

13. FULL APPLICATION – S73 APPLICATION FOR THE REMOVAL OR VARIATION OF CONDITION 2 AND 5 ON NP/HPK/1015/0996 AT CARBOLITE LTD, PARSONS LANE, HOPE (NP/HPK/1125/1140, WE)

APPLICANT: CARBOLITE LTD

Summary

1. The application proposes amendments to planning permission NP/HPK/1015/0996. The proposed amendment is an infill extension between the existing two buildings on site which is currently an open yard.
2. In addition to seeking planning permission for the additional infill extension, this application has been supported by a Noise Assessment which was conditioned by the previous approval on site.
3. The proposed development represents a modest infill between two existing buildings on an existing industrial site. It has been concluded that the proposed development, individually or cumulatively with what has already been approved, would not detrimentally impact the valued landscape character, residential amenity, highway safety or contribute towards increased flood risk locally.
4. The application is considered to be in accordance with the relevant policies of the development plan. It is therefore recommended for conditional approval.

Proposal

5. The application proposes to extend a small link between the two existing industrial buildings on site to create a single-storey infill between the two structures. The proposed infill extension would have a floorspace of 405sqm.
6. It would measure approximately 28m in width and 15m in depth. It would have a mono-pitched roof and extend from the roof structure of the existing link between the two buildings. It would be single storey, measuring approximately 4.5m in height.
7. Externally, it would have a number of pedestrian doors, windows and a large central roller shutter door.
8. The extension would be clad in sheeting to match the existing buildings. The application states that it would be clad in sheeting finished in a brown colour.
9. This application has also been supported by a Noise Assessment and seeks to satisfy the details required by condition 5 on permission NP/HPK/1015/0996.

Site and Surroundings

10. Carbolite Ltd occupies the application site which is in use as a manufacturing premises. The site is located approximately 0.8 km to the east of the settlement of Hope. Hope Railway Station is located adjacent to application site and the railway line runs along the northern boundary of the site.
11. The site comprises a factory and office building with a link between them, along with a car park. The site is an elongated shape and relatively narrow.

12. Several residential properties are scattered around the site. Some of these properties are sited on the private road to the west of the site. Whilst the other properties are located approximately 150 m to the south of the site.
13. The Hallam Barn Grasslands Site of Special Scientific Interest lies some 500m to the north east. The site is in Flood Zone 2 and the area of the proposed infill extension is in an area at medium risk of surface water flooding.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. **Development to be carried out in accordance with amended plans**
2. **The new car park shall be constructed and made available for use prior to commencement of construction of the eastern extension of the factory building. Thereafter it shall remain available for use throughout the lifetime of the development.**
4. **The walls and roof of the building shall be clad to match the existing in terms of materials. Upon installation, the cladding shall be finished in Vandyke Brown (RAL 8014).**
5. **The rating level of sound emitted from the development site shall not exceed background day or night time levels (as determined within Hilson Moran, “Noise Impact Assessment (ref: 37705-HML-XX-XX-RP-O-500001 ISSUE P02 FINAL), dated 8 September 2025) for the lifetime of the development.**
6. **Prior to the installation of any external lighting, precise details of the intensity, direction, spread of luminance and shielding of light sources, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the National Park Authority and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved scheme.**
7. **The car park barrier shall only be installed with the details approved through discharge application NP/DIS/1018/0980.**
8. **Before any other operations are commenced (excluding demolition/ site clearance), space shall be provided within the site curtilage for storage of plant and materials, site accommodation, loading, unloading and manoeuvring of goods vehicles, and parking and manoeuvring of site operatives and visitors’ vehicles, laid out and constructed in accordance with the details approved through NP/DIS/1018/0980.**
9. **The development shall be carried out in accordance with the Construction Management Plan approved through NP/DIS/1018/0980.**
10. **Prior to the eastern extension being taken in to use a surface water attenuation tank with flow control shall be installed in accordance with the recommendations of the submitted Flood Risk Assessment.**
11. **The infill extension shall be carried out and managed in accordance with the conclusions made in Chapter 7 of the Flood Risk Assessment and SuDs Strategy (Hilson Moran, Issue P05, November 2025).**

12. The landscaping shall be carried out in accordance with drawing number 9015-024/101 as approved through NP/DIS/1018/0980. All planting shall be carried out the first planting season following commencement of the approved car park and eastern extension.
13. The first planting season following commencement of the infill extension, additional tree planting shall be carried out on the southern boundary in front of the extension in accordance with a landscaping plan which shall be first submitted to the National Park Authority for approval in writing.
14. The two swift boxes and two bat boxes approved as part of the landscape works shall be installed prior to the extending factory building being taken in to use.
15. No removal of vegetation that may be used by breeding birds shall take place between 1st March and 31st August.
16. The construction of the car park shall be carried out in accordance with specification approved through NP/DIS/1018/0980.

Key Issues

- Principle of the development;
- Design and Landscape Impact;
- Residential amenity;
- Highway Safety;
- Flood Risk;
- Other matters.

History

14. 2016: Proposed extension to existing factory building and new car park accessed from Station Road (through existing station car park), together with associated landscaping, surfaces and low-level bollard lighting along Station Road – Granted conditionally

Consultations

15. Hope with Aston Parish Council: General comment

Carbolite is an established and significant employer in Hope, and as a Parish Council we strongly support its contribution to the local economy. In relation to the current application, we would like reassurances about the following issues:

1. *Carbolite requests a new infill extension replacing the proposed glazed walkway that gained permission in 2016. We argue that a full visibility assessment of the 674 sq m infill extension is needed. Windows in the infill extension and those proposed for the existing building on the north side will significantly alter visual impacts. The infill will also impact views of the site from the south. We would like to see improved landscaping to mitigate these impacts. We note that local residents are also concerned at the visual intrusion of the site.*
2. *The level of use of Station Road and the Network Rail car park has significantly changed since the original 2015 application. Many more railway passengers now cross the station car park on foot. We are concerned for the safety of these pedestrians in light of the proposals and note this issue was raised in comments relating to the original application, but that it was not fully addressed. The route through the site between Station Road and Parsons Lane has recently been proposed as a bridleway by DCC, Increased use of this route is likely to lead to further*

intermingling of traffic and users of the bridleway, We suggest mitigation measures are needed to enhance safety for pedestrians.

3. *We welcome the fact that cars will not be permitted to move between the Station Road car park and the works, and that access to the new car park will not be permitted from Parsons Lane. However, residents on Station Road are worried about loss of amenity from increased traffic. We are concerned that increased use of the station, along with the parking bays along the length of Station Rd up to the car park, established since the original permission, will create congestion when Carbolite shifts change and cars leave the new car park.*
4. *4. Residents are also worried about the proposed bollard lighting along the roadway in front of their houses on Station Road. This needs careful consideration. We are also concerned at any increases in lighting elsewhere on the site, because of potential negative impact on residents and the environment. The Parish Council would like the opportunity to comment on the detail of the lighting conditions when this is made available.*
5. *Clarity is needed regarding construction of the car park, the new infill and the new extension, to minimise risks for pedestrians and impacts on residents.*

16. Network Rail: No objection

17. Derbyshire County Council (Flood Management): No comments to make

18. Environment Agency: No formal comments to make

19. High Peak Borough Council Environmental Health Officer: No objection

The noise impact assessment submitted in support of the application may be accepted. Hilson Moran, "Noise Impact Assessment (ref: 37705-HML-XX-XX-RP-O-500001 ISSUE P02 FINAL), dated 8 September 2025.

The report concludes that the noise impact of the proposed development is low/negligible and as such additional acoustic mitigation is not required for the scheme. It's recommended that condition 5 may be discharged (subject to comments below).

Condition 5 contains three clauses that can be summarised:

1. *Submit noise assessment.*
2. *Mitigation agreed in writing*
3. *Agreed mitigation measures adopted within the development*

In hindsight it would be useful if there was an additional clause/condition limiting the noise from the site to specific sound level (dB LAeq) or "no increase above established background". Otherwise after the report is approved there appears to be no planning limit to noise the site can produce. If the LPA desire that long-term noise be considered an alternative may be for the applicant to submit a statement, for approval, supplementary to this report, formally stating "no increase above established background" as a form of long-term mitigation for loss of local residential amenity (noise).

An appropriate statement may be:

"As long-term mitigation it is proposed that the rating level of sound emitted from the development site (for the life of the development) shall not exceed background day or night time levels (as determined within Hilson Moran, "Noise Impact Assessment (ref: 37705-HML-XX-XX-RP-O-500001 ISSUE P02 FINAL), dated 8 September 2025). All measurements shall be made in accordance with the methodology of BS 4142:2014+A1:2019 "Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound" and/or its subsequent amendments. Where access to the nearest sound sensitive property is not possible, measurements shall be undertaken at an appropriate location and corrected to establish the noise levels at the nearest sound sensitive property.

20. Derbyshire County Council Highway Authority: Awaiting final comments – A verbal update will be given during the presentation.

21. High Peak Borough Council: No response to date

Representations

22. 9 representations were received during the determination of the application. 1 representation supported the proposal and 8 objected.

23. The reason for support was:

- The proposed parking would alleviate traffic exiting Parsons Lane and reduce wear and tear on the road surface.

24. The reasons for objection were:

- Increase in traffic along the single-tracked lane to the station compare which is already deteriorating significantly.
- Increase in traffic would have an impact on the residential amenity of properties fronting directly onto Station Road, with regard to noise, loss of privacy and transport movements;
- Concerns regarding the pollarding along section of Station Road;
- Requests that no vehicles access the factory complex from the new car park, and it is reserved only for pedestrian access;
- Situation has changed from the original 2015 application and now, with parking along Station Road and an increase in passenger numbers meaning there are more movements along that section of Station Road, creating additional congestion;
- Conflict between users of the railway station and employees using the extended car park;
- Impact of the development on wildlife through light pollution, particularly owls;
- Request additional planting on the northern boundary as it is currently thin and not evergreen, allowing views into the site from the north;
- Concern regarding loss of trees;
- Light pollution and loss of privacy from additional windows on the north facing elevation;
- Impact on dark skies as a special quality of the National Park;
- Impact of new car park on drainage, requesting permeable surface;
- Procedural concern regarding why the proposal has been submitted through a S73 application when they consider it to be a significant change;
- Change of private road to bridleway and impact of increased horse and cycle traffic;
- Change to Highway Code impacting feasibility of the access arrangement;
- Increased likelihood of cars parked close to the entrance of Station Road.

Main Policies

Relevant Core Strategy policies: DS1, GSP1, GSP3, L1, CC1, CC4, E2

Relevant Development Management Plan policies: DME7, DME8, DMC3

Statutory Framework

25. National Park designation is the highest level of landscape designation in the UK. The Environment Act 1995 sets out two statutory purposes for National Parks in England: to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage and promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of National Parks by the public. When they carry out these purposes they also have the duty to; seek to foster the economic and social well-being of local communities in National Parks.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

26. The NPPF is a material consideration and carries particular weight where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date. Paragraph 189 states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.
27. In the National Park, the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy (2011) and the Development Management Policies (DMP) (2019). The development plan provides a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. In this case, it is considered there are no significant conflicts between prevailing policies in the development plan and the NPPF.

Assessment

Principle of Development

28. The principle of the extending factory site was established under the approval of the original application NP/HPK/1015/0996. This original application was major development because it created over 1000m² of floorspace. This application seeks to amend the approved development incorporating a larger link extension.
29. A High Court decision in 2013 found that, for the purposes of planning policy, 'major development' should not have the same meaning as in the 2010 Order; rather it concluded that it should be considered in the context of the document it appears and that it is reasonable to apply the "normal meaning" of the words when interpreting the policies.
30. It is reasonable in this instance, therefore, to assess whether or not the development is major by reference to its impact on the National Park's valued characteristics as protected by planning policy. Officers consider that as an extension of a building that does not represent a change of use, does not extend the limits of the site, does not propose additional infrastructure, and does not lie within an area of ecological, historic, or archaeological designation, the development cannot reasonably be considered to be major in term of its likely impacts. That is not to say that its impacts could not still be significant within the context of the site itself – something that is assessed against planning policy in the following discussions – only that the restrictions placed on major development by national and local policy are not considered to apply to the proposal.
31. Policy DS1 outlines that in the open countryside, extensions to buildings are acceptable in principle. This is expanded upon in policy DME7 which states that outside of DS1 settlements, expansion of existing industrial and business development will only be permitted where:
- i) it is of a modest scale in relation to the existing activity and/or buildings; and
 - ii) the scale and type of development can be accommodated without adversely affecting the residential amenity and valued characteristics of the area or traffic safety and circulation;
 - iii) it does not adversely affect, and wherever possible, secures the enhancement of the site as well as the future management of the valued characteristics of the site and adjoining land; and

- iv) proper consideration has been given to the possibilities of conserving and enhancing landscape character by using, modifying or extending existing buildings.
32. Consideration to the impacts on residential amenity and valued characteristics from operating hours, lighting, and noise will also be given. Subject to the above therefore the principle of extension is acceptable.

Design and landscape

33. Core Strategy Policy L1 requires that development must conserve and enhance valued landscape character as identified in the Landscape Strategy Action Plan and other valued characteristics.
34. Development Management Policy DMC3 requires that 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. Particular attention is to be paid to the siting, scale, form, mass, levels, height and orientation in relation to existing buildings, settlement form and character, including impact on open spaces, landscape features and the wider landscape setting which contribute to the valued character and appearance of the area.
35. The changes to the proposed development include increasing the size of the previous extension to the 'link' between the two buildings, extending an additional 15m south. The extension would be mono-pitched, with the roof sloping from the front of the building, down towards the back where it would meet the existing link between the buildings.
36. The extension would be recessed significantly from the face of the adjacent buildings, approximately 6m from the western building and 12m from the eastern building. In addition, it would be set well-below the height of the adjacent buildings by approximately 4.3m.
37. Therefore, the proposed infill extension would be subservient in scale to the adjacent buildings. By virtue of its height and recess, it would still be seen as a link structure; albeit larger in scale. The materials and overall detailing of the proposed infill extension would match that of the adjacent buildings, featuring 'Vandyke brown' profile sheeted cladding.
38. Therefore, the proposed design of the infill extension is acceptable and in compliance with design policy DMC3.
39. The development site is in the valley farmland with villages landscape character type of the Derwent Valley. It should be noted that Carbolite is a relatively conspicuous site in the Derwent/Hope Valley by virtue of its size. Mitigating factors, such as the railway line and mature planting along its boundary go some way to minimising its impact; however, significant consideration needs to be given to whether any additional development on the site would further exacerbate its impact upon the landscape.
40. From the north, the impact of the infill extension needs consideration for views looking south from Aston, Parsons Lane and the right of way network in that area.
41. As the infill extension would be extended from the existing link, with its mono-pitch roof only extending modestly above the existing height of the structure, the potential for landscape harm is limited when viewed from the north. Representations have submitted photographs showing the visibility of the Carbolite site from the north showing the visibility of the site during the winter months when the trees are not in leaf.

42. These photographs show a complex which are at odds with the prevailing form and massing typically found in the National Park; however, they are existing features and that needs to be acknowledged. The pertinent consideration is not whether the existing complex is visible, it is whether the additional infill would constitute an unacceptable impact.
43. For the reasons explained above, it is concluded that the infill extension from the existing link would not have detrimental impact on the landscape. It would marginally increase the visibility and massing between the two structures; however, it would be a subservient feature in a well-established employment site and read clearly within the existing structures.
44. Representations have requested additional planting, but the pre-existing planting along the northern boundary is on the northern side of the Hope Valley railway land, outside of the control of the applicant. In any case, given the scale of change proposed between the existing link and proposed infill extension, the requirement for additional planting along the northern boundary would not be necessary to mitigate the impact of the development which would be minimal.
45. From the south, the complex is visible from Hope Road. Mature planting along its southern boundary assists in assimilating the site into the landscape; however, planting is fairly limited in front of the proposed infill extension. Whilst the infill extension would be a modest alteration, it would nevertheless increase its massing through increased height and prominence when seen from this location.
46. Therefore, it is recommended that additional tree planting is required in front of the extension. It is recommended this is secured through a planning condition which requires additional planting the first planting season following construction or first occupation.
47. Subject to the above, the proposed extension is considered to conserve the valued characteristics of the landscape.

Residential Amenity

48. As noted, there are several properties in close proximity to the development site, including properties along Station Road and off Parsons Lane.
49. This application has been supported by a Noise Impact Assessment which assesses the likely impact of both the extant eastern extension and the infill extension.
50. The Impact Assessment concluded that the noise impact of both the extant eastern extension, infill extension and wider noise generated from the site (such a forklift movements), that there would be no impact during the daytime or night-time at any of the identified sensitive receptors, and no mitigation is considered necessary.
51. With regard to building service plant noise emission, the precise specification of these have not been designed or provided. The Impact Assessment provided limits in accordance with criteria, and the building service plants shall be designed to achieve the specified limit.
52. The Environmental Health Officer has reviewed the assessment and has no objection. They have requested that measures be put in place to ensure that the noise limits do not exceed the specified criteria for the lifetime of the development. This has been recommended through a condition.
53. Therefore, the noise of the proposed development (individually and cumulatively) would not have an adverse impact on residential amenity.

54. This application does not propose any changes to the parking provision on the site. The previous application approved an additional car park off Hope Valley Railway Station car park for use in association with the site. The majority of site users would use the existing site entrance off Parsons Lane' however, provision for 32 additional bays on a grasscrete car park was approved. Users of this car park would park their vehicle in the car park and walk from the eastern end of the carpark to Station Road, and walk along the track to Carbolite.
55. The impact of the vehicle movements along Station Road to the approved carpark, and the foot traffic along Station Road from the carpark, in addition to the impact of lighting bollards in the car park and along Station Road (details secured by condition) on residential amenity were considered in the previous application. This proposal would not materially alter parking or lighting provision.
56. The proposed development would not harm the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. It is therefore in compliance with the relevant amenity criteria outlined in policies GSP3, DME7 and DME8.

Highways & Access

57. As noted, the previous application granted permission for 32 car parking spaces on a site to the east of Hope Railway Station car park, which would be accessed via Station Road and the existing car park. Servicing of the site would be from the main access onto Parsons Lane.
58. This application has been supported by a Technical Note based upon the original Transport Statement submitted with the original application.
59. The Technical Note clarifies a number of matters, including:
- The parking arrangement will remain unchanged, with staff and visitor parking provided from Station Road and servicing from Parsons Lane;
 - The modelled 'worse case' peak would remain as originally modelled, below 26 two-way movements in a single peak hour which is below the Department for Transport Guidance on Transport Assessment 30 two-way trips screening threshold. Therefore, no operational junction capacity modelling is required;
60. Therefore, the development now proposed would not result in any material change to transport or highway effects when measured against the approved baseline. There would be no change to the number of trips generated or the time of day in which they occur. No new mitigation, junction modelling, or off-site works are necessary.
61. The above assessment is based upon the logic that the proposed development is for operational purposes, the Technical Note stating that *current amendment is internal to the existing building complex and not introduce, re-site, or intensify any external vehicle or pedestrian access points.*
62. Officers accept that the proposed infill extension is to cover an existing area of operational land and would facilitate alterations to the internal layout of the factory, as opposed to providing a substantial expansion capable of employing additional staff. The extant number of car parking spaces is therefore accepted as suitable, as is the conclusion that it would not result in unacceptable vehicle movements during peak times.
63. On this basis, the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on highway safety, nor impact the local highway network and emerging junctions.

Flood risk

64. The development site is in Flood Zone 2 for fluvial flooding, in addition to an area of medium risk to surface water flooding. The application has therefore been supported by a Flood Risk Assessment which assessed the development against current flood risk modelling in addition to future climate change modelling.
65. As the proposed development is for a small infill extension to an existing site, it has been concluded that it should not be subject to the sequential assessment or exception test. However, it should still demonstrate that it is safe with regard to flood risk.
66. The existing courtyard area between the existing factory and office buildings is currently covered by hardstanding and is therefore wholly impermeable. The proposed extension to widen the existing link structure between the two buildings will result in no increase to the impermeable area on the site.
67. The run off from the existing impermeable areas is currently attenuated underground attenuation tanks on the site. As the courtyard area is previously developed and there would be no increase in impermeable area, the proposed development would maintain runoff rates and volumes at existing conditions.
68. In addition, the Flood Risk Assessment identified a safe access and egress route for the development, in addition to a number of flood resilience measures which would be incorporated into the development.
69. The Lead Local Flood Authority and Environment Agency have been consulted on the above application and resolved to make no comments.
70. Therefore, subject to the development being carried out in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment, the development is considered to be acceptable with regard to flood risk. It is therefore in compliance with policy CC4 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other matters

71. Given the scale of development, it is recognised that the proposed infill extension would not exacerbate the impact of the development as a whole on ecology and biodiversity. Therefore, the mitigation and enhancement measures required through the the original application are considered commensurate and appropriate to the increase in development proposed through this application.
72. The application is exempt from statutory Biodiversity Net Gain requirements.

Conclusion

73. This application seeks planning permission for an amendment to planning permission NP/HPK/1015/0996 for a small infill extension between the existing buildings on site. Having considered the scale and design of the proposed amendment, it has been concluded that subject to conditions, it would not have a detrimental impact on the valued landscape character, residential amenity, highway safety, flood risk or ecological value of the site. Consideration has been given to the cumulative impact of the proposed amendment and the extant permission.
74. It is therefore considered to be in compliance with policy DME7 and all other relevant policies of the development plan.
75. It is recommended for conditional approval on this basis.

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