

**7. FULL APPLICATION – ALTERATIONS AND EXTENSION TO AN EXISTING RESIDENTIAL UNIT (USE CLASS C2) AT THE LODGE, MANCHESTER ROAD, SHEFFIELD (NP/S/1024/1162, WE)**

**APPLICANT: MOORVILLE RESIDENTIAL**

**Summary**

1. The site includes a former dwelling which has been converted and extended to create a care home. The care home has since been expanded with extensions to the original building and new detached buildings constructed. The site is located in open countryside at Hollow Meadows.
2. This planning application proposes an extension to the north-western detached building. The extension would accommodate a lounge, office, 2-en-suite shower-rooms, with a WC and a double bedroom above.
3. Externally, the application proposes a modest patio area surrounding the extension. As part of the scheme of works, the application proposes a landscaping strategy and a scheme of biodiversity enhancements far in excess of the statutory requirement.
4. The proposed development is acceptable and subject to conditions would not have an adverse impact on the landscape, ecological interest or neighbouring amenity. It is recommended for approval on this basis.
5. **Officers note:** This application originally proposed a tennis court and outdoor swimming pool to the north-west of the site. Following correspondence between the case officer and planning agent, the applicant resolved to remove these elements of the proposal and seek permission for the extension only.

**Site and Surroundings**

6. The Lodge is located to the north of the A57 at Hollow Meadows. The property is a former dwelling now converted and extended to a residential care home following the grant of planning permission (see planning history section of the report). The property was originally associated with the old Hollow Meadows hospital located immediately to the east (now converted to housing).
7. The original Lodge building is two storey and constructed in natural gritstone under a blue slate roof. The 2017 extension is also two storeys, located to the west of the original building and linked to it by a conservatory. In 2018, a further extension to the building was approved and in 2021, 3x two-storey detached residential units to the rear of the Lodge were allowed on appeal following refusal of planning permission.
8. The built-form of the facility is concentrated to the north-east of the site. To the south and west, the site is comprised of improved grassland with scattered trees/vegetation and a pond.

**Proposal**

9. Planning permission is sought for a 1.5 storey extension to one of the 1.5-storey building located in the centre-north of the site. The extension would sit perpendicular to the host building and extend to the west. It would be constructed from matching materials to the host building.
10. The application also seeks consent for paving surrounding the building, in addition to an extension to the existing wall which surrounds it.

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. Statutory 3-year implementation time
2. To be carried out in accordance with the amended plans and specifications.
3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved biodiversity gain plan (approved under general condition imposed by paragraph 13(1), Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act (1990)) and the approved biodiversity gain plan shall be implemented before first use of the development hereby permitted.
4. Prior to any demolition or construction or any associated ground works or the arrival of any materials or machinery to the build location, an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the National Park Authority and any specified physical tree protection measures shall be installed. The AMS and TPP shall be prepared in accordance with British Standard BS 5837:2012. All measures described in the AMS and TPP shall be implemented in full and any specified physical tree protection measures shall remain in place until the completion of the approved building works.
5. In first planting season following construction of the development, the planting shall be carried in strict accordance with the submitted 'Landscape Strategy Plan' Rev B which shall be modified to require the mixed hedgerow to span the height of the site unless an alternative landscaping scheme or timescale is first submitted to and agreed in writing by the National Park Authority. Thereafter, it shall be maintained in accordance with the submitted specifications.
6. Notwithstanding the aftercare period specified on 'Landscape Strategy Plan' Rev B, any tree retained or proposed by 'Landscape Strategy Plan' Rev B which is uprooted, destroyed, pruned, cut or damaged in any manner during the development phase and thereafter within 5 years from the date of occupation of the building for its permitted use, other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars or as may be permitted by prior approval in writing from the National Park Authority. Any such tree which is cut down, uprooted, destroyed, pruned, cut or damaged within that period shall be replaced with another of the same species at the same location and of minimum height 2.5 metres above ground level except where an alternative is approved in writing by the National Park Authority.
7. There shall be no external lighting installed on the extension or the patio area except in accordance with a scheme which shall have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the National Park Authority.

## **Key Issues**

- Principle of development;
- Design and landscape impact;
- Ecology;
- Amenity.

## **History**

11. 2017 - Change of use of The Lodge from C3 to C2 (care home for adults) and retention of access to serve the Lodge (NP/S/1216/1235) – Granted conditionally
12. 2018 - Extension to existing care home (NP/S/1217/1246) – Granted conditionally
13. 2018 - Single storey and two storey extension to existing care home and polytunnels and storage shed (NP/S/0518/0432) – Granted conditionally
14. 2021 - Two storey detached residential units to existing care home (NP/S/1019/1109) – Refused but subsequently allowed at appeal
15. 2023 - Extension of an existing C2 residential unit to create respite care (C2), including a new associated outdoor swimming pool and tennis court (NP/S/1123/1374). Application was withdrawn following officer concerns.

## **Consultations**

16. PDNPA Tree Officer: *This application does not propose tree removals, and there is no tree survey documentation provided. However, while the applicant may not be intending to remove trees, there are many ways in which development and associated building site activities can harm trees and thereby cause their loss.*

*Damage to trees' rooting areas is often overlooked but is a frequent cause of unintended tree loss. I am comfortable that with the appropriate measures it is possible to implement the proposal without harming the trees' roots or rooting areas, so we do not require anything more prior to the planning decision.*

*If planning permission is granted, we will require an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) with Tree Protection Plan (TPP) – considering all relevant aspects and prepared following the guidance in BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction.*

*I note that the submitted landscape/planting proposal will require updating to current proposal, and assume that if planning permission is granted, the proposed tree planting will be covered within landscape condition(s).*

17. PDNPA Landscape Officer: *The revised proposal to extend an existing C2 living unit with associated paved area and parking area is much more modest than the previous submission, the proposals are supported by the accompanying Landscape Framework shown on Landscape Strategy Plan Revision B which is in keeping with the area and will provide screening for the development by year 15 as summarised in the LVA.*

*The proposed hedgerow to the west of the access track will provide separation from adjacent agricultural land and will help to soften the existing access track when viewed from the south and south west e.g. VCP3 taken from Headstone within CROW land, SCP5 taken from SHE 55#1 and from the A57 when travelling east. The proposed tree and shrub planting along with the hedge is appropriate for the area and well located to screen the extension but also the existing built form, along with any additional domestic paraphernalia introduced to the enclosed paved area in time.*

*I agree with the findings of the LVA and do not have any objections to the revised scheme and the landscape scheme submitted.*

18. PDNPA Ecology: Requested site of the revised biodiversity metric and habitat condition sheets.

However, provisionally; subject to reviewing the BNG metric which needs to be submitted, I agree; the proposals are not likely to constitute a 'significant' uplift relative to the biodiversity value before development. The proposed habitats are generally native which is welcomed. The landscape strategy plan which outlines management of the proposed habitats should be conditioned.

19. Highway Authority: No response received to date.

20. City Council: No response received to date.

21. Parish Council: No response to date

### **Representations**

22. Nine letters of objection have been received. The following reasons are given in the representations:

- The proposed development does not contribute towards the statutory purposes of the National Park;
- Creating the appearance of a housing estate in the open countryside;
- The anticipated timeframe for successful screening is unacceptable;
- The site has been heavily expanded over several years and approval of this application would compound the over-developed site;
- The site is a source of environmental pollution from inappropriately lighting and vehicular movements;
- The site impacts neighbouring amenity;
- The use of the site has resulted in a loss of local wildlife, including birds, small mammals and toads;
- Detrimental impact to the landscape from growth of the site over time;
- The development does not offer benefits to the local community;
- Inconsistencies and inaccuracies in the application, including the method of disposal for foul water, selective photographs within the LVIA, and status of biodiversity enhancements.

### **Main Policies**

23. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L1, L2, CC2

24. Relevant Development Management policies: DMC1, DMC3, DMC11, DMC13, DMC14

### **National Planning Policy Framework**

25. The NPPF (revised December 2024) is a material consideration which carries particular weight where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date.
26. The development plan for the National Park comprises the Core Strategy 2011 and Development Management Policies 2019. Policies in the development plan provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for determining this application. In this case there is not considered to be any significant conflict between prevailing policies in the development plan and the NPPF.

27. Paragraph 189 states 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 matters. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and heritage are also important considerations and should be given great weight.

#### Peak District National Park Core Strategy

28. GSP1, GSP2 – Set out the broad strategy for achieving the National Park's objectives, and seek to secure national park legal purposes and duties through the conversion and enhancement of the National Park's landscape and its wildlife and heritage.
29. GSP2 – Proposals intended to enhance the National Park will need to demonstrate they offer significant overall benefit to natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage.
30. GSP3 – All development must respect, conserve and enhance all valued characteristics of the site and buildings, paying particular attention to impact on the character and setting of buildings, scale of the development appropriate to the character and appearance of the National Park, materials, design in accordance with the National Park Authority Design Guide and adapting to and mitigating the impacts of climate change.
31. DS1 – Sets out the Development Strategy for the National Park. Residential extensions are acceptable in principle.
32. L1 – Development must conserve and enhance valued landscape character, as identified in the Landscape Strategy and Action Plan and other valued characteristics, and other than in exceptional circumstances.
33. 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.
34. CC1 – All development must make the most efficient use of land and buildings and take account of the energy hierarchy by reducing the need for energy, using energy more efficiently, supplying energy efficiently and using low carbon and renewable energy. Development should be directed away from areas of flood risk.

#### Development Management Policies

35. DMC1 – In countryside beyond the edge of settlements listed in Core Strategy policy DS1, any development proposal with a wide scale landscape impact must provide a landscape assessment with reference to the Landscape Strategy and Action Plan. The assessment must be proportionate to the proposed development and clearly demonstrate how valued landscape character, including natural beauty, biodiversity, cultural heritage features and other valued characteristics will be conserved and, where possible, enhanced.
36. DMC3 – Design is required to be of a high standard which where possible enhances the natural beauty, quality and visual amenity of the landscape, including cultural heritage that contributes to the distinctive sense of place. Design and materials should be appropriate to the context.
37. DMC11 – States that development should aim to achieve net gains to biodiversity as a result of development. All reasonable measures must be taken to avoid net loss. DMC11 B. says that details of appropriate safeguards and enhancement measures for nature conservation interests that could be affected by the development must be provided.

38. DMC13 – Planning applications should provide sufficient information to enable impact on trees and woodland to be properly considered. Trees and hedgerows that positively contribute to the visual amenity or biodiversity of the area will be protected and loss of these features will not be permitted.
39. DMC14 – States that development that presents a risk of pollution or disturbance will not be permitted unless adequate control measures are put in place to bring the pollution within acceptable limits.

## **Assessment**

### **Principle of Development**

40. The Lodge is a former dwelling and annex (Use Class C3) which has been converted to a care home (Use Class C2) and thereafter substantially extended.
41. This application proposes an extension to one of the existing detached care home buildings. There is no specific policy for the extension of a care-home; however, the Authority's development plan does allow for extensions to existing buildings in principle. In particular, Policies E2 and DME7 together say that the expansion of existing businesses will be carefully considered in terms of landscape impact and should be a modest scale in relation to existing activity and/or buildings.
42. Therefore, it is considered that relevant policies do offer support in principle for an extension to the existing care home provided that the design, scale and landscape impact was acceptable and that the development was acceptable in all other respects.

### **Design and landscape impact**

43. Policy DMC3 advises where development is acceptable in principle, it will be permitted provided that its detailed treatment is of a high standard that respects, protects and where possible enhances the natural beauty, quality and visual amenity of the landscape, including the wildlife and cultural heritage that contribute to the distinctive sense of place.
44. The most significant element of this application relates to the proposed extension to the most westerly building on site. This building is 1.5-storeys and constructed from natural stone set under a Hardrow concrete tiled roof. It features UPVC windows and aluminium bi-fold doors and is oriented with its ridge running north-south with its south gable end looking down the access drive to the main site entrance.
45. The existing building has a length of approximately 15.6m. The proposed extension would extend from the west of the building by 11m. The ridge and eaves of the extension would be set below that of the host building. Officers acknowledge that it would be a sizeable extension to the existing building; however, on balance, the reduction in eaves and ridge height helps the extension appear as subservient to the main building despite its length.
46. The proposed extension would be constructed from matching materials. It would feature a 3-panelled bifold door with a 2-light window above on its western facing gable elevation which is reflective of the design for the host dwelling. While this would increase the potential for increased light-pollution on the local landscape, this would be mitigated by the additional screening on the western boundary of the site and would have limited visibility from publicly accessible vantage points. The detailing of the extension matches that of the host in terms of size and number of openings.

47. The proposed extension would therefore be interpreted as a relatively large, albeit subservient, element to the host building. The scale, mass, form, materials and detailing are reflective of the host. Therefore, the proposed development is in compliance with design policy DMC3.
48. As noted, the Lodge is in the open countryside in the enclosed gritstone upland landscape character type of the Dark Peak. This landscape type is characterised by rolling uplands, localised pockets of peat with bracken and gorse, small remnant woodlands and scattered trees along cloughs and field boundaries and regular pattern of medium to large fields.
49. With regard to the built-form of the area, the local landscape is characterised by intermittent and dispersed development on the north side of the A57. Despite its open countryside location, the built-form of the site is fairly well related to the neighbouring Hollow Meadows Mews (of which the original building was formerly associated with). The fields immediately surrounding The Lodge and Hollow Meadow Mews appear to be improved grassland pasture arranged in larger, semi-regular field parcels separated by drystone walls and boundary trees.
50. Historically, the built-form of the site was restricted to the eastern half of field-parcel, with a mature hedgerow bisecting the residential property's garden from the adjacent land which was agricultural in character. The division of the site has been eroded overtime since the original change of use application was granted despite several planning conditions from previous planning applications requiring the reinstatement of the boundary hedge. At present, the site remains open with the western half of the site appearing as leisure/amenity space for the residential facility.
51. Subject to appropriation screening and appropriate rooflight models (heritage-conservation models fitted flush in the roofslope), the proposed extension would have a very limited impact on the landscape. It would increase the degree of built-form to the west of the site, but as discussed above the proposed scale and design of the building would appear as a subservient element to the host building. Therefore, it would not intensify the degree of built-form on site to an unacceptable amount.
52. Similarly, the extension would also increase the degree of light pollution on site by a small degree; however, the proposed landscaping would mitigate much of the light spillage from the extension.
53. The proposed patio area and walling surrounding the extension would extend further to the west. Officers are conscious that the built-form of the care facility should be located to the east of the site; however, this small degree of expansion to the west of the site would be largely imperceptible from the local landscape. Furthermore, the proposed landscaping scheme, which includes a hedgerow separating the built-form on the east to the open area to the west, in addition to planting directly in front of the patio, would screen this element in the wider landscape and reinforce a firm boundary between the two halves of the site. It is noted that the submitted landscaping scheme proposes the hedgerow end stopping short of the top of the field. Officers consider it important that the hedgerow connect to the north of the site to retain proper differentiation between the amenity land associated with the care home and the open agricultural land to the west. It is therefore suggested that a planning condition be applied to any approval requiring strict approval with the landscaping scheme with an amendment stipulating that the mixed hedgerow runs the whole height of the site and connects to the vegetation on the north of the site.
54. The PDNPA Landscape Officer has assessed the proposed development and reviewed the findings of the Landscape Visual Assessment (LVA). They concur with the findings of the LVA and consider that the proposed hedging, tree and shrub planting is appropriate for the area – the proposed species mix is expansive and includes field maple, hornbeam,

Scots pine, and field oak for the trees, and the hedge would be predominantly Hawthorn with a relatively large proportion of black-thorn and common hazel amongst other fruiting and flowering species.

55. Therefore, subject to the specified modifications to the landscaping scheme, the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on the landscape and it would not harm or impact the valued characteristics of the landscape type. The proposed development, as mitigated by the landscaping scheme, would conserve the valued landscape character. It is therefore in compliance with policies DMC1 and L1.
56. It should be acknowledged that there is an outstanding enforcement enquiry open at the Lodge regarding the failure to submit and carry out a detailed scheme for landscaping (in addition to other boundary and ground treatments) as required by appeal decision APP/M9496/W/20/3257551. Furthermore, the site operators have failed to plant a hedgerow on the western side of the driveway as required applications NP/S/0518/0432 and NP/S/1019/1109. To ensure that the proposed development does not detrimentally impact the National Park's valued characteristics, Officers will need to monitor the site to ensure that the landscaping scheme with the amendment suggested above to extend the boundary hedgerow planting all the way to the top of the site is carried out in accordance with the submitted details.

### Ecology

57. The proposed development is required to provide the statutory 10% net-gain to onsite habitats.
58. A Biodiversity Net-Gain Report has been submitted with this application which has assessed the baseline habitat interest of the site. It concluded that full compliance with the submitted landscaping scheme would provide a net gain of 22.99% for area habitats and a net-gain of 62.64% for linear habitat units.
59. This would be far in excess of the 10% statutory gains. Accordingly, the proposed development would satisfy the legislative requirement in addition to policies L3 and DMC11.
60. This application does not propose the removal of any trees; however, there is the potential that the development may impact the rooting zones of adjacent trees. The Tree Conservation Officer has reviewed the application and is satisfied that with appropriate mitigation the proposed development is capable without harming the rooting zones.
61. Therefore, Officers recommend the inclusion of 2 arboricultural conditions to mitigate the impact of the development on trees. The first would require the submission of an Arboricultural Method Statement and a Tree Protection Plan for approval in writing prior to commencement of the development. The second condition would require the replacement of any of the proposed or retained trees with a similar specimen for a period of 5-years following occupation of the extension.
62. Subject to the above conditions, the proposed development would not harm the onsite trees and would therefore be in compliance with policy DMC13.

### Impact upon residential amenity

63. The proposed extension would house one additional bedroom. The Planning Statement advises that the extension would enable a form of respite care where an individual from the wider care group could be taken for a holiday-like experience.



64. As the overall scale of accommodation provided by the proposed extension would be minimal (one-bedroom and a lounge), it is not anticipated that the proposed development would contribute to a significant increase in vehicular traffic visiting the site. This application also proposes to regularise 3-car parking bays. This is considered acceptable, particularly when considering that appeal decision APP/M9496/W/20/3257551 permitted an additional 9 bedrooms for 6 residents without an increase in parking provision for residents, carers and visitors.
65. The proposed development would be situated in the north of the site with the additional outdoor patio further to the west. The nearest third-party neighbour would be some 100m to the south-east and screened by existing buildings and boundary planting. Therefore, the proposed development would not create an unacceptable level of noise, nor amount to a loss of privacy. The proposed development is therefore acceptable on residential amenity grounds.

### **Conclusion**

66. This application proposes an extension to an existing building at the care facility The Lodge at Hollow Meadows.
67. The proposed extension would match the materials and detailing of the host dwelling and would be subservient to the host building. It is therefore acceptable on design grounds. Subject to appropriate mitigation and strict compliance with the submitted landscaping scheme, the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the landscape.
68. The proposed development would 22.9% net-gains to onsite area habitat and 62.4% of linear habitat. This would be far in excess of the statutory 10%. Subject to conditions, the proposed development would not have a harmful impact on the tree rooting zones.
69. The proposed development is acceptable with regard to residential amenity and highway safety.
70. Therefore, this application is in compliance with the development plan and 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 and Job Title**

Will Eyre – Principal Planner – North Area.