

9. FULL APPLICATION – CHANGE OF USE AND ALTERATIONS AND EXTENSION OF EXISTING BARN TO FORM DWELLING AT BARN, CHURCH LANE, TIDESWELL (NP/DDD/0326/0281), HF)

APPLICANT: MR DANNY HOPKINS

Summary

1. This application seeks change of use, alterations and extension to a roadside barn on Church Lane, Tideswell, within the Conservation Area. The barn is considered a non-designated asset, albeit works have been carried out which have harmed its character.
2. Planning permission was granted for the barn's conversion in 2015 and required works to be undertaken entirely within the barn's existing shell, except for those areas shown to be re-constructed. However, works carried out involved re-construction beyond that permission. A new application is therefore submitted, and includes for further extension.
3. The extensions and alteration of the barn and associated works are considered to harm the character and appearance of the barn and Conservation Area. The development would not achieve the conservation or enhancement of a non-designated heritage asset, and would therefore not meet one of the exceptions for new housing in the National Park.
4. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

Site and Surroundings

5. The application relates to a barn formed of limestone with pitched roof, on the south west edge of Church Lane, on the edge of Tideswell and within Tideswell Conservation Area.
6. The building has been subject to construction works following the grant of planning permission for its conversion in 2015. The extent of reconstruction is considered to have gone beyond the existing permission, including re-building of parts of the external walls and raising of eaves, ridge and roof pitch. Changes to boundary walls have also occurred.
7. Prior to works commencing, the barn had a gritstone roof, lean-to on its north east elevation and single storey off-shot. The nearest dwellings are on Chantry Lane to the north of Church Lane, and north west on Church Lane. Allotments are to the north east.
8. The sites is within the catchment of the Unit 70 and 71 of the Wye Valley Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), a component of the Peak District Dales Special Area of Conservation (SAC), a European protected site which is in unfavourable condition.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. **The proposed dwelling does not achieve the conservation and / or enhancement of a non-designated heritage asset, and it does not meet any other exception for new housing in the National Park, contrary to Core Strategy Policy HC1 and Development Management Policy DMC10.**
2. **The proposed development would have an unacceptable design and would result in harm to the character and appearance of the non-designated barn and Tideswell Conservation Area. The harm to the Conservation Area would be less than substantial but would not be outweighed by any public benefits, and harm to the non-designated barn is not outweighed as part of the planning balance. The development is therefore contrary to Core Strategy Policies GSP1, GSP3, L1 and L3, Development Management Policies DMC3, DMC5 and DMC8 and the NPPF.**

Key Issues

9. Whether the proposed dwelling is required to achieve the conservation and / or enhancement of a non-designated asset.
10. Whether the development is acceptable in relation to impact on character and appearance of the building, Conservation Area and landscape, and impact on neighbouring amenity, highway safety and ecology.

History

11. NP/DDD/0915/0863: Conversion of redundant agricultural barn to form dwelling – Granted conditionally 13th November 2015.
12. Planning conditions included that the conversion was to be carried out within the shell of the building, with any rebuilding limited to that specifically shown on the approved plan.
13. NP/DDD/0820/0726: Change of use and alterations and extension of existing barn to form dwelling – Withdrawn.
14. 21/0051: An enforcement case was opened on the site as the works to the building had gone beyond what was permitted by the 2015 planning permission.
15. Following a meeting in July 2024, the view from the Authority was that the extent of works carried out went beyond the 2015 permission as they included substantial re-building and construction of extensions significantly larger than the approved dimensions.
16. NP/DDD/0824/0896: Change of use and alterations and extension of barn to form dwelling – Refused at planning committee October 2025 as the proposal did not achieve conservation or enhancement of a non-designated asset, and resulted in harm to a non-designated asset and Conservation Area, not outweighed by material considerations or public benefits. A recommended reason for refusal on highways grounds was dismissed.

Consultations

17. Derbyshire County Council (Highways): Recommend deferral pending additional information. A visibility splay of 2.4m set back from highway edge and 215m in either direction along carriageway is required for a 60mph speed limit. The visibility splay drawing shows sight lines of 20.5m to the south and 44m to the north. The splays are commensurate with speeds of 20mph south and 30mph north. A speed survey should be undertaken if it is considered vehicle speeds on Church Lane are lower than 60mph, to demonstrate reduced vehicle speed within the 85th percentile. Moving the access slightly further north would improve visibility to the south by avoiding the building wall.

A minimum of two off street parking spaces are required. The parking space shown in the garage is discounted as garages are often used for storage. The drawing should be updated to show two parking spaces with swept path analysis to show vehicles can exit in forward gear. The dwelling is an intensification of use of the site. No details provided on sustainable modes of travel. There are no footways on Church Lane.

18. Derbyshire Dales District Council (Planning): No response received to date.
19. Natural England: The proposal can be considered under Natural England standing advice and flowcharts and likely significant effects can be ruled out. Comments regarding the mains network provided as general advice.
20. Peak District National Park Authority Archaeology: There have been changes to the wall south west of the barn, which formed the edge of a long thin field of historic importance

because it formed the boundary of field that fossilised the arrangement of part of the medieval field system of Tideswell. The proposals extend the barn curtilage and change the alignment of this historically significant boundary. This would result in minor harm to the fossilised medieval field system (a non-designated heritage asset with historic interest and intrinsic landscape value) of regional significance. Harm needs to be taken into account and a balanced planning decision reached in line with NPPF para. 216.

No heritage statement has been submitted. The extent of rebuilding has been clarified. When the conversion was approved in 2015 the building was a traditional farm building, and a non-designated heritage asset. The extent of rebuilding demonstrates how much of the building's original external elevations are left and how the plan form has been altered. From an archaeological perspective this has become a rebuild on the site of a former historic barn and not a conversion of a heritage asset. A planning opinion needs to be made on what policies apply here, whether it is considered as a conversion. From a heritage perspective the scheme cannot be considered to conserve a heritage asset.

21. Peak District National Park Authority Ecology: The site was visited by the Authority's ecologist in 2025 following which they were satisfied further ecology surveys were not necessary. However, a precautionary approach continues to be advised during works.

The barn has negligible potential for roosting bats due to water ingress and limited crevices, cracks and missing stones and mortar. There are nesting bird opportunities with swallow previously recorded. The nearby pond was unsuitable for amphibians. Rubble piles could provide refugia for amphibians or reptiles. A trench poses a risk to animals.

Pre-commencement condition recommended for Wildlife Mitigation and Enhancement Scheme with details of replacement and additional bat roost provision and specifications and methods for incorporation into the building fabric. Details of bat friendly lighting, bird nesting provision, wildlife friendly planting with other enhancements also recommended. Precautionary working measures for protected species, nesting birds, covering or provision of escape ramps for excavations of trenches overnight, and care when moving rubble piles advised.

22. Tideswell Parish Council: The development is appropriate for the plot and in keeping with local character and will allow a local family to have a family home. It will allow for green energy solutions such as solar. The PC strongly support this application.

Representations

23. One representation received. Support for conclusion of the project as a dwelling, but raises two factors which may affect the neighbouring property:

- Potential impact on Cliffe House (with cellars, constructed on bedrock) downhill on Church Lane from drainage of the waste water / septic. Unclear what assessment has been made for path of liquids from the infiltration bed.
- Closing 2 of 3 accesses to fields behind barn may increase use of remaining narrower access below retaining wall and adjacent Cliffe House, a new access on Church Lane or widening of remaining access. A dew pond would be affected.
- Barn and fields have same, or similar, ownership. Curtilage should combine barn and wider land to capture access and potential permitted development rights.

Main Policies

24. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, L1, L2, L3, HC1, CC1
25. Relevant Development Management Plan policies: DMC3, DMC5, DMC8, DMC10, DMC11, DMC12, DMT3, DMT8

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

26. 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.
27. 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.
28. 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.

Relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance

Conversion of Historic Buildings SPD
Building Design Guide
Alterations & Extensions SPD
Historic Farmsteads Guidance

Assessment

Principle of development

29. Policy DS1 permits housing in settlements and the countryside through conversion of traditional buildings. Policy HC1 confirms provision will not be made for housing solely to meet open market demand. Exceptionally, new housing (whether newly built or from re-use of existing buildings) can be accepted where:
 - C. In accordance with core policies GSP1 and GSP2:
 - I. it is required to achieve conservation and / or enhancement of valued vernacular; or
 - II. it is required to achieve conservation or enhancement in settlements listed in DS1.
30. DMC10.A confirms conversion of a heritage asset will be permitted if it can accommodate the new use without changes that adversely affect its character (such as enlargement or other alterations) and which conserve or enhance the asset significance and setting.
31. DMC10.B confirms proposals under HC1.C(I) will only be permitted where the building is a designated heritage asset or non-designated asset, and where it can be demonstrated that conversion to a market dwelling is required to achieve the conservation and, where appropriate, enhancement of the significance of the asset and contribution of its setting.
32. In approving the application to convert the barn in 2015, the Authority concluded the barn was a non-designated heritage asset and worthy of conversion.
33. Works have been carried out to the barn between that permission and current application, including reconstruction of the lean-to on the north east elevation and of the original gable wall above, and part of the south west elevation. Ventilation holes have been blocked up, the eaves and ridge raised and lintel to south west elevation door replaced. Works have also been carried out to the drystone wall west of the barn.

34. The development that has been carried out is, as a matter of fact, a different one to that approved in 2015 and is therefore subject of a fresh application.
35. The Authority's Senior Archaeologist raises concerns that the application has not been supported by a Heritage Statement to establish the significance of the barn and the impact of the works carried out to date and whether the barn is still of significance. They also raise concern the extent of re-building is not conservation of a heritage asset, and is instead a re-build, with a planning judgement required on how to treat the proposal.
36. Whilst officers agree the extent of re-building is undesirable, it is considered sufficient extent of the frontage wall remains, and it was accepted at the October 2025 committee that the building retained sufficient value to warrant its conversion. However, the scope of alterations undertaken and whether they conserve the barn need to be considered.
37. The impact of the works undertaken and proposed, and how they impact the significance of the barn, is addressed further below. It is therefore necessary to establish if the proposed conversion, alterations and extensions (part retrospective) are necessary to achieve the conservation and / or enhancement of a non-designated heritage asset under Policy HC1.C(i) and whether they comply with DMC10 and other policies.

Impact on Character and Appearance

38. Permission is sought for a replacement lean-to and reconstruction of the south east elevation, reconstruction of parts of the north west elevation, parts of the rear elevation, the raising of the ridge and eaves, change to roof pitch and re-alignment of drystone wall (part retrospective). Permission is also sought for a 1.5 storey extension on the rear elevation and creation of a new access west of the barn.
39. The below considers if the development conserves and / or enhances the character and appearance of the barn, Conservation Area, and the surrounding landscape. In doing so, regard is had to policies GSP1, GSP3, L1, L3, HC1, DMC3, DMC5, DMC8 and DMC10.

Reconstruction of Barn Walls and Changes to Roof

40. The original permission allowed for reconstruction of the roof structure and re-cladding with existing stone tiles. However, as with the application that was refused in October 2025, the proposed plans show the barn's ridge height has increased from around 5.7m to 7.3m (on north west elevation). The roof pitch is now steeper.
41. 3.11 of the Alterations & Extensions SPD states that: "*Raising the eaves and/or the ridge to increase head height is generally unacceptable*". Principle 2 of the Conversions SPD states development should work with the existing form and character. 5.8 states most farm buildings are generally simple and functional in form. 5.13 states existing features may impose constraints on a conversion's design, such as restricted headroom and that allowing the existing building form to influence the design may require creative thinking. 5.14 states schemes should work within the shell of the existing building and "*where room heights are low, for example, first floor rooms can be partly contained within the roof space as an increase in eaves or roof heights may change the character of the building*".
42. Page 19 of the Building Design Guide states the overall shape of traditional buildings is horizontal and ground-hugging. Page 40 states in reference to barn conversions that: "*It is best to work within the existing shell of the building and avoid extending upwards or outwards. Where room heights are low it is better, and cheaper, to use part of the roofspace for the first floor rooms rather than increase the height of the walls.*"
43. As concluded under the officer report for the October 2025 refusal, the raising of the eaves and ridge and change to roof pitch is contrary to the Alterations & Extensions SPD, Conversions SPD and the Building Design Guide. The alteration has visually changed

the barn by creating a more vertical form, rather than traditional horizontal. The gap between first floor window lintels and eaves emphasises this and the roof pitch is visibly steeper and more domestic. The alteration is unacceptable and harms the form and architectural interest of the barn.

44. The case in the applicant's Planning Statement that the height increase is typical of re-roofing is recognised, however officers respectfully disagree and consider the height increase goes beyond an acceptable level, as outlined above, resulting in changes to the building's character which the Conversions SPD warns against.
45. The reconstruction of the external walls includes reconstruction of part of the north west elevation, parts of the rear elevation, and all of the south east elevation including lean-to. The front elevation has been retained although ventilation holes have been filled in.
46. The reconstruction of the walls, whilst regrettable and beyond the scope of the original permission, is not considered to result in particular harm with the exception of the infilling of ventilation holes which has eroded part of the barn's character and evidence of its historic use. The changes that have arisen as part of the general reconstruction of walls, including raising of eaves, and elements of the reconstructed lean-to, do result in harm.

Proposed Extensions

47. The lean-to on the south east elevation appears to have been replaced from the original structure as part of works that have commenced. The form of the lean-to has a footprint similar to the original structure. However, the form is different as the original structure included a lean-to that generally reflected the width of the gable which it attaches to with a small rear projection which was mono-pitched and, whilst unsympathetic in form, less conspicuous due to its height. The lean-to approved in 2015 reflected the gable width.
48. The lean-to on the south east elevation now proposed has a footprint akin to the 2015 permission, extending the length of the north west gable. It is 0.3m taller than the original lean-to, however the general form and length now proposed is overall considered to be acceptable as it does not interrupt the original shape and solidity of the barn.
49. The extension to the rear is a single storey gable projection. It is understood the increased scale over the 2015 approval is due to a desire for additional internal living accommodation, larger bedrooms and to provide a garage.
50. The original form of the barn appeared typical of a field barn, which the Historic Farmsteads guidance describes as single buildings within or on the edge of a field away from the main farmstead, and a highly significant feature of the Peak District, combining with the intricate patterns of dry stone walling and hay meadows to form an integral and distinctive part of its landscape.
51. Principle 2 of the Conversions SPD, with 5.14 stating "*Schemes should work within the shell of the existing building, avoiding additions or extensions*".
52. If the barn is not capable of accommodating the desired level of living space without inappropriate extension, then general conservation principles indicate the building is not suitable for conversion for the intended type of development.
53. The Building Design Guide confirms at page 40 in relation to barn conversions that: "*the form of the building must be kept simple. Where extensions are unavoidable, for instance to house a car, they should be as unobtrusive as possible. Quite often barns were extended by means of a lean-to at the rear or side. This is sometimes a good pattern to follow. Small projections such as porches tend to confuse the simple basic form. They are too domestic in appearance.*"

54. Officers consider the building was capable of being converted within its shell and without the need for further extensions, as demonstrated by the 2015 permission which provided a 3-bedroom property with ample living space and small, simple lean-to extensions.
55. The proposed extension remains a large addition to the barn and in officers view is domestic in appearance, not reflective of the form and character of what is likely to have been a historic field barn, whereas referenced above an addition to the barn would likely be in the form of a side or rear lean-to.
56. Whilst it is appreciated the applicant has reduced the rear extension from the previous refusal, the scale and form of the extension remains unacceptable. It domesticates and complicates the appearance of a simple barn, whilst the long rear projection detracts from the barn's form, creating a sprawling development into the agricultural landscape.
57. The high eaves of the rear extension (sought to achieve a third bedroom and larger bedrooms within the main barn) are at odds with the side lean-to, meaning on what should be a simple agricultural barn, there are three different heights of ridge and eaves. There are also concerns with the detailing, with the rooflights not aligned over the windows (as per 2.10 of the Alterations & Extensions SPD) and detailing on the south east elevation including the door creating a domestic appearance.
58. The rear extension is too large and inappropriate in form and height. It harms the simple form and agricultural character of the barn, which originally formed a distinctive feature in the National Park landscape. It conflicts with the Building Design Guide and Conversions SPD, along with general design, landscape and heritage policies.

Changes to Boundary Wall

59. Physical works have been carried out to re-construct the drystone wall west of the barn. The wall is understood to have formed one edge of a linear medieval strip field, a historic form of landscape which contributes to the Conservation Area and its setting.
60. The wall has been partly re-constructed and alters the historic linear form of the strip field, which is narrower as it nears Church Lane. More space has been created around the barn, changing its immediate curtilage and relationship with the landscape, although in the absence of a Heritage Statement the precise relationship is not clear.
61. Notwithstanding the lack of a Heritage Statement, due to the clear change that would arise to what is an established form of historic field pattern in the Peak District, it is considered the change in the alignment of the wall results in less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and setting of the barn. Similar harm would also arise from the setting back of the roadside wall to facilitate the access.

Summary

62. The proposed alterations and extensions harm the character and appearance of the barn. The re-alignment of the wall to the west is also considered to harm the setting of the barn. Harm also arises towards the Conservation Area. For clarity, the applicant has confirmed they do not wish to reduce the scale of development proposed any further.

Highways

63. The Highways Authority advise the application is deferred pending additional information, as the visibility splays of 20.5m south east and 44m north west are below the Manual for Streets requirement for 215m in either direction on a 60mph road (and are reflective of speed limits in 20mph or 30mph areas). Highways advise that if it is considered speed limits are lower along Church Lane, this should be demonstrated by a speed survey.

64. The proposed vehicular access relocates the access approved with the 2015 application from the south east of the barn, to the north west. The visibility splays provided with this application match that of the 2015 application albeit the length of splay looking south east and north west has switched as the access is on the opposite side of the barn.
65. The applicant seeks to relocate the access to improve visibility over the access approved in 2015. That access was found to be acceptable by Highways, and it is noted the nature of Church Lane is single track and has been observed by officers to be generally quiet and largely used by pedestrians.
66. Notwithstanding this, the Highways Authority have assessed this application on its merits and consider the information available is not sufficient to determine if the access is suitable. They also consider the proposal represents an intensification of use with associated increase in vehicle movements.
67. Whilst officers recognise the Highways Authority comments, the same matter was raised during the October 2025 application and whilst Highways had not requested a speed survey at the time, members regarded the 2015 permission as an important consideration and considered the new access should not form a reason for refusal on highway safety grounds. The application was therefore not refused on that basis.
68. The determination of an application with the same intensity of use and vehicular access in October 2025 is considered by officers to be a significant material consideration, and the application is therefore not recommended for refusal on highways grounds. Members should however have careful regard to the matters raised by the Highways Authority.
69. In respect of car parking, the Highways Authority have requested a layout showing two parking spaces outside of the garage and swept path analysis to show vehicles can exit in forward gear. It is however noted the parking arrangement is similar to the previous scheme which was accepted on highways grounds and is a material consideration.
70. Whilst Highways indicate a garage parking space cannot be counted, the Development Management Policies Appendix 9 states in the case of dwellinghouses the provision of space within a garage of a minimum internal space of 5m x 2.5m shall be deemed to be equivalent of a parking space. Officers therefore do not consider there to be reasonable grounds to not count the garage parking space based on the development plan and material considerations. If necessary, a condition could require the garage to remain available for parking at all times. There appears space for one parking space in the yard.
71. Based on the above and material considerations, the application is not recommended for refusal in respect of highway safety, Policy DMT3 and NPPF paragraphs 115 and 116.

Ecology

72. The Authority's ecologist has advised based on the site conditions, that no further ecology surveys are necessary to inform the application. However, a precautionary approach is necessary during works.
73. A Wildlife Mitigation and Enhancement Scheme is required prior to development commencing (or in this case continuing). This should detail precautionary working measures around protected species and pre-work checks. Enhancement measures include replacement and additional bat roosts, bat friendly lighting, bird nesting provision and appropriate planting. The development is considered acceptable with regard to wildlife and protected species subject to a condition to secure the above.
74. The site is within the catchment of the Unit 70 and 71 of the Wye Valley Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), a component of the Special Area of Conservation (SAC) where development is required to demonstrate nutrient neutrality.

75. The application includes for a package treatment plant (PTP) and associated drainage field / mound, with accompanying report demonstrating those features are acceptable. Provision of the PTP and drainage field prior to occupation of the dwelling and its retention for the lifetime of the development could be secured by planning condition.
76. In line with Natural England's Standing Advice 2022, where a drainage field complies with the advice, a likely significant effect on site integrity can be ruled out as insignificant levels of phosphorus from the development would discharge to the site. Natural England have confirmed the Authority can assess this scheme under that advice. It is concluded the development would not have a significant impact on nearby designated sites, as confirmed by a Habitat Regulation Assessment screening report undertaken by officers.
77. Subject to the above conditions, the development complies with L2, DMC11 and DMC12.

Amenity

78. The site is opposite 43 Chantry Lane, a single storey dwelling. The rear wall no.43 includes two habitable rooms at a distance of between 11m and 16m from the barn's front wall. The two first floor bedroom windows would have clear views into the habitable rooms and into the rear garden of no.43, raising overlooking and privacy concerns.
79. It was concluded under the 2015 application that provided the first floor bedroom windows were obscured and fixed frame, this would prevent overlooking whilst allowing daylight into first floor rooms. The latest drawings confirm the first floor windows on the front elevation will be obscure glazed. A condition requiring the windows to be fixed and obscure glazed prior to first use of the dwelling would conserve neighbouring amenity.
80. It is not considered the development would have any other impacts upon neighbouring amenity given the distance and orientation of buildings, and nature of the proposed use.
81. A representation raises concern over the closure of accesses for farm vehicles on to the wider land holding, which may increase vehicles using the access further north west on Church Lane adjacent Cliffe House, and which may be accompanied with works to widen the access, with this also potentially also impacting a dew pond. As there is already an access capable of being used adjacent Cliffe House with no restriction on frequency of use, and no proposal present for widening, it is difficult to give weight to those matters.
82. It may however be beneficial to the applicant to retain a wider access to the field. There is an existing gated access east of the barn which could be retained, although this would need to be subject to a condition or amendment on the plan.

Other Matters

83. Regarding the proposed drainage field and concern regarding run-off impact on Cliffe House, further west and downhill of the site, officers consider run-off is likely to be acceptable provided drainage is installed correctly in line with relevant standards and regulations. The Nutrient Neutrality Assessment report states percolation testing has revealed a rate of 25.9 Vp (percolation value) and that Building Regulations states drainage fields should only be used where percolation tests indicate area values of Vp of between 12 and 100.
84. As the evidence submitted appears to suggest good percolation rates to ground compliant with Building Regulations, officers consider it unlikely the proposed drainage field would result in drainage issues for neighbouring properties, particularly given the distance. A condition requiring drainage to be maintained for the lifetime of development would be necessary to ensure the system continues to operate effectively.

85. Provision of sustainable energy measures as endorsed by the Parish Council should be provided in accordance with Policy CC1. Whilst solar panels are discounted by the applicant due to site constraints, it is unclear if other measures such as air source heat pump could be explored. Provision of a scheme of details could be conditioned.
86. It is not considered necessary to alter the curtilage of the proposal, as a wider curtilage would be inappropriate in terms of character and appearance. The Site Location Plan is appropriately scaled and shows wider land ownership.

Planning Balance

87. In weighing the public benefits of the proposals against the less than substantial harm arising towards the Conservation Area, considerable importance and weight are afforded to the desirability of preserving the Conservation Area, having regard to the duty required under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
88. The conservation and enhancement of cultural heritage in National Parks should also be given *great weight*, whilst the landscape and scenic beauty of the National Park has the *highest status of protection* in relation to these issues (paragraph 189 of the NPPF).
89. *Great weight* is also afforded to the conservation of a designated heritage asset (the Conservation Area) by paragraph 212 of the NPPF.
90. It is recognised the development would result in the creation of a market dwelling and the submission states this would be for a local person. The Parish Council have strongly supported the application as the development would provide a home for a local family.
91. However, HC1 is clear that provision will not be made for housing solely to meet open market demand in the National Park, with the exceptions to new housing being where development achieves the conservation of a heritage asset. In this case, it is concluded the development would harm, rather than conserve, a heritage asset and would not meet that exception. The English National Parks and the Broads: UK Government Vision and Circular 2010 is clear that National Parks are not suitable locations for unrestricted housing and do not provide general housing targets for those areas.
92. It has also been demonstrated under the 2015 permission that the barn is capable of conversion to a 3-bedroom dwelling with sufficient living space for a future occupant, with conversion capable of being achieved in a manner sensitive to the character of the barn.
93. The application is not made on the basis of being a local affordable needs dwelling, nor would the scale of development be compliant with policies for affordable housing. In any case, policies for conservation would still apply to such an application.
94. Taking the above into account, the benefits associated with the provision of a market dwelling are afforded limited weight. The suggested benefits associated with re-building of the boundary wall (due to required repairs) are noted, however officers do not consider any need for repair negates or requires the change in alignment of the wall from what is a historic field alignment, or that this outweighs the cumulative harm arising.
95. Notwithstanding the case put forward by the applicant's submission, Officers do not consider there to be sufficient public benefits weighing favour of the proposals.
96. Having regard to DMC5 and paragraph 215 of the NPPF, the less than substantial harm arising towards the Conservation Area as a result of the extension and alteration of a non-designated asset within the Conservation Area, and changes to the historic field boundary, are not considered to be outweighed by the public benefits of the development.

97. Addressing the harm to the non-designated barn and field walls as part of the wider planning balance, as required by DMC5 and paragraph 216 of the NPPF, it is similarly considered the benefits in respect of conversion and repair would not outweigh the harm arising towards the character and appearance of the site and Conservation Area.

Conclusion

98. The proposed conversion of the non-designated barn with associated extensions and alterations would harm the traditional form and character of the building, its setting and the character and appearance of Tideswell Conservation Area. It is therefore not considered the proposed dwelling would achieve the conservation of a non-designated heritage asset, contrary to the exception to new market housing under HC1.C.
99. In addition, the conversion as a whole would not conserve or enhance the non-designated barn, Conservation Area or landscape setting, contrary to Policies GSP1, GSP3, L1, L3, DMC3, DMC5, DMC8 and DMC10, and paragraph 189 of the NPPF.
100. The less than substantial harm arising towards the Conservation Area is not considered to be outweighed by any of the identified public benefits of the development, and harm to the non-designated asset is not outweighed as part of the wider planning balance, contrary to Policy DMC5 and NPPF paragraphs 215 and 216.
101. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

Human Rights

102. 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: Hannah Freer, Senior Planner