. The amendment is considered to comply with Policies T6 and DMT5.
68. Officers consider a condition is required for the revised parking arrangement and sign to be provided within a specified timeframe given the works have already commenced, and to be maintained for the lifetime of the development, to ensure the parking remains safe.
69. In respect of Policies T1 and T6, there is already traffic associated with the campsite in the area and the increase of 8 car parking spaces is not considered to unacceptably alter that relationship within the area or exceed environmental capacity.
70. In respect of DMT6, it is recognised there is a need for campsite parking with overspill parking having occurred further west by the agricultural buildings. Concerns with parking in that location have been raised, although that location is outside of the application boundary and beyond the scope of this application. The additional parking is considered to be of a limited nature, appropriate to the size of the campsite and visually appropriate.
71. It is recognised there are concerns raised in respect of the level of vehicular traffic in the area, however the existing campsite use is long established and the amendment considered as part of this proposal is not considered to unacceptably alter that position.
72. Whilst the permission included a condition for a Construction Management Plan, the Highways Authority have advised this could be dealt with through an informative advising on considerate construction and that the PRow remains unobstructed. Given the scale, nature and location of works, it is not necessary to make the development acceptable.
73. An objector has raised concerns over the content of the approved Travel Plan. Officers have clarified with the applicant that the arrangement offers discounted camping rates for those who arrive by train and that arrangement is considered to be acceptable.

Other Matters

74. The proposed amendments relate to the parking area at the south edge of field 3, which is a sufficient distance from the nearest dwelling (including those on the campsite) such that the arrangements are not considered to impact on amenity. The development complies with Policies GSP3 and DMC3 in this respect.
75. The amendments are not considered to raise new issues in respect of trees or ecology.

Conclusion

76. On balance, having regard to the existing site context and approval, the proposed amendments and associated landscaping are not considered to harm the character and appearance of the site, landscape or Conservation Area or result in unacceptable impacts in respect of highways or other matters.
77. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

Human Rights

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

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

Nil

Report Author: Hannah Freer, Senior Planner