

**7. FULL APPLICATION – CONVERSION AND ALTERATION OF FORMER AGRICULTURAL BUILDING TO FORM 1 NO. DWELLINGHOUSE AND ASSOCIATED WORKS AT SITTERLOW FARM, PARWICH (NP/DDD/0625/0619 - PM)**

**APPLICANT: S AMOS**

**Summary**

1. Planning permission is sought for the conversion and alteration of a former agricultural building to form 1 No. dwelling house and associated works.
2. The building is located approximately 1 km south of the village of Parwich in open countryside.
3. A stone barn at the site dating from the early 19<sup>th</sup> century was substantially intact until approximately 2005. By 2009 the roof and most of the east wall had collapsed. Due to the extent of the rebuilding which has taken place, and its variance from the barn which stood prior to circa 2005, the current barn is considered to be a new building and as such has limited heritage significance.
4. The application is therefore recommended for refusal as the building does not have sufficient heritage significance to justify the creation of open market housing in this location. Additional recommended reasons for refusal relate to design, landscape impact and flood risk.

**Site and Surroundings**

5. Sitterlow Farm is located approximately 1km south from the village of Parwich, in open countryside.
6. The application relates to an agricultural barn that is removed from the main building group. The barn is located approximately 20 metres from the vehicular access track leading to the farm building group. The barn is located approximately 350 metres to the north east of the farm building group and approximately 120 metres to the south west of the public highway running from the B5056 to Parwich village.
7. A stone barn at the site dating from the early 19<sup>th</sup> century was substantially intact until approximately 2005. By 2009 the roof and most of the east wall had collapsed. The submitted heritage assessment states that “*The roof was replaced c.2015, the east wall partly rebuilt, and the other walls repaired.*” However, based on site photos, google street view imagery and aerial photography it is concluded that the rebuilding took place at some point between August 2019 and April 2021.
8. The rebuilding comprised a new east wall and substantial rebuilding to both gable ends. A profile metal sheet roof was installed. The rebuilt stone walls do not match the surviving original stone walls in terms of stone size and coursing. Additionally, an elliptical arch has been introduced into the southern end gable. The existing / proposed elevation plans do not show this significance difference finish between the original and rebuilt walls. Additionally, the heritage statement acknowledges that the eastern wall was rebuilt with an open central section at variance with the situation prior to collapse. Any former internal walls are no longer present.
9. The extent of rebuilding undertaken between August 2019 and April 2021 was development requiring planning permission. No planning permission was sought for the

works at the time although the rebuilding is now likely immune from enforcement action, it being more than 4 years since those operations took place.

10. The application site is not within a conservation area and there are no listed buildings in close proximity to the application site. The historic building group at Sitterlow Farm is recorded on the Derbyshire Historic Environment Record (HER) as a 'partially extant 19<sup>th</sup> century farmstead'. However, the barn subject to this application is located approximately 350 metres away from the main farm building group containing the historic farm buildings. The recording on the Derbyshire HER is therefore not considered to extend to include the application building.
11. Due to the extent of the rebuilding which has taken place, combined with the loss of the original roof, and the variance from the original in terms of apertures and stonework size and coursing it is considered that the stone barn currently standing is tantamount to a new build barn. As such the present structure is not considered to be of vernacular merit and is not considered to be a non-designated heritage asset with heritage significance.
12. The Authority's Landscape Strategy (2021) identifies the landscape immediately adjacent to the application site as falling within the defined Riverside meadows Landscape character type (LCT) within the wider Derbyshire peak fringe Landscape character zone. The Riverside meadows LCT can be characterised as a relatively flat landscape with a regular pattern of small to medium sized fields divided by hedges with dense waterside and scattered hedgerow trees. Surrounding higher land falling within the defined Village farmlands on shale ridges LCT is visible from the application site, particularly dominant when looking west.
13. A public footpath runs on a north to south axis through the nearby landscape passing approximately 200 metres to the west of the application site. Another public footpath runs from the public highway in a north westerly direction towards Parwich village and passes the application site approximately 130 metres to the north east.
14. The barn itself and surrounding curtilage is located within flood zone 1 (land with lowest probability of flooding). However, part of the access track between the barn and the public highway fall within flood zone 2 and flood zone 3 (land with highest probability of flooding)

### **Proposal**

15. Planning permission is sought for the conversion and alteration of a former agricultural building to form a market dwelling.
16. The proposed alterations to the building comprise the insertion of windows and doors into existing openings, the re-opening of previously blocked up openings in the western elevation and the insertion of 3 No. rooflights into both the eastern and western facing roof slopes to serve the first floor accommodation.
17. A new Staffordshire blue tiled roof is proposed as a replacement for the existing metal sheet roof.
18. It is proposed to provide outdoor amenity space to the east of the building within the historic field stock yard with the existing stone boundary wall around the perimeter of this being repaired and rebuilt.
19. Existing hardstanding to the south of the barn is to be retained to provide 2 No. car parking spaces to serve the proposed dwelling.

20. Amended plans have been received which has seen a reduction in the extent of the proposed external amenity space (so that it is fully within the perimeter of the historic field stock yard) and the proposed removal of the area of hardstanding to the south east of the building.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

1. **The proposed conversion to a market dwelling is not considered to be acceptable in principle and is contrary to Core Strategy policy HC1 and Development Management policy DMC10. The building has recently been substantially re-built and is significantly different to the barn which stood prior to 2005. The existing building therefore is not considered to be a heritage asset. Furthermore, due to the condition of the building there is not a requirement for conversion to a market dwelling to secure its conservation or enhancement.**
2. **The proposed character and appearance of the building as converted would not conserve or enhance the agricultural character of the building and as such would be contrary to Development Management policies DMC3 and DMC10 and the Authority's SPDs relating to Design and the Conversion of Traditional Buildings.**
3. **The proposal would harm to the established landscape character of the area and as such would be contrary to Core Strategy policy L1 and Development Management policies DMC3 and DMC10.**
4. **A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has not been submitted with the application. As such it has not been possible to determine the risk of flooding to the development and the impact this may have on flood risk elsewhere. An FRA is also required to set out measures to reduce and manage the risk of flooding. Therefore, the submitted proposal is contrary to Core Strategy policy CC5, Development Management policy DMC3 and paragraph 181 of the NPPF.**

### **Key Issues**

- Principle of conversion to a market dwelling.
- The impact upon the character and appearance of the building
- The impact upon landscape character
- Flood Risk
- The impact upon residential amenities
- The impact upon highway safety
- Ecology considerations
- Climate Change Mitigation

### **History**

21. There is no relevant planning history.

### **Consultations**

22. Derbyshire County Council (Highways) - No objection.

23. Parwich Parish Council – *The Council supports this application noting in particular,*  
*1. The quality of the application documents. 2. The sympathetic treatment of the building's historic fabric. 3. The benefit of finding an economic use for historic buildings that might otherwise fall into decay.*

- 24. Natural England – No response received.
- 25. PDNPA Ecology – No objection subject to conditions relating to pre works checks for bird nests during the bird breeding season and for a scheme of ecological enhancement.
- 26. Derbyshire Dales District Council (Planning) – No response received.

### **Representations**

- 27. No representations have been received.

### **Main Policies**

- 28. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, L1, L2, L3, HC1, CC1
- 29. Relevant Development Management policies: DMC3, DMC5, DMC10, DMC11, DMC12, DMT3

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

- 30. In the National Park the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and Development Management Policies (adopted May 2019) in the Development Plan provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. It is considered that in this case there is no significant conflict between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and the NPPF.
- 31. Paragraph 189 of the NPPF states that 'great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads.
- 32. With regard to flood risk, paragraph 181 of the NPPF advises that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Where appropriate, applications should be supported by a site specific flood-risk assessment.

### **Core Strategy**

- 33. 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 conservation and enhancement of the National Park's landscape and its natural and heritage assets.
- 34. GSP3 sets out development management principles and states that all development must respect, conserve and enhance all valued characteristics of the site and buildings, paying particular attention to, amongst other elements, impact on the character and setting of buildings, scale of the development appropriate to the character and appearance of the National Park, design in accordance with the National Park Authority Design Guide and impact on living conditions of communities.

- 35. DS1 - Development Strategy. Sets out the forms of development that are acceptable in principle in all settlements and in the countryside outside of the Natural Zone.
- 36. L1 identifies that development must conserve and enhance valued landscape character and valued characteristics, and other than in exceptional circumstances, proposals in the Natural Zone will not be permitted.
- 37. L2 – Development must conserve and enhance sites, features or species of biodiversity importance and their setting and development likely to have an adverse impact on any of the above, that have statutory designation or are of international or national importance for their biodiversity, will not be permitted other than in exceptional circumstances.
- 38. L3 requires that development must conserve and where appropriate enhance or reveal significance of archaeological, artistic or historic asset and their setting, including statutory designation and other heritage assets of international, national, regional or local importance or special interest.
- 39. HC1 – New Housing – Sets out the situations where, exceptionally, new housing (whether newly built or from re-use of an existing building) can be accepted.
- 40. CC1 states that development must make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources. Development must also achieve the highest possible standards of carbon reductions.
- 41. CC5 – Development which would unacceptably increase flood risk will generally not be permitted.

#### **Development Management Policies**

- 42. DMC3 - requires development to be 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. It also provides further detailed criteria to assess design and landscaping, as well as requiring development to conserve the amenity of other properties.
- 43. DMC5 - Assesses the impact of development on designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings.
- 44. DMC10 –addresses conversion of heritage assets, permitting this where the new use would conserve its character and significance, and where the new use and associated infrastructure conserve the asset, its setting, and valued landscape character. It also notes that new uses or curtilages should not be visually intrusive in the landscape or have an adverse impact on tranquillity, dark skies, or other valued characteristics.
- 45. DMC11 Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests. Proposals should aim to achieve net gains to biodiversity or geodiversity as a result of development. Details of appropriate safeguards and enhancement measures for a site, feature or species of nature conservation importance must be provided in line with the Biodiversity Action Plan. For all sites, features and species development proposals must consider amongst other things, the setting of the development in relation to other features of importance, historical and cultural.
- 46. DMC12 – Sites, features or species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance. Development will only be permitted where significant harm can be avoided and the conservation status of the population of the species or habitat concerned is

maintained.

47. DMT3 - a safe vehicular access should be provided in a way that does not detract from the character and appearance of the locality and where possible enhances it.

### **Supplementary Planning Documents**

48. Peak District National Park Authority Design Guide (2007): The Design Guide states that, when considering a conversion, the building in question should be of sufficient historic or architectural merit to warrant its conversion. Factors such as location, size and character of the building and its means of access will all be assessed. The guiding principle behind the design of any conversion should be that the character of the original building and its setting should be respected and retained.
49. Peak District National Park Conversion of Traditional Buildings SPD (2022): The SPD provides detailed guidance on the principles to be considered when proposing the conversion of traditional buildings. This is set out as 6 key principles: 1. Understanding the building and its setting 2. Working with the existing form and character 3. Following a conservation approach 4. Creating responsive new design 5. Using appropriate materials and detailing. 6. Conserving and enhancing the setting.

### **Assessment**

#### **Principle of conversion to a market dwelling**

50. Core Strategy policy HC1 part C in accordance with core strategy policies GSP1 and GSP2 allows for the creation of open market housing if it is required in order to achieve conservation and/or enhancement of valued vernacular or listed buildings.
51. Para 12.18 of the Core Strategy provides context on policy HC1 part C:  
*“Occasionally, new housing (whether newly built or from re-use of an existing building) may be the best way to achieve conservation and enhancement (for example of a valued building) or the treatment of a despoiled site. Sometimes this requires the impetus provided by open market values, but wherever possible and financially viable such developments should add to the stock of affordable housing, either on the site itself or elsewhere in the National Park. It is accepted that for small schemes capable of providing only one dwelling (whether new-build or changing the use of a building such as a barn) this is unlikely to be viable.”*
52. In addition, where it is established that a scheme is for and can only accommodate one dwelling unit, there is no requirement within policy for that unit to be affordable or for applicants to discount other uses in order to justify an open market house. The submitted application proposes one open market residential unit.
53. The key judgment in determining whether the proposal is acceptable in principle is whether the building is a valued vernacular building of sufficient architectural merit or historic interest to allow for an open market residential unit on an exceptional basis as permitted by policy HC1 part C.
54. The barn was subject to extensive rebuilding circa 2020. The rebuilt stone walls do not match the surviving original stone walls in terms of stone size and coursing. Additionally, an elliptical arch has been introduced into the southern end gable, and the rebuilt eastern wall contains an open central section which was not present in the barn prior to collapse. Due to the extent of the rebuilding which has taken place, and the variance from the original in terms of apertures and stonework size and coursing it is considered that the stone barn currently standing is tantamount to a new build barn.

55. The re-building work has significantly harmed the significance of the former structure. The present structure is considered to have very limited historical significance and vernacular merit and is not considered to constitute a non-designated heritage asset.
56. A heritage statement addendum has been submitted to address the issue of the heritage significance of the building. This has been fully considered by officers but does not alter the judgement set out at paragraph 54 above. The key point is that the extent of the recent works undertaken goes far beyond what can be considered to be a repair.
57. Putting the status of the building to one side. The recent re-building works have left the building structurally sound. There is no clear impetus as to why the value created by a market dwelling is required to secure the conservation or enhancement of the building.
58. Therefore, the proposed conversion to a market dwelling is not considered to be acceptable in principle and is contrary to Core Strategy policy HC1 and Development Management policy DMC10. The building does not have sufficient heritage significance to justify the creation of open market housing.

#### Impact upon character and appearance of building

59. The proposed scheme would replace the metal roof with a Staffordshire blue tiled roof providing an enhancement in that regard and restoring the roof to the situation pre collapse in the late 2000s.
60. Whilst it is considered that the building has very limited heritage significance, it does retain an agricultural character within an open agricultural landscape. The proposed scheme would undermine this character by the use of the non-original openings to provide large areas of glazing (large opening in eastern elevation and elliptical arch in southern gable.) This would undermine the high solid to void ratio of the original barn and would be domestic in character undermining the agricultural character of the building. Additionally, six rooflights are proposed (3 on each roof slope).
61. Overall, the proposed character and appearance of the building as converted would not conserve or enhance the agricultural character of the building or its setting and as such would be contrary to Development Management policies DMC3 and DMC10 and the authority's SPDs relating to Design and the Conversion of Traditional Buildings.

#### Landscape impact

62. The existing building sits on its own within a relatively flat and open part of the landscape. The barn is clearly visible from the nearby public highway and from nearby public footpaths. Amended plans have seen the extent of proposed residential curtilage reduced with the proposed garden area to be contained within stone boundary walls forming part of the rebuilt field stock yard to the east of the building. Some existing hardstanding to the south east of the building is also to be removed.
63. The converted barn would have a large residential curtilage extending up to 13 metres from the side of the barn. The conversion to a dwelling would include the introduction of domestic elements into the landscape such as bin stores, cars, garden furniture, washing lines, lighting / security measures. These alterations to the site would result in significant domestication of the land which would be conspicuous in what is a generally open and uninhabited landscape. The possible removal of permitted development rights would not adequately restrict the domestication of the site as many changes can occur outside of planning control.

64. The proposal would cause significant harm to the established landscape character of the area and as such would be contrary to Core Strategy policy L1 and Development Management policies DMC3 and DMC10.

#### Flood risk

65. The barn itself and surrounding curtilage is located within flood zone 1 (land with lowest probability of flooding). However, part of the access track between the barn and the public highway fall within flood zone 2 and flood zone 3 (land with highest probability of flooding). As such an FRA (Flood Risk Assessment) is required.
66. An FRA has not been submitted with the application. As such it has not been possible to determine the risk of flooding to the development and the impact this may have on flood risk elsewhere. An FRA is also required to set out measures to reduce and manage the risk of flooding. Therefore, the submitted proposal is contrary to Core Strategy policy CC5, Development Management policy DMC3 and paragraph 181 of the NPPF.
67. As the recommendation is to refuse planning permission (for other reasons in addition to flood risk), it was considered unreasonable to require submission of an FRA at this stage. However, if Members resolve to grant planning permission for the development this should be subject to submission of an adequate FRA and consultation with the Environment Agency before planning permission can be issued.

#### The Impact upon Residential Amenities

68. Due to its isolated location away from neighbouring occupiers, the proposal would not result in harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers and would ensure an appropriate level of amenity for future occupiers.

#### The Impact upon Highway Safety

69. The proposed conversion would utilise the existing vehicular access to the farm building group from the public highway. The extra use of the existing farm access as a result of a dwelling is not considered to materially increase vehicle movements to / from the public highway. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with policy DMT3. Derbyshire County Council as highway authority has no objection to the proposal.

#### Ecological Considerations

70. A Bat and Bird Survey report has been submitted in support of the application. During three activity surveys, one common pipistrelle was observed foraging around the barn and heading north along the hedgerow however, no bats emerged or re-entered the barn during any of the four activity surveys. It was concluded that the barn does not contain bat roosts but the long grass surrounding the barn provides a minimal section of a common pipistrelle bat foraging flight path. There was no evidence of current or historical nesting birds at the site.
71. The authority's ecologist has no objection to the proposal subject to conditions requiring submission of an Ecological Enhancement Plan and pre works check for breeding birds in the bird breeding season.
72. The proposal is exempt from statutory Biodiversity Net Gain, with the majority of the site currently being hardstanding.

### Climate Change Mitigation

73. The proposal is of a scale where it is considered that provision of renewable energy generation would be expected to serve the dwelling, e.g. air or ground source heat pump, or ground mounted solar. The submitted planning statement sets out a number of energy saving and climate change mitigation measures but does not extend to provision of renewable energy generation. Were the development acceptable in other respects then provision of renewable energy generation equipment could be secured by condition.

### Conclusion

74. The proposed conversion to a market dwelling is not considered to be acceptable in principle and is contrary to Core Strategy policy HC1 and Development Management policy DMC10. The building does not have sufficient heritage significance to justify the creation of open market housing. Due to the extent of the rebuilding which has taken place, and its variance from the barn which stood prior to circa 2005, the current barn is considered to be a new building.
75. The proposed character and appearance of the building as converted would not conserve or enhance the agricultural character of the building and as such would be contrary to Development Management policies DMC3 and DMC10 and the authority's SPDs relating to Design and the Conversion of Traditional Buildings.
76. The proposal would cause significant harm to the established landscape character of the area and as such would be contrary to Core Strategy policy L1 and Development Management policies DMC3 and DMC10.
77. A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has not been submitted with the application. As such it has not been possible to determine the risk of flooding to the development and the impact this may have on flood risk elsewhere. An FRA is also required to set out measures to reduce and manage the risk of flooding. Therefore, the submitted proposal is contrary to Core Strategy policy CC5, Development Management policy DMC3 and paragraph 181 of the NPPF.
78. The proposal would result in some enhancement to the building and its setting by replacement of the metal roof, removal of hardstanding and restoration of the historic field stock yard. Additionally, the development would provide some ecological enhancement. However, these public benefits are outweighed by the significant harms resulting from the proposal.
79. It is therefore recommended that planning permission be refused.

### 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: Peter Mansbridge - Planner - South Area.