

**15. FULL APPLICATION – EXTENSION TO THE CAR PARK at DENNIS KNOLL CAR PARK, HOLLIN BANK ROAD, HATHERSAGE (NP/DDD/0925/0951) WE**

**APPLICANT:** Peak District National Park Authority

**Summary**

1. This application seeks full planning permission for the extension of the Dennis Knoll Car Park, a small pay and display carpark located at the western end of the North Lees Estate.
2. The proposed development would result in carpark extending approximately 97m to the east, spanning the entire length of the adjacent woodland. It would also encroach into the woodland to the north by several metres.
3. The application has been supported by detailed data collected from ongoing monitoring outlining the existing parking capacity across the North Lees Estate, in addition to an overview of the issues surrounding inconsiderate verge parking across the locality.
4. The application has demonstrated a demonstratable need for its enlargement. Subject to conditions, the proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact upon valued characteristics, adjacent scheduled monuments/archaeology, and would not negatively impact the ecological value of the site, nor impact the significance of the adjacent designated habitats.
5. The application would provide approximately 18.45% net-gains to onsite biodiversity. As the development would impact and enhance habitats of a medium distinctiveness, the gains are therefore 'significant' and would require monitoring for 30-years. The planning permission will therefore be subject to the prior entry into a legal agreement to secure funds for the ongoing monitoring of the site.
6. This application is therefore recommended for conditional approval subject to the prior entry into a legal agreement.

**Site and Surroundings**

7. The site is Dennis Knoll Car Park, a pay and display carpark located approximately 2.7km north of Hathersage and approximately 2km to the east of Bamford on the eastern end of the North Lees Estate.
8. The car park is located near Long Causeway to the south-east of Bamford Moor, close to Bamford Edge and Standage Edge and is approximately 2 km to the south east of Lady Bower Reservoir.
9. The current car park is approximately 270 sqm in area and provides space for around 10-12 cars. The parking bays are not marked out and the surface of the of the car park is crushed stone.
10. The application site is comprises the existing carpark, the road verge, grassland to the south of the woodland and the woodland itself. It is within the setting of scheduled monuments. These include Sheep wash Bank and Dennis Knoll, a Cairnfield (a pre-historic settlement and field system), and a Roman Road.
11. To the north, east and west of the development site is European designated sites the Peak District Moors Special Protection Area (SPA), South Pennine Moors Special Area of Conservation (SAC), in addition to the Eastern Peak District Moors Site of Special

Scientific Interest (SSSI). These areas are also designated as Natural Zone within the development plan.

### **Proposal**

12. This application seeks full planning permission for the extension and enlargement of the existing Dennis Knoll carpark to provide approximately 60 car parking spaces.
13. The proposed enlargement would extend the carpark approximately 97m to the east, spanning the length of the adjacent woodland. It would also extend into the woodland to the north by several metres, resulting in the loss of several trees of varying height and species.
14. The carpark would have two access points, the western entrance point and the eastern exit point. The access and exit points would be tarmacked.
15. The western section of the carpark would provide 3 marked disabled bays and would be tarmacked. The pay and display machines would also be located in this part of the carpark, along with cycle racks.
16. The larger and extended eastern section of the carpark would remain unmarked and would be surfaced in 'Ultitrek' recycled material. Stone sets would demarcate the areas of Ultitrek and tarmac.
17. The application also proposes the creation of a raised bund on the verge with the highway. The submitted planting scheme proposes the planting of several trees along the bund, in addition to several trees and shrub planting in the carpark itself. Additional planting is proposed on the eastern boundary of the site.
18. The application drawings also show details of signage in association with the carpark. For clarity, these would be subject to a separate application for consent to display an advertisement if found to be too large to benefit from deemed consent.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

**That the application APPROVED subject to the prior entry into a Section 106 Agreement and the following conditions:**

- 1. Statutory three-year implementation period;**
- 2. The development shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the amended plans and specifications subject to the following conditions and/or modifications.**
- 3 No development shall commence until a Habitat and Management Monitoring Plan (HMMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the National Park Authority. The HMMP shall provide details for the creation, enhancement and management of habitats on the site and adjacent to the site post development. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out and the site monitored in complete compliance with the agreed HMMP.**

- 4**     **a) No development shall take place until a Written Scheme of Investigation for archaeological work has been submitted to and approved by the National Park Authority in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and**

  - 1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording;**
  - 2. The programme for post investigation assessment;**
  - 3. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording;**
  - 4. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation;**
  - 5. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation;**
  - 6. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organization to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.**
- b) No development shall take place other than in accordance with the archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation approved under part (a).**
- c) Within a period of 12 weeks from completion of the development the archaeological site investigation and post investigation analysis and reporting shall have been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under part (a) and the provision to be made for publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition shall have been secured.**
- 5**     **No development shall take place until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to the National Park Authority for approval in writing. The CEMP shall include detailed construction phase impact avoidance and mitigation measures summarised within the Appropriate Assessment of the submitted ‘shadow’ HRA document, in addition to environmental control measures, including but not limited to: the implementation of strict protection measures for the root protection areas of retained trees and hedgerows, in accordance with BS5837:2012; details of appropriate fencing to restrict access into key ecological areas; information on any timing restrictions; and measures to prevent damage to sensitive ecological habitats and protected species, including control and monitoring of surface water run-off, construction dust and recreational disturbance. Thereafter, the development shall only be carried out in accordance with the Construction Environmental Management Plan.**
- 6**     **The development shall not be brought into use until a strategy and management plan for the reduction of verge parking has been implemented in accordance with details which shall have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the National Park Authority. The strategy and management plan shall include the precise details to reduce the verge parking surrounding the site, including communication, enforcement and timings.**
- 7**     **The first planting season following first use of the development, the tree and shrub planting shall be carried out in accordance with plan dwg. PM06913A/2025/LS01 and shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the provisions outlined in the Habitat and Management Monitoring Plan.**

- 8 Any trees that are found to be dead, dying, severely damaged or diseased within five years of the completion of the building works or five years of the carrying out of the landscaping scheme (whichever is later) shall be replaced in the next planting season by specimens of similar size and species in the first suitable planting season (unless in accordance with an alternative specification which shall be first submitted to and agreed in writing by the National Park Authority).
- 9 The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the Reasonable Avoidance (RAMs) and Precautionary Methods as detailed in Section 5.0 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Pioneer Environment Group Ltd).
- 10 Prior to first use of the development, the ecological enhancements outlined in Section 5.28 - 5.30 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal shall be implemented and thereafter shall be maintained for the lifetime of the development.
- 11 The development shall be constructed outside of the bird breeding season (February to September).
- 12 The development shall be carried out in accordance with the Arboricultural Report & Impact Assessment (AWA Tree Consultants) and Arboricultural Method Statement (AWA Tree Consultants).
- 13 The development shall not be brought into use until the access, parking and turning facilities have been provided as shown on drawing PM06913A/2025/PP04 R01, PM06913A/2025/PP05 R01 and PM06913A/2025/LP01 R01.

### **Key Issues**

- Principle of the development;
- Justification for extension;
- Impact upon the valued characteristics of the landscape;
- Impact upon heritage assets and archaeology;
- Ecology and biodiversity;
- Impact upon trees;
- Highway safety;
- Other matters.

### **History**

- 2001 – Extension of lay-by parking area (NP/DDD/0700/291) – Withdrawn. Standage Forum Steering Group advised the application should be withdrawn while a management plan is prepared for the area is prepared.
- 2023 - Installation of solar powered car park machine and associated base, pedestrian area and signage (NP/DDD/1222/1558) – Granted conditionally

### **Consultations**

19. Hathersage Parish Council – General comment.

*While commending the depth of consideration that had gone into the application some Cllrs shared concerns including that the pay-and-display conditions may push visitors to park - at no charge – elsewhere, including on verges. Queried whether robust enforcement measures will be put in place - who will undertake enforcement? how will it be funded? what levels of fines will be imposed? Lack of toilet facilities also a concern. Cllr Olle commented that the location for such a large car park was inappropriate and*

would have a negative impact on the landscape. She suggested the expansion would encourage car use to the detriment of encouraging visitors to use public transport, and that it set a precedent for further car park expansion across the Peak Park. More broadly, Cllrs noted the expansion did not reference a wider PDNPA strategy on parking and visitor management including overnight campervan parking - suggested there needs to be a clear strategy developed with input from Peak Park communities and any further parking proposals to be aligned to the strategy. Cllrs also called for consideration be given to appropriate measures/deterrents to protect verges e.g. wooden barriers.

20. Natural England – No objection subject to appropriate mitigation being secured

*Natural England considers that without appropriate mitigation the application could:*

- *have an adverse effect on the integrity of South Pennine Moors, Special Area of Conservation and the Peak District Moor (South Pennine Moor Phase 1), Special Protection Area.*
- *damage or destroy the interest features for which Eastern Peak District Moors Site of Special Scientific Interest has been notified.*

*In order to mitigate these adverse effects and make the development acceptable, the following mitigation options should be secured:*

- *A written Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) produced which outlines all mitigation measures stated within the Appropriate Assessment of the submitted 'shadow' HRA document.*
- *All works on-site to be completed outside of the bird breeding season (February to September). Continual monitoring. During construction, of potential hydrological impacts upon the adjacent designated sites, caused by an increase in surface water run-off.*

*We advise that an appropriate planning condition or obligation is attached to any planning permission to secure these measures.*

21. Historic England – No advice offered.

22. Highway Authority – No objection.

*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.*

*Suggested a condition requiring the development not being brought into use before the access, parking and turning facilities have been provided in accordance with submitted drawing. Also suggested an informative relating to undertaking works in the highway.*

23. PDNPA Landscape – No objection.

*The application site is an existing car park in the Open Moors LCT in the Eastern Moors LCA. It is screened to the north and south by blocks of woodland.*

*The proposal is to enlarge the car park – with the aim of discouraging parking on verges.*

*An LVA has been prepared which outlines the potential landscape and visual effects – I agree with its findings. This outlines proposed mitigation (which is detailed in Plan 9 Landscape Proposals).*

*Key issues are the enlargement of the car park and its potential adverse effects on landscape and views; while the car park is enlarged, it is broken up with planting, it has*

*a planted bund to the south and a proposed block of planted at its eastern end. This mitigation, combined with the reduction of verge car parking elsewhere, gives a neutral landscape and visual effect in my view - as long as the landscape mitigation works are undertaken, I do not object to the scheme.*

#### 24. PDNPA Ecology – No objection

*Current mapping and proposals result in a net gain of 18.45%. The proposed uplift results in a net gain of 1.01 habitat units as calculated using DEFRA's Biodiversity Metric 4.0. However, at this stage proposals and calculations are indicative only and are based on a previous proposal. The final uplift will be submitted in the final version of the BNG metric following approval of the application. It is understood that plans may incorporate a slightly larger verge in the south-east corner (Drawing number PM06913A/2025/LS01, dated 24/7/25) and this would be welcomed, because it would enable retention of habitat in this area along with the potential to plant more trees. With the retention of this area, the biodiversity uplift is expected to be higher than 18.45%. Nevertheless, the metric as submitted, demonstrates that the application is capable of meeting the Biodiversity Net Gain condition.*

*It is understood that the fence line bounding the northern area of the woodland does not correspond with the red line boundary; and therefore, a large area of adjacent habitat (heathland) has not been included within the metric. Provided no works take place beyond the tree protection fence line, as illustrated in the Arboricultural Method Statement, this area is not expected to be impacted.*

*In the context of the location, (adjacent to SPA/SAC/SSSI); based on the information received, the uplift and proposed habitats (of medium to high distinctiveness) are considered significant enough to warrant maintenance with a legal agreement (planning obligation or conservation covenant) or planning condition for 30 years.*

*A Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) will be required to be submitted that sets out the detailed habitat creation and enhancement specifications and long-term management prescriptions. The proposed amended plan (Drawing number PM06913A/2025/LS01, dated 24/7/25) is welcomed. It is understood 10no trees will be removed, along with part of a group of trees (G1). Removal of trees should be limited to those identified within the Arboricultural Method Statement (June 2025).*

*Table 4 in the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report suggests using Emorsgat Wildflower seed mix (e.g. EM10 Tussock Meadow Mixture) to seed the verges. Preferably, local green hay will be used, but if this is not practical, a bespoke seed mix is required (rather than an off the shelf mix). For example, EM10, EM7 and EM8 have species that are not characteristic of grasslands of the National Park e.g. wild carrot and bladder campion. Any species mix needs to be of UK origin and preferably of local provenance.*

#### Ecological impacts

*The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal identified potential impacts on protected species mainly through construction activity. The appraisal states there are no ponds within 500 m. However, there are waterbodies suitable for amphibians situated within 200 m. Nevertheless, in consideration of the location of the waterbodies where there is suitable adjacent habitat, it is considered that the proposed Precautionary Method Statement outlined within the ecology report, along with the appointment of an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) is sufficient to protect amphibians during construction.*

*In the absence of any mitigation measures, the proposed development would have the potential to result in negative effects, specifically on nesting birds, bats, amphibians and*

small mammals. Provided mitigation and precautionary measures proposed in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal by Pioneer Environmental group are implemented, the development is not anticipated to result in any significant residual negative effects on important ecological features.

Lighting is not expected to be used during or post construction. If lighting is proposed, a lighting strategy for bats developed in accordance with current guidance from the Bat Conservation Trust and Institution of Lighting Professionals 'Bats and Artificial Lighting at Night' (Guidance note 08/23) should be submitted.

The enhancements provided in Section 5.28-5.30 in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal are welcomed and will provide additional compensation for the loss of habitat.

25. PDNPA Archaeology – No objection. Some harm but capable of mitigation through conditions.

On initial assessment it would be expected that the creation of a car parking area would require a considerable amount of ground disturbance and therefore have a considerable impact of archaeological remains.

However, the car park proposals have been carefully designed to limit the amount of ground disturbance required, making use of natural contours and falls, and permeable materials to facilitate drainage; only requiring a scrape back of the turf rather than any digging out. More significance archaeological impacts have been designed out. This is welcomed.

As such, the **archaeological impacts will be minor**. The possible small quarry pit will be backfilled and levelled out, so will be lost. It is also possible that buried features will be encountered during the turf strip and affected by even the minimal ground disturbance taken place.

The significance and harm identified above needs to be taken into account as an informed and balanced planning decision is made.

Should the planning balance be favourable then a programme of archaeological work needs to be secured by condition in order mitigate the harm identified above. This needs to include:

- Survey of the quarry pit (Level 2)
- Archaeological monitoring and recording during turf strip and all other groundworks.

This needs to be carried out by a suitable qualified and experienced archaeological contractor in accordance with a written scheme of investigation/project design that I have approved and in accordance with the standards and guidance of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologist.

26. PDNPA Tree Conservation Officer – No objection subject to conditions:

1. Adhere to the Arboricultural Method Statement submitted by AWA Tree Consultants in June 2025
2. Carry out 4.4.1 Suitable Mitigation regarding new tree replanting, stated in the Arboricultural report & Impact Assessment
3. Any trees that are found to be dead, dying, severely damaged or diseased within five years of the completion of the building works or five years of the carrying out of the landscaping scheme (whichever is later) shall be replaced in the next planting season by specimens of similar size and species in the first suitable planting season (unless the National Park Authority gives its written consent to any variation).

## **Representations**

27. 3 representations have been received during the determination of this application. 2 in support, 1 objecting.

28. The representations in support of the application cited the following:

- One of the representations in support of the proposal was Deputy chair of the Stanage Steering Group. They stated that parking across the Estate is a problem which has only escalated over time. Considered the extension to be essential in the overall strategy of managing parking across the Estate. It is needed to eliminate the damaging verge parking. The current use of Dennis Knoll is irresponsible and dangerous. Vehicles and parking need managing on the Estate. The design of the Car Park has been sympathetically thought through. Accessible parking bays will be welcome complimentary assets to the Miles Without Stiles project on Long Causeway. This Dennis Knoll Car Park application should be supported.
- Carpark would assist in reducing the parking on the verge which has created an unsightly mess. Verge parking has also limited the size of traffic that can pass on busy days, including emergency vehicles.
- Cited concern that the carpark may be too small to solve the identified issues.

29. The representation which objected cited the following reasons:

- The ecology report states no ponds within 500m. There is a small pond within 500m, also a regularly flooded strip on the opposite side of the Causeway which provides a breeding place for frogs and toads thus supporting the migrant and resident birds.
- You have not provided a factual argument for the removal of woodland and additional spaces; you are already creating many additional spaces at Hollin Bank. Both car parks are rarely anywhere near capacity, with people parking for free on verges.
- I support your plan to use the verge down from Dennis Knoll, this needs surfacing to provide parking which can be paid for at Dennis Knoll machine.
- Removal of the woodland to the rear of Dennis Knoll for additional car parking will be visible from many points along the Causeway and Stanage Edge, thus further urbanising a wild landscape. Hollin Bank is very well screened and so invisible in this respect. New planting will take years to provide adequate screening.
- Providing more paid parking will not stop people parking for free wherever possible. Without proper enforcement/deterrents the additional development costs will not be viable.

## **Main Policies**

Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, L1, L2, L3, T1, CC1

Relevant Local Plan policies: DMC1, DMC3, DMC5, DMC6, DMC11, DMC12, DMC13, DMT3, DMT7



## National Planning Policy Framework

30. 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.
31. 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

32. 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.
33. 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.
34. 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.
35. 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.

36. Policy L1 says 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. Policy L2 states that development must conserve and enhance any sites, features or species of biodiversity interest and where appropriate their setting

Other than in exceptional circumstances development will not be permitted where it is likely to have an adverse impact on any sites, features or species of biodiversity importance or their setting that have statutory designation or are of international or national importance for their biodiversity.

38. 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.

39. 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.

40. Policy T1 'Reducing the general need to travel and encouraging sustainable transport' states that conserving and enhancing the National Park's valued characteristics will be the primary criterion in the planning and design of transport and its management.

It states that a modal shift to sustainable transport will be encouraged.

#### Development Management Policies Plan

41. 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.

42. 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.

43. 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.

44. Policy DMC6 states that planning applications involving a Scheduled Monument and/or its setting will be determined in accordance with policy DMC5.

45. Policy DMC11 states that development should aim to achieve net gains to biodiversity or geodiversity as a result of development. In considering whether a proposal conserves and enhances sites, features or species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance all reasonable measures must be taken to avoid net loss.
46. Policy DMC12 states that for Internationally designated or candidate sites, or European Protected Species, the exceptional circumstances where development may be permitted are those where it can be demonstrated that the legislative provisions to protect such sites or species can be fully met.
- A. For sites, features or species of national importance, exceptional circumstances are those where development is essential:
- (i) for the management of those sites, features or species; or
  - (ii) for the conservation and enhancement of the National Park's valued characteristics; or
  - (iii) where the benefits of the development at a site clearly outweigh the impacts on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest and any broader impacts on the national network of SSSIs.
47. Policy DMC13 states that applications should provide sufficient information to enable their impact on trees, woodlands and other landscape features to be properly considered in accordance with 'BS 5837: 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations' or equivalent.
48. Policy DMT3 sets out that development will only be permitted where a safe access that is achievable for all people can be provided in a way that does not detract from the character and appearance of the locality.
49. Policy DMT7 states that new or enlarged car parks will not be permitted unless a clear, demonstrable need, delivering local benefit, can be shown.

Where new or additional off-street visitor parking is permitted, an equivalent removal of on-street parking will usually be required. This will be delivered through Traffic Regulation Orders to restrict on-street parking.

## **Assessment**

### **Principle of the development**

50. The starting point for considering applications for visitor parking are policies T1 ("Reducing the general need to travel and encouraging sustainable transport" - Core Strategy) and DMT7 ("Visitor Parking" – Development Management Policies).
51. In so far as it relates to the proposed car park extension, the thrust of T1 is to encourage a shift towards sustainable transport, to minimise impacts of development within environmentally sensitive locations, avoid harm to valued characteristics, and to consider demand management where appropriate
52. Policy DMT7 states that new or enlarged car parks will not be permitted unless a clear, demonstrable need, delivering local benefit can be shown.
53. DMT7.B states that here new or additional off-street visitor parking is permitted, an equivalent removal of on-street parking will usually be required. This will be delivered through Traffic Regulation Orders to restrict on-street parking.

54. Therefore, the proposed extension is acceptable in principle subject to the application demonstrating a clear demonstrable need (which would deliver local benefit) for the development that it would not harm the valued characteristics of the National Park, and has minimised impacts within its environmentally sensitive location and has a method for the management of demand (and reduction of off-street car parking).
55. The need for the proposed development, in addition to its impact upon the valued characteristics of the National Park will be discussed in the following sections of this report.

#### Justification for extension and local benefit

56. As noted, policy DMT7 states enlarged visitor carparks will not be permitted unless a clear, demonstrable need can be shown which delivers benefits locally.
57. This application has been supported by a Car Park Capacity Report. It provides data and commentary on the ongoing monitoring of the Dennis Knoll site over a period of several months.
58. Using data obtained from the pay and display machine, the report identifies that between 1<sup>st</sup> January 2025 and 31<sup>st</sup> August 2025, Dennis Knoll carpark was above capacity approximately 25% of the time. The data found that this was typically concentrated on weekends and bank holidays, but included days during particularly sunny spells in March and April.
59. In addition to the pay and display data, the application provides an enforcement survey data carried out between May and August 2025. During this period, there were 62 enforcement visits, 11 on weekends and 51 during the week.
60. To summarise, the survey found that on two visits (Sunday 27<sup>th</sup> April and Saturday 31<sup>st</sup> May 2025), the carpark was over capacity with 12 and 13 cars parked in the carpark respectively. On the 27<sup>th</sup> April visit, an additional 44 cars were parked on the verge, and on 31<sup>st</sup> May, 31 cars were parked on the verge.
61. On the other enforcement visits, the car park did not exceed its capacity. However, on 46 of the 62 visits cars were observed parking on the verges even when there was available capacity in the carpark.
62. Across the whole monitoring period, cars parked in the formal car park equalled 164 vehicles, whilst 447 vehicles were parked on the verge surrounding the carpark. Whilst this invariably fluctuates across weeks and month, it shows that for every car parked in the formal car park, there was evidence of at least 2-3 parked on the verge.
63. Across the monitoring survey, it found on 27 visits across the 62-day period, the parking surrounding Dennis Knoll (including both carpark and verge) exceeded the formal capacity of the site, indicating a short-fall in capacity in the area.
64. Furthermore, it is also necessary to consider the visual impact of the current verge parking. The current verge parking does not benefit from any screening, and its uncontrolled nature creates a cluttered and piece-meal appearance. Additionally, the verge parking has eroded the grassland immediately adjacent to the road causing damage and churning the vegetation. This further negatively affects the character and appearance of the site even when cars are not parked on the verge.

65. Further to the east of the carpark, the verge abutting Hollin Bank Road is designated as SAC, SPA and SSSI and the continued parking on these areas are damaging the significance of these designations.
66. It should also be acknowledged that Dennis Knoll has become an increasing popular area to start walks across the North Lees estate, including Stanage and Bamford Edge (as demonstrated by the submitted monitoring data). Increased monitoring and physical barriers could be utilised to deter verge parking which would alleviate the visual and ecological implications; however, these risks pushing the issue to alternative locations. It would therefore be favourable to retain the capacity (of both the carpark and current verge parking) but operate it in a controlled, screened and appropriately designed way.
67. To secure that the scheme delivers local benefits, it is necessary to ensure that appropriate measures are secured which would decrease the amount of verge parking locally. Particularly as the evidence indicates that visitors may continue to choose to park on the verge even if additional capacity is provided. As submitted, the proposal includes a bund which would span the southern side of the carpark, restricting parking along this highway edge. However, measures would also need to be secured limiting verge parking across the adjacent roads and the wider North Lees estate.
68. The application has also been supported by a Traffic Management Strategy. This is a wide-ranging document; however, it sets out the proposed measures for the removal of informal parking. It suggests that the applicant can utilise by-laws to enforce parking on the following areas:
- Land that it owns
  - Land that it manages through a formal agreement where that land is also open access land.
69. The applicant is in discussion with the Local Highway Authority to reach a formal agreement to take on management of the verges which are outside of their land ownership and in Highway Authority control. This would likely be secured through a Section 101 agreement.
70. It also outlines that the areas of the estate where the verge is not in applicant ownership nor is it within Access land are small areas but on which some verge parking does occur. These areas will be monitored and if necessary, further physical measures implemented in consultation with the Highways department of Derbyshire County Council.
71. To ensure that the proposed delivers public benefit to justify the principle of the development, it is necessary that the mitigation/enforcement measures remove no less than the number of carparks proposed. In this instance, the carpark extension would provide an additional 50 spaces, so the mitigation measures would need to remove the same amount from the local highway verges. Should the mitigation measures remove in excess of that amount, it would weigh more favourably in the planning balance.
72. Accordingly, if this application is recommended for approval, a condition is recommended that restricts the operation of the carpark until a Management Plan is secured which sets out how much verge parking would be removed, and the precise methods that this would be secured by including details of monitoring visits.
73. Additionally, the application would only provide benefits locally if it can be shown to have an acceptable impact upon the valued characteristics of the area, including landscape, heritage assets and local wildlife. Subject to the above, the proposed development would accord with policy DMT7.

Impact upon the valued characteristics of the landscape

74. Policy L1 which states that development must conserve and enhance valued landscape character as identified in the Landscape Strategy and other valued characteristics. Policy DMC1 expands upon this and 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
75. The application site is in the Open Moors Landscape Character Type of the Eastern Moors Landscape Character Area. It is characterised by:
- Undulating settled gritstone summits with large gritstone edges, scattered rock outcrops and tors
  - Unenclosed heather and grass moorland, with areas of birch and willow scrub
  - Extensive and nationally-important archaeological evidence from prehistoric and later activity
  - Thin impoverished soils with some deposits of peat
76. The Landscape Strategy and Action Plan notes that the landscape is generally open with expansive views over the adjacent valley; however, there are some localised patches of bird and willow scrub on lower lying moors and a number of localised plantations. The application site would fall within the latter category situated between the woodland to the north and Dennis Knoll plantation to the south.
77. The application has been supported by a Landscape Visual Appraisal. The appraisal assesses the development proposal from 13 receptors across a distance of 500m from the application site. The viewpoints are from a number of public footpaths, National Trails, bridleways and open access land.
78. The appraisal concludes that from viewpoints 1, 2, 3, and 12 the existing topography and plantation woodlands would provide full screening from the proposed carpark extension. These viewpoints are from between 200m and 500m from the south-east.
79. From viewpoint 4, a public right of way on Stanage Edge approximately 300m directly to the east, the proposed development would be visible during the winter months.
80. Similarly, from viewpoints 5 and 6, which are also footpaths on Stanage Edge directly to the east of development site, the proposed carpark extension would be visible during the winter months through sightlines between the northern woodland and plantation to the south.
81. From viewpoints 7, 8, 9 and 10 which are located between 200 and 300m to the north of the development site, the proposal would be visible through the sparse nature of the existing woodland to the north. It should be noted that the density of the woodland would further be reduced through the removal of trees to facilitate the extension.
82. Viewpoint 11 is a local view from Hollin Bank Road less than 100m to the east of the site. Upon construction, the development site would be visible between the northern woodland and southern plantation.
83. Viewpoint 13 is the only viewpoint to the west, a byway crossing the open moor. From this viewpoint, the existing woodland planting would screen the proposed carpark extension. It should be noted that from this viewpoint, the extent of verge parking along Long Causeway is evident. Should appropriate mitigation measures be secured, this verge parking will be removed and directed onto the better screened site behind the woodland.

84. The appraisal goes on to conclude that upon construction, the fabric of the landscape will change locally as it would result in an enlarged carpark with the woodland encroached into. The appraisal concludes that the proposal would be intrusive on the landscape and there would be a minor adverse effect on the landscape character compared to the baseline.
85. It then goes on to state that the susceptibility of the local landscape is low due to the fact the area is relatively sheltered and is already a carpark.
86. Once the proposed mitigation and tree/shrub planting has established, the landscape would accommodate the change in character and the proposed development would be integrated well into its local woodland setting.
87. To conclude, the proposed development would be visible and potentially intrusive during the winter months following its construction. This would be most evident from recreational users on Stanage Edge and the moorland below it, in addition to local views from the approach to the east. Initially, this would comprise a minor adverse visual effect.
88. By the summer of the 15<sup>th</sup> year following mitigation planting and management, the proposed carpark will be enclosed and in a wooded setting, appearing as an extension of the existing woodland to the north, there will likely be visibility of vehicles through filtered trees but they will not stand out in the landscape. The landscape and visual impact will be neutral to minor beneficial given the removal of nuisance verge parking which is visible from many of the identified viewpoints.
89. Therefore, in the short-term, the proposed development would have a minor adverse impact upon the valued characteristics of the landscape before becoming a neutral feature by year 15.
90. It should also be noted that the proposed development includes the creation of a bund (with tree planting atop) running the southern perimeter of the carpark. This would provide modest mitigation to the visual impact of the proposed development in the street-scene, in addition to restricting verge parking along this section of the road.
91. This harm needs to be weighed carefully against the current situation with verge parking evident across the roads surrounding Dennis Knoll. This uncontrolled and unregulated parking also has a negative impact on the landscape, with a lower density of parking resulting in larger and longer rows of parking which do not benefit from screening.
92. The consolidation of the carparking in this location through the proposed carpark extension through increased density and effective enforcement limiting verge parking would provide a modest improvement on the current situation. While short-term harm has been identified, subject to appropriate planting and enforcement mitigation, the proposed development would provide modest positive impact on the landscape.
93. The proposed development is therefore in compliance with policies L1, GSP2 and DMC1.

Impact upon heritage assets and archaeology:

94. The proposed development is in close proximity to two Scheduled Monuments, 1020171 Sheepwash Bank and Dennis Knoll prehistoric settlement and field system and the Long Causey, a historic routeway of at least medieval origin and likely older. There is the potential for previously unknown and unrecorded belowground remains related to these features, although the likelihood of these is anticipated to be low. Any remains associated with the prehistoric settlement and field system are likely to be of up to

national significance due to the association with the scheduled monuments. Remains associated with the Long Causeway are likely to be of regional significance.

95. Therefore, policies L3, DMC5 and DMC6 are engaged requiring development to conserve and where possible enhance the significance and setting of heritage assets, including archaeology and Scheduled Monuments.
96. The application has been supported by a thorough desk-based assessment and an impact assessment which provides the necessary information outlined through national and local policy to assess the impacts of the proposal. The submitted assessment also identified a small earthwork within the site itself, likely a small quarry associated with construction of the adjacent road in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. This would be a feature of local significance.
97. The proposed carpark has been designed to limit the ground disturbance, making use of natural contours and falls, with permeable materials to facilitate drainage. It would only require a scrape back of the turf, rather than any further digging out.
98. As such, the archaeological impacts will be minor. The possible small quarry pit will be backfilled and levelled out, so will be lost. It is also possible that buried features will be encountered during the turf strip and affected by even the minimal ground disturbance taken place
99. The identified heritage assets potentially affected by the proposal are non-designated. National and local policies therefore require the impact upon the heritage assets to be considered in the wider planning balance, taking into account the significance of the heritage assets.
100. When weighed in the wider balance, it is considered that the benefits associated with the proposal would outweigh the harm through the loss of the local non-designated archaeological asset subject to appropriate archaeological monitoring.
101. Should the application be recommended for approval, a pre-commencement condition for a Written Scheme of Investigation for archaeological monitoring and a survey of the identified quarry pit.
102. Subject to the above, the proposed development is acceptable with regard to cultural heritage and would be in compliance with policies L3, DMC5 and DMC6.

#### Ecology and biodiversity

103. The development site is located immediately adjacent to several ecology designations, Peak District Moors Special Protection Area (SPA), South Pennine Moors Special Area of Conservation (SAC), in addition to the Eastern Peak District Moors Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).
104. The proposed development would also result in the loss of woodland and grassland habitats. Accordingly, policies L2, DMC11 and DMC12 are engaged which require development to achieve net-gains to biodiversity as a result of development, and to follow the correct legislative procedure in connection with European and national legislation.
105. With regard to onsite habitats and species of interest, the application has been supported by a preliminary ecological assessment (PEA).
106. The PEA identifies a number of fauna species to consider. It found that the proposed development would not impact bats or common amphibians and reptiles; however, the document provides recommendations to further reduce the risk to these species. One



recommendation was to carry out the de-vegetation works during the active season (March – October); however, this potentially created conflict with the bird nesting mitigation measures (below). An update has been received from the Project Ecologist advising that the works could be carried out earlier, but would be dependent on weather (8-10 degrees Celsius) and an ecologist check prior to the clearance.

107. The grassland and woodland to the north provide suitable nesting and foraging opportunities for birds. To mitigate this risk, the PEA suggests the works are undertaken outside of the bird nesting season; however, it goes on to advise that if this is not possible, the areas requiring de-vegetation should be checked for active nests by a suitably qualified ecologist a maximum of 24 hours before removal works begin. If an active nest were to be discovered during the works, an exclusion zone around the nest would need to be established and maintained until a suitably qualified person has confirmed the birds have fledged or that the nesting attempt has concluded.
108. A number of enhancement measures have been proposed. These include bird and bat boxes, log piles and hibernacula for amphibians and reptiles.
109. Subject to conditions, the proposed development would not have an adverse impact upon protected species or the fauna interest of the site.
110. With regard to the impact on the designated sites, this application has been supported by a Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment (sHRA). The report outlined the qualifying species for the Peak District Moors SPA and the qualifying habitat for the South Pennine Moors SAC. It assessed these features of value against the potential threats to the sites from the proposed development, including cumulative impacts from other development locally.
111. The sHRA identified three potential factors from the development that could impact the designated sites, water pollution, construction dust and recreational disturbance.
112. The document concluded that subject to mitigation measures, the proposed development would not result in any significant harm the significance of the European designated sites. A Habitats Regulations Assessment and Appropriate Assessment has been undertaken and adopted by the National Park Authority. The mitigation measures shall be secured by planning condition. On this basis, the proposal is in compliance with policy DMC12.
113. This application is subject to Biodiversity Net Gain. The biodiversity net-gain metric and a report has been submitted in support of this application. It confirmed that the proposed works could provide a 18.45% gain to onsite habitat.
114. The proposed development would impact habitat of a medium distinctiveness (namely heathland). An amended plan has been provided which reduces the amount of medium distinctiveness habitat which would be lost. Both national and local policy requires development to follow a priority or hierarchy in its approach to loss of habitats. In this instance, the applicant has demonstrated that there is a need for the development proposed, and there are no reasonable alternative locations which would not impact more ecologically sensitive sites. Therefore, the small loss of this habitat has been successfully justified, and in any case would be off-set and compensated for in the biodiversity gain plan.
115. Accordingly, the proposed development would deliver in excess of 10% net-gains and has followed regard to the biodiversity hierarchy. As the proposal would provide gains to habitats of a medium distinctiveness, the gains are therefore significant. The net-gains will therefore need to be delivered and maintained for a minimum of 30-years. If recommended for approval, planning permission should not be granted until the applicant

has entered into a planning obligation to secure payment to the Authority for the monitoring fees of the gains for 30-years.

#### Impact upon trees

116. The proposed development would result in the loss of several trees in the woodland to the north of the development site. The application has been supported by an Arboricultural Report and a Method Statement. The Report advises that tree/groups T2, T3, T5, T6, T7, T8, T9 and T10 would require removal to facilitate the development, whilst group G1 would require partial removal. All trees proposed for removal are category 'C' trees.
117. The report advises that a scheme of measures, such as a planting strategy, would provide mitigation for the loss of trees and also provide the opportunity to strengthen and increase the tree cover locally.
118. The submitted Method Statement sets out a number of measures to safeguard the retained trees for the duration of the construction phase.
119. The Tree Conservation Officer has reviewed the submission and raised no objection subject to compliance with the submitted reports and recommendations, in addition to an additional condition requiring lost or diseased trees to be replaced for the first 5-years following completion of the development.

#### Highway Impacts

120. The proposed development demonstrates suitable access, exit, visibility splays, and internal layout. Subject to conditions requiring the entrance, exit and sightlines being provided before the development is brought into use, it would give rise to highway safety concerns. It is therefore in compliance with policy DMT3.

#### Conclusion

121. The application has demonstrated that there is a clear, demonstratable need for the proposed carpark extension which has shown to deliver benefits locally; however, this would be subject to the applicant providing details that the scheme would result in a reduction of an equivalent number of vehicles parking on the verges across the North Lees estate. Furthermore, it would also be contingent on the scheme being supported by an appropriate screening and planting regime which would mitigate the landscape impact of the proposal as it has been recognised that it would have an adverse impact upon the landscape character in the short-term.
122. The application has demonstrated that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact upon ecology, biodiversity or onsite habitat. Subject to conditions, it would not harm the significance of the adjacent European designated sites. The application would provide approximately 18.45% to onsite habitats.
123. The proposed development is acceptable with regard to archaeology/heritage, highway safety and archaeology.
124. Subject to conditions and the prior entry into a S106 agreement to secure the monitoring fees for the biodiversity net-gain, the proposed development would comply with the relevant policies of the development plan. There are no material planning considerations which indicate that planning permission should be determined otherwise than in accordance with it.
125. It is therefore recommended for approval.

## **Human Rights**

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

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

Nil

**Report Author: Will Eyre – Principal Planner**