

**12. FULL APPLICATION – PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF EXISTING COMMERCIAL BUILDING AND PROPOSED NEW 2-STOREY DOMESTIC 2-BEDROOM DWELLING AND ASSOCIATED LIMITED LANDSCAPING at POST OFFICE, MAIN ROAD EYAM (NP/DDD/0625/0591) WE**

**APPLICANT:** Mr Jason White

**Summary**

1. This application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the Post Office building and the erection of a 2-bedroom dwelling.
2. The application has been supported by a viability and marketing exercise which has successfully demonstrated that the building is not viable for an alternative community use or affordable housing, with evidence of reasonable attempts to market the building for an alternative commercial use which has proven unsuccessful.
3. The proposed development would facilitate the removal of a poor-quality single-storey building in the centre of the Eyam Post Office and the erection of a traditionally designed two-bedroom dwelling.
4. The proposed dwelling would facilitate the removal of a poor-quality building which detracts from the Eyam Conservation Area, providing a replacement which reflects and complements the prevailing form and vernacular of the street-scene.
5. It is therefore in compliance with the development plan when read as a whole. There are no material planning considerations which indicate that the application should be determined otherwise than in accordance with the plan.
6. This application is therefore recommended for conditional approval.

**Site and Surroundings**

7. The development site is the Post Office building located on Main Road in the centre of Eyam.
8. It is a single storey building dating from the 1970s. It is constructed from reconstituted stone set under pitched concrete roof. The property features a large horizontal window with a pedestrian door. There is a rear projecting gable extending from the eastern elevation. The property features a shallow ramp and railing leading to the pedestrian door.
9. The site is in the Eyam Conservation Area. The neighbour to the north, Laburnum Cottage is a grade II listed building. Two properties to the south of the site are Hall Farmhouse, a grade II listed building. The area is predominantly residential.
10. The building was last used as a Post Office until its closure on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2024.

**Proposal**

11. This application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the existing building and the erection of a two-bedroom dwellinghouse.

12. The proposed dwelling would occupy the same footprint as the existing building. The proposed dwelling comprises a principal elevation of 2 vertically emphasised windows (one on each floor) and a single pedestrian door. The dwelling would be faced in natural coursed stone with gritstone detailing including quoins, lintels, cills and surrounds. The roof would be clad in blue-slate, with metal rainwater goods affixed with metal brackets.
13. The application proposes a low stone wall to the front of the property and the planting of a hedgerow behind the wall. The area to the front of the property would be utilised as a small amenity area.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

1. **Statutory 3-year implementation period**
2. **The development shall not be carried out other than in strict accordance with amended plans subject to conditions and modifications.**
3. **Pre-commencement condition for Written Scheme of Investigation for a staged programme of archaeological evaluation and mitigation.**
4. **Agree and in accordance with a Construction Management Plan**
5. **There shall be no work to the boundary and retaining wall structures except in accordance with a specification and methodology, including details of construction and external material, which shall be first submitted to and approved in writing by the NPA**
6. **Sample panel of natural coursed gritstone (not limestone) to be agreed**
7. **Agree sample of blue-slate**
8. **Precise design, specification and design for windows and doors**
9. **Windows and doors shall be recessed no less than 100mm from the external face of the wall.**
10. **The north-facing kitchen window shall be non-opening and obscure glazed**
11. **The development shall not be brought into use until the air source heat pump is fully operational in accordance with a specification which shall be first agreed in writing by NPA**
12. **The development shall not be brought into use until the front boundary walling and instant hornbeam hedging has been installed in accordance with approved plans.**
13. **All pipework other than rainwater goods to be internal**
14. **All service lines associated with the development on land in applicant's ownership and control shall be underground**
15. **Remove PD rights for external alterations, porches, extensions, ancillary buildings, fences, solar or PV panels**

## **Key Issues**

- Principle of the development;
- Loss of a community facility;
- Impact on heritage assets
- Impact on residential amenity;
- Other matters;
- Planning balance.

## **History**

- 1973 - NP/BAR/873/16 – Erect post office building – Granted conditionally
- 1985 - NP/WED/1284/500 – Extension to post office – Granted conditionally
- 2024 – NP/DDD/1224/1358 – Change of use of post office to dwelling – Application withdrawn following unfavourable comments from planning officer

## **Consultations**

### 14. Highway Authority – No objection

*Paragraph 116 of the NPPF states Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.*

*Therefore, based on the analysis of the information submitted and a review of Local and National policy the Highway Authority concludes that there would not be an unacceptable impact on Highway Safety or a severe impact on congestion. There are no justifiable grounds on which an objection could be maintained.*

*Recommended two conditions.*

### 15. Eyam Parish Council – Objection.

*Members agreed to **object** to the application on the grounds that there is no provision for off-street parking.*

*Parking on Main Road and throughout Eyam is already a serious and significant problem. The development of a 2-bedroom dwelling will require parking for 2 additional vehicles on Main Road, which will only exacerbate existing parking concerns.*

*The development of any new dwelling in Eyam, therefore, should have provision for adequate off-street parking.*

### 16. PDNPA Archaeology – No objection.

*At this stage I can only conclude that harm to archaeological interest is possible.*

*The ground reduction and ground works required for the development, including but not limited to for foundations, services and landscaping would destroy any surviving archaeological remains within the footprint, resulting in permanent harm to the archaeological interest of the site. The scale of this harm is likely to be minor-moderate in scale.*

*If the existing foundations can be reused the impact could be designed out, or minimised with the use of raft foundations, but no such detail is included in the application.*

*The harm identified above should be taken into account as a balanced planning decision is reached. Should the planning balance be favourable, I recommend that a programme of archaeological work is secured by condition. This needs to comprise archaeological monitoring of the initial strip of the site to evaluate and assess the extent of previous ground impacts and potential for survival of archaeological remains below. Then subsequent programme of mitigation e.g. archaeological monitoring/excavation on further groundworks as required.*

*This needs to be undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced archaeological contractor, to the standards and guidance of the Chartered Institute of Archaeologists and a project design/written scheme of investigation that I have approved.*

17. Derbyshire Dales District Council – No response to date

**Representations**

18. 19 representations have been received by 15 separate individuals.

19. 11 representations, including the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England, objected to the proposed development for the following reasons:

- Proposed building is an intrusion on landscape;
- Negative impact on adjacent heritage assets;
- Submitted plans are inaccurate and do not show accurate representation between neighbouring properties;
- Negative impact on residential amenity, including outlook, privacy and daylight;
- Parking constraints on Main Road;
- Inaccurate land ownership of the site;
- Works include changes to boundary walls including one which is curtilage listed;
- An unsupported chimneystack without provision shown for a heating appliance on either floor plan;
- The development would not comply with building control
- The property never had a 'To Let' sign erected during its marketing;
- Impact upon the local community through the loss of the retail space;
- Concern that the proposal would become a second home or holiday-let which is not what Eyam needs;
- The proposal would result in a loss of a post box;
- Does not address a need for affordable housing;
- Site is not appropriate for a two-storey dwelling;
- The building's design is at odds with neighbouring properties;
- The building does not provide sufficient amenity space;
- Over-development of a small plot;
- Health and safety concerns with dwellings in close proximity to another;
- Impact upon health of neighbouring residents from loss of light;
- Impact a sole means of access for neighbouring property;
- Impact of the proposed development on the community and sustainability;
- Concerns raised by the CPRE over the viability information and requested that the National Park Authority appoints a chartered surveyor to review the information and assess whether it stands up to scrutiny.

20. 2 representations supported the application for the following reasons:

- Existing building is ugly 1970s and replacement and proposed design suits the village environment;

- Makes reference to Bamford NatWest building as an example of a former retail building which has since become a detracting influence in the village;
- The proposal would be enhancement to the townscape;
- Reduce traffic;
- Appropriate development for a brownfield site.

21. 2 representations made general comments and observations on the following matters:

- Questioned whether this would become another holiday home;
- Concern over the loss of a business premises;
- Lack of parking.

22. 1 representation expressed no objection but stated the following:

- Stated that new development should have off-road parking due to the large number of visitors to the village.

### **Main Policies**

Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, L3, CC1, CC2, HC1, HC4

Relevant Local Plan policies: DM1, DMC3, DMC5, DMC7, DMC8, DMH6, DMS2

### **National Planning Policy Framework**

23. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27 March 2012 and replaced a significant proportion of central government planning policy with immediate effect. It was last updated in December 2024. The Government's intention is that the document should be considered as a material consideration and carry particular weight where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date. In the National Park the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and those in the Development Management Plan adopted in May 2019. Policies in the Development Plan provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application.

24. Paragraph 184 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."

### **Core Strategy**

25. Policy GSP1 sets out the broad strategy for achieving the National Park's objectives having regard to the Sandford Principle, (that is, where there are conflicting desired outcomes in achieving national park purposes, greater priority must be given to the conservation of the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area, even at the cost of socio-economic benefits). GPS1 also sets out the need for sustainable development and to avoid major development unless it is essential, and the need to mitigate localised harm where essential major development is allowed.

26. Policy GSP2: Enhancing the National Park states that:

- Opportunities for enhancing the valued characteristics of the National Park will be identified and acted upon
- Proposals intended to enhance the National Park will need to demonstrate that they offer significant overall benefit to the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area.
- When development is permitted, a design will be sought that respects the character of the area.
- Opportunities will be taken to enhance the National Park by the treatment or removal of undesirable features or buildings. Work must be undertaken in a manner which conserves the valued characteristics of the site and its surroundings
- Development in settlements necessary for the treatment, removal or relocation of nonconforming uses to an acceptable site, or which would enhance the valued characteristics of the National Park will be permitted.

27. Policy 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.

28. Policy DS1 sets out the Development Strategy for the National Park. DS1.C. sets out the forms of development that are acceptable in principle in the countryside outside of the Natural Zone. There is no scope for the erection of new housing here other than as part of development needed to secure effective conservation and enhancement.

29. Policy L3 'Cultural heritage assets of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic significance' states that: A. Development must conserve and where appropriate enhance or reveal the significance of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic assets and their settings, including statutory designations and other heritage assets of international, national, regional or local importance or special interest.

30. Policy CC1 states that development must make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources, taking into account the energy hierarchy and achieving the highest possible standards of carbon reductions and water efficiency. Part C also states that development must be directed away from flood risk areas, and seek to reduce overall risk from flooding within the National Park and areas outside it, upstream and downstream.

31. Policy CC2 states proposals for low carbon and renewable energy development will be encouraged provided they can be accommodated without adversely affecting landscape character, cultural heritage assets, other valued characteristics, or other established uses of the area.

32. 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.

33. Policy CC4 states proposals to change the use of buildings or sites which provide community services and facilities including shops and financial and professional services to non-community uses must demonstrate that the service or facility is:
- i) no longer needed; or
  - ii) available elsewhere in the settlement; or
  - iii) can no longer be viable.

Wherever possible, the new use must either meet another community need or offer alternative community benefit such as social housing. Evidence of reasonable attempts to secure such a use must be provided before any other use is permitted.

#### Development Management Policies Plan

34. Policy DMC1 states that 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.
35. Policy DMC3 says 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.
36. Policy DMC5 states detailed advice relating to proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings, requiring new development to demonstrate how valued features will be conserved, as well as detailing the types and levels of information required to support such proposals.
37. Policy DMC7 Listed buildings states advising that applications for such development should be determined in accordance with policy DMC5. And should clearly demonstrate how these will be preserved and where possible enhanced and why the proposed works are desirable or necessary. Development will not be permitted if it would adversely affect the character, scale, proportion, design, detailing of or materials used in the listed building or would result in the loss of or irreversible change to original features.
38. Policy DMC8 requires that applications for development in a Conservation Area, or for development that affects its setting or important views into, out of, across or through the area, should assess and clearly demonstrate how the character or appearance and significance of the Conservation Area will be preserved or enhanced.

39. Policy DMS2 states that where an applicant is seeking change of use from a shop or a community service/facility to a non-community use, evidence of reasonable attempts to sell or let the shop or community service/facility as a going concern must be provided including:
- i) evidence of a thorough viability assessment and a marketing exercise with a commercial property agent, sustained over at least 12 months, to sell or let the building for alternative community uses or facilities including local needs affordable housing; and
  - ii) evidence of marketing of the property through the Economic Development Team of the appropriate local authority for at least 12 months; and
  - iii) details of contact made with the Town Council, Parish Council or Meeting and other adjacent Parishes to establish the needs existing in the local area and an assessment of the local affordable housing needs in the Parish or adjoining Parishes with reference to an up-to-date Housing Needs Survey prepared by or in consultation with the district authority as Housing Authority.
40. Policy DMH6 states 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 the development**

41. There are two matters to determine in considering the principle of the development. Firstly, whether the loss of the community asset is acceptable, and secondly whether the erection of an open market dwelling is acceptable in its place.
42. The most recent use of the site was a Post Office. Whilst it shut in February 2024, it is nevertheless considered to be a community facility wherein there is a presumption to retain such uses. Policy HC4 outlines that the loss of community facilities, such as a post office, into an alternative use is acceptable subject to several criteria, including the application demonstrating that the existing facility is no longer needed, is available elsewhere in the settlement or is no longer viable.
43. Policy DMS2 sets out further requirements for the change of use of community facilities. The following section of this report will examine whether this application has been supported by sufficient information to demonstrate compliance with policies HC4 and DMS2.
44. Moving onto the principal of the proposed dwellinghouse in its place, policy HC1 states that provision will not be made for housing solely to meet open market demand. It states that exceptionally, new housing (whether newly built or from re-use of an existing building) can be accepted where it addresses an eligible local need for homes that remain affordable with occupation restricted to local people in perpetuity or it is for aged persons' assisted accommodation. It also advises that new housing can be accepted where it provides for key workers in agricultural, forestry or other rural enterprises.
45. Furthermore, the policy states that new housing can be accepted where, in accordance with policies GSP1 and GSP2, it is required in order to achieve conservation and/or



enhancement of a valued vernacular or listed building, or it is required in order to achieve conservation or enhancement in settlements listed in core policy DS1.

46. This application is clear in stating that the application would be for an open market dwelling. Therefore, the only route for new housing would be conservation and/or enhancement of a valued vernacular/listed building or DS1 settlement.
47. The existing building was constructed in the early 1970s and features reconstituted stone, concrete rooftiles and features poor quality design details like soffits boards. It holds no architectural, historic or aesthetic merit. Whilst small in size, it does not positively contribute to the significance of the Eyam Conservation Area, nor the street-scene.
48. Therefore, the proposed development is acceptable in principle subject to justifying the loss of the community facility, in accordance with the provisions set out in policies HC4 and DMS2, in addition to demonstrating that the proposed dwelling would be required to conserve or enhance Eyam as required by policies HC1 and GSP2.

#### Loss of community facility

49. Policies HC4 states that proposals to change the use of buildings or sites which provide community services and facilities including shops and financial and professional services to non-community uses must demonstrate that the service or facility is: i) No longer needed; or ii) Available elsewhere in the settlement; or iii) Can no longer be viable. Wherever possible, the new use must either meet another community need or offer alternative community benefit such as social housing. Evidence of reasonable attempts to secure such a use must be provided before any other use is permitted.
50. Policy DMS2 outlines where an applicant is seeking change of use from a shop or a community service/facility to a non-community use, evidence of reasonable attempts to sell or let the shop or community service/facility as a going concern must be provided including:
  - evidence of a thorough viability assessment and a marketing exercise with a commercial property agent, sustained over at least 12 months, to sell or let the building for alternative community uses or facilities including local needs affordable housing; and
  - evidence of marketing of the property through the Economic Development Team of the appropriate local authority for at least 12 months; and
  - details of contact made with the Town Council, Parish Council or Meeting and other adjacent Parishes to establish the needs existing in the local area and an assessment of the local affordable housing needs in the Parish or adjoining Parishes with reference to an up-to-date Housing Needs Survey prepared by or in consultation with the district authority as Housing Authority.
51. The Authority will consider favourably proposals for the change of use of shops, community services and facilities to mixed use community schemes including the provision of affordable housing for eligible local need and for workspace.
52. This application has been supported by various viability appraisals. One of these assessments has concluded that it would not be viable to convert the building into an affordable dwelling. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, this is accepted.
53. The application has also been supported by viability assessments assessing whether the building can be used for an alternative community use. Again, these assessments conclude that the constraints of the site, in addition to market conditions, would mean that the site would not be viable for an alternative use. It also notes the need to upgrade

the building to meet current regulations would render the building even less viable for an alternative use. These reports were carried out by professional RICS surveyors and are accepted.

54. The property was also marketed through a commercial property agency between 5<sup>th</sup> March 2024 until at least the submission of this application in June 2025, a period over 16 months. It was also advertised on commercial property search engine sites, such as NovaLoca and Loopnet/Costar at a rent of £6000 per annum, or £500 per month, which was commensurate with the rent paid during the building's use as a Post Office.
55. The marketing exercise received one serious enquirer seeking use of the building as an office; however, this enquiry did not prove to be successful as a result of the condition of the property and extent of works required to make it fit for purpose.
56. However, it should be noted that several representations on this application have raised concern that there was no 'To Let' erected on the building during its marketing exercise. This criticism is acknowledged; however, the building had been vacant since February 2024 and had been advertised on various commercial letting websites. Should either community groups or local business owners been interested in the property, it is reasonable to suggest they should have researched on the internet and enquired through those means. It is therefore agreed that a To Let sign would have been preferable during the marketing exercise, but it has nevertheless not invalidated the exercise.
57. The landowner did not market the building through the District Council's Economic Development Team as stipulated by policy DMS2. Furthermore, there is no evidence of the landowner approaching the Parish Council to discuss affordable housing needs; however, the application has demonstrated that it would be unviable to provide a contribution to such needs.
58. Whilst the exact provisions of policy DMS2 have not been followed, it has nevertheless been accepted that the application has been supported by thorough viability appraisals and marketing exercises which has demonstrated that there has been no demand for use of the building for an alternative community use and that it is not economically viable by virtue of its market rent and condition.
59. It is accepted that reasonable attempts have been made to use the building as an alternative community use. The loss of the community facility is therefore acceptable and in compliance with policies HC4 and DMS2.

#### Impact on heritage assets

60. The site is in the Eyam Conservation Area and immediately adjacent to the grade II listed Laburnham Cottage. Two properties to the south on Main Road is the grade II Hall Farmhouse. Policies L3, DMC5, DMC7 and DMC8 are engaged which require development to conserve and where possible, enhance the significance and setting of heritage assets.
61. The current single-storey building is a detracting influence in the street-scene. The prevailing nature of Main Road is two-storey buildings fronting directly onto the road or pavement. The neighbouring buildings are typically constructed from coursed gritstone set under blue-slate or stone roofs. The building subject to this application is distinct in being constructed from re-constituted stone under a concrete roof. Furthermore, its shopfront window and soffit boards further pull the building away from the local vernacular.

62. While small and relatively discrete, it is acknowledged that the building at present does not make a positive contribution to the significance of the Eyam Conservation Area, nor the setting of the adjacent listed buildings.
63. The proposed dwelling would be traditionally designed, featuring natural stone walling, vertically emphasised windows, blue-slate roof and stone detailing. Due to the size of the site the building would appear somewhat narrower than the other properties along Main Road, which have a more horizontal character; however, the improvements to the form, materials, and detailed design would nevertheless be a significant enhancement on the current building.
64. Therefore, the proposed development would result in a loss of the building which does not contribute towards the significance of the Conservation Area. Its removal and replacement with the proposed dwelling would provide an enhancement to its significance.
65. The proposed development would result in a taller and more conspicuous building in close proximity to the grade II Laburnham Cottage. Submitted plans show that the proposed dwelling would be at a similar height to the southern neighbour The Rookery. The proposed dwelling would therefore be at a similar height, if not slightly higher, than Laburnham Cottage despite Laburnham Cottage being sited on elevated ground. However, the dwelling would still be located 6.5m from the southern gable of the listed building and the siting of a taller building in close proximity to the listed building would not have a negative impact upon its setting, particularly in the context of the Eyam Conservation Area where there is dense built form.
66. Representations have raised concern over the works to the retaining structure and boundary wall, noting that the northern wall between the development site and Laburnham Cottage is curtilage listed. The applicant has confirmed that the wall between the site and Laburnham Cottage would not be affected by the proposals, while the rear retaining wall may need stabilisation work following further surveys once the current building has been demolished. Therefore, a condition has been suggested stating that there shall be no works to the wall or retaining structures unless in accordance with a specification which shall be agreed with the National Park Authority.
67. The proposed development would have the potential to harm below ground archaeology; however, this could be mitigated should the overall planning balance weigh in favour of the development.
68. Therefore, the proposed development would conserve the significance and setting of adjacent heritage assets. It would have a positive impact upon the significance of the Eyam Conservation Area, whilst the setting of Laburnham Cottage would be conserved as a result of development. The proposed development is in compliance with policies L3, DMC5, DMC7 and DMC8.

#### Impact on residential amenity

69. The development site is located on Main Road which is characterised by properties fronting directly onto the highway. It also has a dense built-form with many of the properties being attached or located very close to their neighbours.
70. The Post Office building is located approximately 6.5m south of its northern neighbour Laburnham Cottage and approximately 0.9m from the northern extension on the southern neighbour The Rookery. When measured from the main house, it is approximately 3.2m away. To the west, Crown Cottage is 11.3m across the road.

71. Given the areas density, the impact of the proposed development on the residential amenity and living conditions of the neighbouring properties is a key consideration.
72. For Laburnham Cottage, the proposed development would result in a taller building being sited close to its shared boundary. At present, the building is approximately 4.2m in height and this would rise to approximately 7m. This would invariably result in a sense of overbearing and loss of light when using the section of the garden which immediately abuts the neighbouring property. However, Laburnham Cottage has a large garden which extends to the front of the property. Therefore, while the proposed development would result in some loss of light and a sense of overbearing, it would not be to an unacceptable degree as the residents of the property could utilise different areas of their amenity space which would not be impacted. Furthermore, the southern facing south window would not be impacted by the proposed development by virtue of the proposed dwellings sited slightly in front of the window. Therefore, the proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact upon the amenity or living conditions of Laburnham Cottage.
73. The Rookery has a small side window which serves a bedroom located approximately 3.1m away which currently looks onto the roof apex of the existing property. The proposal would increase the height of the building by approximately 2.8m resulting in the outlook of this window fronting onto a gable end. It would also likely reduce the light entering the rooms only window. However, this window is located on a north facing elevation near the junction with an extension which extends north. During the morning, the extension would likely block sunlight entering this room, whilst during day the sun would be tracking to the south of the dwelling. Therefore the light entering this window is severely limited already, and while the proposal may contribute to a further reduction it is not considered to be to an unacceptable degree.
74. By virtue of the separation distance between the windows, it is anticipated that the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact upon the privacy of Crown Cottage approximately 11.3m to the west across the road. Furthermore, the application proposes hornbeam hedging which would further improve privacy between the ground-floor windows.
75. To safeguard the privacy of the future residents, it is suggested that the ground-floor window on the northern elevation is obscure glazed to limit any overlooking from the northern neighbours when using their garden.
76. Accordingly, the proposed development would have an impact upon the residential amenity and living conditions of Laburnham Cottage and The Rookery and may create a degree of change in how they experience or use certain parts of their properties; however, these impacts are not deemed to be unacceptable in planning terms.

#### Other matters

77. The proposed development would not have off-street parking. It should be noted that many representations have expressed concern over additional parking pressures along Main Road.
78. The Highway Authority have raised no objection to the proposal. They acknowledge that under the National Park Authority's parking standards, the development should have 2 off-street carparking spaces; however, on the basis that the existing building was last used as a Post Office, this would have generated more parking demand along Main Road with frequent vehicular movements due to the nature of the site. Therefore, the demand of carparking along Main Road would be reduced. In any case, the village is served by several bus routes and is therefore a sustainable location for housing.

79. The Highway Authority recommended a condition requiring a 'Welcome Travel Pack' forming new residents' information regarding location of bus stops, local bus services, location of retail and local amenities, local walking routes, opportunities for cycling and details of local taxi ranks in order to discourage the use of private vehicles and use of active travel. Whilst the intention of this condition is acknowledged, it is not considered necessary and proportionate to the level of accommodation provided.
80. The application has been supported by a Sustainability Statement which outlines that the building would be constructed using sustainable materials and would feature renewable energy equipment such as an Air Source Heat Pump. This is sufficient to satisfy policy CC1.
81. The proposed development would not impact more than 25sqm of onsite habitat. It is therefore exempt from statutory biodiversity net gain.

### **Conclusion**

82. Following a marketing exercise, this application has demonstrated that there is no demand for the retention of the building for use as a community facility. Furthermore, the viability appraisal has demonstrated that it would not be viable for such a use, in addition to providing other community benefits such as affordable housing.
83. The proposed development would facilitate the removal of a detracting previously developed site in the Eyam Conservation Area and replacement with a traditionally designed building which would complement its setting, therefore constituting an enhancement.
84. The proposed development would have an impact upon the residential amenity of Laburnham Cottage and The Rookery; however, these impacts are not considered to be unacceptable.
85. The proposed development is acceptable with regard to highway safety and sustainability.
86. Therefore, the proposed development is in compliance with the development plan when read as a whole. There are no material planning considerations which indicate the application should be determined otherwise than in accordance with the plan.
87. It is therefore recommended for conditional 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 – Will Eyre, Principal Planner**