

15. FULL APPLICATION – DEMOLITION OF FARMHOUSE AND ERECTION OF REPLACEMENT DWELLINGHOUSE; DEMOLITION AND REBUILDING OF STABLES TO FORM ADDITIONAL LIVING ACCOMMODATION; ERECTION OF STABLE BUILDINGS AND GARAGING AT BLEAKLOW FARM, HASSOP (NP/DDD/1115/1053, P4718, 421762 373510, 06/11/15/KW)

APPLICANT: MR PETER HUNT

Site and Surroundings

Bleaklow Farm is a vacant farmstead situated in an isolated hilltop position close to the ridge of Longstone Edge, 900m north of Rowland hamlet. The farmstead is situated in a slight hollow and is bounded to its north, east and west sides by mature tree plantations. Although it is situated in a remote and isolated position it is not unduly prominent in the wider landscape, but is visible from a public footpath which passes directly through the farmstead.

The farmstead originally comprised a derelict farmhouse with adjacent outbuildings to the west and north sides, forming a courtyard. There is a further detached traditional outbuilding to the north of the farmhouse and formerly to the north of the courtyard buildings was a dilapidated range of modern farm buildings.

The former farmhouse was vacant and in a poor structural condition and appearance and had been the subject of inappropriate additions, including a 16.7m long x 4.5m wide single-storey extension attached to its western side. The building forming the western end of the courtyard complex is a traditional single-storey stable building which was showing signs of deterioration with visible structural cracks in the external walls. The building forming the northern side of the courtyard complex is an attractive, traditional two-storey barn of some architectural merit and is in a good structural condition. The openings to this barn are provided with attractive dressed surrounds and quoinwork. Some of these dressed surrounds have recently been replaced with matching stonework to match exactly the original. This barn is clad with a corrugated sheet roof. The detached traditional outbuilding to the north of the courtyard complex is of some architectural interest with attractive opening surrounds and detailing. This is clad with a corrugated sheet roof.

Consent was granted in June 2014 for the demolition of the existing farmhouse and erection of a replacement farmhouse of a larger, but similar size and character to the original farmhouse. The approved scheme included the replacement of the single-storey extension with a contemporary extension, part rebuilding of the stable building at the western end of the courtyard, and the erection of a secondary courtyard of buildings behind the main building courtyard to accommodate stabling and garaging.

The applicant then began constructing the replacement dwelling, which has been constructed up to first floor level. However, following an officer site inspection it was subsequently discovered that the replacement dwelling was being constructed to significantly larger dimensions than that given approval, and other unauthorised design changes had been made to the scheme.

A meeting was held with the applicant and agent and they were advised by officers that the unauthorised changes to the size and design of the dwelling were unacceptable. Rather than revert to the originally approved scheme, the applicant has chosen to submit this retrospective planning application to build the replacement dwelling to the larger dimensions and amended design, as presently constructed.

The originally submitted scheme also included the upgrading of the southern access track to the farm complex. This was the source of local concerns, including Rowland parish meeting. These issues were discussed in detail as part of the previous planning application, and the upgrading works were approved, subject to conditions to prevent the stabling element of the scheme

becoming a commercial stables.

There are, therefore, two vehicle accesses presently serving the complex. There is an improved access to the north of the complex off the Longstone Edge road. The second access track is to the south of the complex and passes through several fields and alongside a disused quarry to the south-east before meeting the single-track lane, which then passes through Rowland. This 600m length of access track was recently upgraded by the applicant, who resurfaced it with compacted limestone chippings.

Proposals

Retrospective planning is being sought for the same elements of the scheme that were previously approved, but with an amended size/design for the main farmhouse and an amended design for the rear porch building. The other elements, i.e. the contemporary extension, part rebuilding of the western stable building and the creation of the secondary rear stabling/garaging courtyard largely stay the same as previously approved, although there are some nominal increases in the dimensions and the window opening sizes in the rear two-storey extension and an additional first floor window added.

The farmhouse as originally approved was detailed on the lines of the existing farmhouse having a double-fronted symmetrical frontage form with a two-storey rear projecting wing extension. The overall massing and footprint was slightly larger than the present farmhouse.

In this amended scheme the design concept remains that of a double-fronted symmetrical frontage form, with a rear projecting, two-storey gabled extension however, the size of the main farmhouse element has been significantly increased. Some of the design elements have also been changed. The main differences in dimensions and design from that originally approved are as follows:

Original Farmhouse	Originally Approved Scheme	As Built
Main frontage length ~ 9.0m	Main frontage length ~ 11.4m	Main frontage length ~ 13.2m
Gable width ~ 4.8m	Gable width ~ 6.5m	Gable width ~ 7.5m
Footprint ~ 198.4m ²	Footprint ~ 233.72m ² (17%)	Footprint ~ 263.0m ² (32.5%)
Volume ~ 638.0m ³	Volume ~ 1060.0m ³ (66%)	Volume ~ 1325.57m ³ (107%)
	3.4 x 3.0m rear lean-to porch.	5.3m x 5.3m (max. dimensions) multi-splayed rear porch.
	Single sash window openings to main frontage elevation.	Twin sash window openings to main frontage elevation.

The scheme also involves the erection of a substantial range of single-storey stables and garaging in the area to the north of the courtyard complex currently occupied by a dilapidated range of modern farm buildings. The stabling/garaging block is arranged in an 'L' plan form which links in with the existing traditional barns creating a further courtyard of buildings behind the main farmstead courtyard complex. The external dimensions of the external 'L' plan arrangement measure 26.3m x 28.3m. The gable widths of the stables/garages are 5.0m/5.75m respectively. This provides stabling for four horses with associated tack/feed/storage buildings and garaging for four vehicles. The garaging takes the form of open-fronted car ports. The buildings are to be clad with roughly coursed natural limestone.

The former walled dewpond which is situated immediately adjacent to the north-east side of the farmhouse is to be reinstated.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed replacement dwelling would be significantly larger than the original farmhouse, and would be of an inappropriate design, character, form, massing and detailing that would be more intrusive in the immediate locality when viewed from the adjacent public footpath. Consequently, the current proposal would reflect the character and appearance the original farmhouse and its setting and would not provide the overall enhancement to both the appearance of the original dwelling site and its setting as was achieved in the previously approved scheme in 2014. The proposed scheme would therefore be contrary to Core strategy policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3 and L1, and Local plan policies LC4 and LH5, as well as guidance in the Framework.**
- 2. An appropriate scheme for the replacement farmhouse has previously been approved and, consequently, there is insufficient justification for the increase in its size, form, massing and design changes as now proposed. In the absence of an overriding justification for the proposal as amended, the current proposal would not represent a sustainable pattern of development, and would be contrary to the principles of good design and sustainable development set out in the Authority's Core strategy policies GSP1, GSP3, DS1 and L1, and saved Local plan policies LC4 and LH5, and in national planning policies in the Framework.**

Key Issues

1. Whether the principle of the proposed replacement dwelling complies with Local Plan policy LH5.
2. Whether the proposed dwelling is of a similar size to the dwelling it will replace (LH5 criterion iii).
3. Landscape and visual impact and design.
4. Impact on neighbours.
5. Environmental Management.
6. Ecological Issues.
7. Access and Parking.

History

August 2013 – Full planning application submitted for the demolition of the farmhouse and erection of a replacement dwelling, which proposed the same size, massing and footprint of buildings as now being proposed, with the exception of a proposed two-storey side extension on the eastern end of the rebuild farmhouse.

The application was subsequently withdrawn by the applicant following concerns raised about the size and massing of the rebuilt farmhouse, and the excessive use of glazing in the single-storey extension attached to the western side of the dwelling. Following the withdrawal of this application, further discussions were held with the Authority's officers, including the Authority's Historic Buildings Architect, culminating in the submission of a revised proposal.

June 2014 – Full planning consent for the replacement farmhouse, demolition and rebuilding of stables to form additional living accommodation, erection of stable buildings and garaging.

August 2015 – Application for discharge of several conditions on the June 2014 approval. This confirmed that condition 1 could not be discharged as the development as partially built had not been lawfully implemented in accordance with the approved plans. The applicant was also reminded that many of the conditions being sought for discharge should have been discharged prior to the commencement of the development.

The applicant was also advised that in respect of the unauthorised building works, the Authority was considering the expediency of taking formal enforcement action and it was the officer's firm view that the unauthorised building should be demolished and then re-built in accordance with the existing permission. Following subsequent meetings with the applicant and agents, it was agreed that enforcement action would be held in abeyance to permit consideration of a planning application for the revised dwelling design as currently built. This agreement was subject to no further construction work on the dwelling being undertaken.

Consultations:

Highway Authority – No comments

District Council – No reply to date.

Rowland Parish Meeting – No reply to date.

Great Longstone Parish Council – No reply to date.

Natural England – No reply to date.

Authority Footpath Officer – There is a public footpath through the farmyard, the line of which should not be obstructed. The planning layout appears to adequately protect the route. Willing to be further involved if the developer has any queries.

Authority's Ecologist – No response to date, however, the previous application proposals were considered to be acceptable, subject to the attaching of conditions requiring the submission and agreement of appropriate mitigation in respect of the bat and great crested newt interests identified on the site. The restoration of the dew pond immediately adjacent to the eastern side of the farmhouse was also welcomed.

Following the commencement of construction works on the previously approved scheme, concerns were initially raised that the ecological conditions requiring the submission of ecological mitigation measures for the great crested newts had not been carried out in accordance with the Natural England licence. It was subsequently found that the NE licence had been amended, but the Authority had not been informed and the relevant ecological conditions attached to the decision notice had not been formally amended. The Authority Ecologist's further comments on the current proposal will be reported orally at the committee meeting.

Main Policies

Relevant Core Strategy policies:

Policy GSP2 states amongst other things that, when development is permitted, a design will be sought that respects the character of the area, and where appropriate, landscaping and planting schemes will be sought that are consistent with local landscape characteristics and their setting, complimenting the locality and helping to achieve biodiversity objectives.

Policy GSP3 states amongst other things that development must respect, conserve and enhance all valued characteristics of the site and buildings that are subject to the development proposal. Particular attention will be paid to, amongst other things, impact on the character and setting of buildings; scale of development appropriate to the character and appearance of the National Park; design in accordance with the National park authority design guide; form and intensity of proposed use or activity; impact on living conditions of communities; impact on access and traffic levels, use of sustainable modes of transport.

Core Strategy policy L1 states that development must conserve and enhance valued landscape character, as identified in the Landscape Strategy and Action Plan and other valued characteristics.

Core Strategy policy L2 requires that development must conserve and enhance any sites, features or species of biodiversity importance and where appropriate to their setting.

Core Strategy policy L3 requires that development must conserve and where appropriate enhance or reveal the significance of archaeological, architectural, artistic or other historic assets and their settings.

Relevant Local Plan policies:

Policy LC4 states that where development is acceptable in principle, it will be permitted provided that its detailed treatment is of a high standard that respects, conserves and where possible it enhances the landscape, built environment and other valued characteristics of the area. Particular attention will be paid to, amongst other things, the amenity, privacy and security of the development and of nearby properties.

Policy LC17 seek to ensure that no harm is caused to protected species as a result of development being carried out, and that where appropriate safeguarding measures are exercised.

Policy LR7 relates to the provision of facilities for the keeping and riding horses and states, amongst other things, that such development will be permitted provided that it does not detract from the landscape or valued characteristics of the area either individually or cumulatively. It should be located adjacent to existing buildings or groups of buildings and should not be likely to cause road safety problems.

In the case of commercial stables/riding centres, they should have good access from strategic and secondary road networks and to an adequate bridleway network that can accommodate the increased activity without harming the valued characteristics of the area or their enjoyment by others. Furthermore, such development should not constitute a nuisance to local residents, landowners or farmers by noise, smell or other adverse impact

Policy LH5 (Replacement Dwellings) states that the replacement of unlisted dwellings will be permitted provided that:

- (i) the replacement contributes to the character or appearance of the area.
- (ii) it is not preferable to repair the existing dwelling.
- (iii) the proposed dwelling will be a similar size to the dwelling it will replace.
- (iv) it will not have an adverse effect on neighbouring properties.
- (v) it will not be more intrusive in the landscape, either through increased building mass or the greater activity created.

Wider Policy Context

National Planning Policy Framework

The National Planning Policy Framework was published in March 2012 and replaced a significant proportion of central government planning policy with immediate effect. The Government's intention is that the document should be considered to be 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 saved policies in the Peak District National Park Local Plan 2001. Policies in the Development Plan provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. It is considered that in this case there is no significant conflict between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and more recent Government guidance in the NPPF with regard to the issues that are raised.

Other Relevant Core Strategy Policies:

GSP1, GSP4, DS1, CC1

Other Relevant Local Plan policies:

LR7, LT11, LT18.

In addition to policies LC4 and LH5, the draft Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) was presented to and agreed by members at the Authority Meeting on 2nd October 2015.

At the October Authority Meeting members agreed that from this stage, some limited weight may be attached to the emerging DPD as a material planning consideration; as an agreed statement of the Authority's intended position on development management policy.

Policy DMH9 of the emerging DPD is of particular relevance to this application. This specifically relates to Replacement Dwellings and states that these will be permitted provided that:

- (i) the dwelling to be replaced is not listed individually or as part of a group listing, and
- (ii) the dwelling to be replaced is not considered to have cultural heritage significance, and

Where the original dwelling complies with these principles development will only be permitted where:

- (iii) the proposed replacement dwelling demonstrates significant overall enhancement to the valued character and appearance of the site itself, and the surrounding built environment and landscape, and
- (iv) the replacement dwelling will not create an adverse impact on neighbours residential amenity, and
- (v) in the event that the replacement dwelling is on another footprint, the existing dwelling is removed from the site prior to the completion of the development, or within 3 months of the first occupation of the new dwelling where the existing dwelling is in residential use, and

- (vi) where there is specific evidence of general housing demand in the Parish for dwellings of the size proposed to be replaced, the replacement dwelling is restricted to that size and/or type.

Further detailed advice on design is provided in the Authority's supplementary planning documents: the Design Guide and its appendix, the Building Design Guide.

Assessment

Introduction

At the time of the previously approved application 2014 it was accepted that existing farmhouse was in a poor structural condition and appearance, and whilst it has been left vacant for some time, officers were satisfied that it still retained its established use rights as a dwelling.

The key consideration in this case, which seeks retrospective planning approval for the partially constructed dwelling of an increased size and amended design therefore, concerns the assessment of the current proposal against the replacement dwelling policy LH5 in the Local Plan. This sets out 5 provisions (listed above) which all need to be met if development is to be permitted in compliance with the policy.

Issue 1 - Whether the principle of the proposed replacement dwelling complies with Local Plan policy LH5.

Local Plan policy LH5 permits the replacement of unlisted dwellings, provided that the proposals meet all the policy's five criteria.

Policy LH5 (ii) specifies that a replacement dwelling will only be permitted where it is not preferable to repair the existing dwelling. The application site property had been the subject of several inappropriate extensions to all sides, which detracted from the character of the original farmhouse. The original farmhouse had an unkempt appearance and, together with the attached extensions, was in need of significant repair and refurbishment. The stable building forming the western end of the courtyard is an attractive building, but was in a poor structural condition. The two-storey barn forming the northern side of the courtyard is of particular architectural interest and is in a good structural condition. The detached single-storey traditional building to the north of the courtyard building is also of architectural interest and is in a good structural condition. The roofs of these traditional buildings, however, were clad with inappropriate corrugated sheeting.

The overall effect was of a farm complex that is out of keeping with the local vernacular with the farmhouse having a 'tired' and unkempt appearance that would require significant repair and refurbishment. The attached extensions to all sides of the farmhouse were of an inappropriate design, form and materials that detracted from the original character of the farm group. Officers considered, therefore, that it would clearly not be preferable to repair and retain the existing dwelling due to its present appearance and the unsympathetic additions.

Officers also considered that the site represents an opportunity for enhancement both in building and landscape terms, by an appropriate redevelopment of the site. The principle of a replacement dwelling is, therefore considered to meet criterion (ii) of Local Plan policy LH5.

Issue 2 - Whether the proposed dwelling is of a similar size to the former farmhouse it will replace (LH5 criterion iii)

This aspect of the policy uses the phrase 'similar size' as a parameter to control the size of replacement dwellings to protect the landscape, instead of a simple like for like floor space or volume calculation. This enables a degree of flexibility necessary to both achieve enhancement of the Park and to allow the scale of a replacement dwelling to respond to what is appropriate for

any particular site and its setting.

Whilst this consideration cannot be divorced from landscape impact it does need to be satisfied if the scheme is to be judged as policy compliant. The existing dwelling, as extended, had a footprint of 198.4sqm. This amended replacement dwelling now has a footprint area of 263sqm, that is, around a 32% increase. This comparison is based on the existing floor areas currently used as dwelling accommodation. The proposed scheme also proposes the rebuilding of the traditional stable building on the western side of the courtyard and incorporation of the floorspace within the rebuilt building to additional living accommodation. This increases the dwelling footprint by a further 72.08sqm and effectively increases the overall dwelling footprint by 69%. The footprint of the rebuilt stable building is increased by 11.33m an increase of only 18% and officers consider that the rebuilding of the stable building is required in order to restore and maintain the integrity of the courtyard building complex.

Footprint must also be considered alongside other measures of size, and volume is a useful measure as this more closely represents the scale and massing of a proposal and is therefore more indicative of how these relate to the local building traditional and potential impact on the surroundings.

In this case the original dwelling, including later additions had a volume of around 638 cubic metres. The amended replacement house, subject of this current proposal, has an above ground volume of 1325.57cubic metres which equates to a 107% increase in the size of the existing dwelling accommodation. This would, therefore, clearly be well in excess of the normally accepted allowance of 25% on top of the original dwelling which is the guideline volume given in the Local Plan for domestic extensions.

The majority of this volume increase is taken up by the increase in the frontage length of the main dwelling from 8.5m to 13.2m and the increase in gable widths from 4.5m to 7.5m, together with the resultant increases in the volumes of the roofs. Whilst the previously approved scheme involved increases in the footprint and volume over that of the original farmhouse, it was considered that these were within acceptable parameters and did not significantly change the humble, character, appearance and detailing of the original farmhouse.

It is considered that the overall massing and form of replacement dwelling as now partially built detracts from the humble character and form of the original dwelling as extended. These disparities are exacerbated by the significant increase in the main frontage length by 4.2m and the over-wide gable width. Consequently, it is considered that the form, proportions and appearance of the main two-storey dwelling cannot be regarded as being of a similar size as the former farmhouse and therefore the current proposal does not meet the terms of Local Plan policy LH5 criterion (iii)

Whilst the replacement dwelling is significantly larger than the existing, it is considered that its acceptability depends upon whether the proposals would contribute to the character of the area or offer up other planning gain that would outweigh any concerns about the increase in size.

Issue 3 - Landscape, Visual Impact and Design

Clause (i) in policy LH5 requires that the replacement dwelling must contribute to the character and appearance of the area and clause (v) states that it should not be more intrusive in the landscape either through increased building mass or the greater activity created.

Due to its remote position away from public roads, its position in a slight hollow and the existing tree screening that surrounds it, the Bleaklow complex is not particularly prominent in the wider landscape. It is however, particularly prominent when approaching the complex from the south-west along the public footpath route, which then passes immediately alongside and through the eastern side of the farm complex. From these viewpoints, the amended design, form and

massing of the dwelling will be easily apparent. Rather than the fairly humble and restrained appearance of the former farmhouse or the previously approved scheme, the replacement dwelling as now proposed has more 'presence' being larger and with the proportions of a grander manor style farmhouse. The simple single sash openings on the main frontage have been replaced with two-light sash window frames, which again detract from the simpler, humble character of the original farmhouse and design concept originally advanced for the previously approved scheme.

These inappropriate design changes are also exacerbated by the amended form of the rear entrance porch. This has changed from a simple traditional lean-to form, on a rectangular footprint, to a larger, multi-splayed form, with a zinc roof, which does not follow the local building tradition.

It is therefore considered that the design concept of the current proposal is inappropriate in terms of its visual impact, design, form, proportions and appearance. Consequently, the current proposal does not meet the terms of Local Plan policy LH5 criteria (i) and (v) as the resultant dwelling does not respect the form of the original farmhouse and through its increased mass fails to contribute to the character and appearance of the locality.

Moreover, the previously approved replacement dwelling, although larger than the original farmhouse still reflected and respected the humble character, form and detailing of the original main farmhouse. This previously approved scheme was also arrived at following lengthy detailed pre-application discussions with applicant and agent and was considered to represent an overall improvement and enhancement to the building complex.

It is therefore considered that an appropriate scheme for the replacement farmhouse has been approved and there is insufficient justification for the increase in its size, form, massing and design changes. In the absence of an overriding justification for the proposal as amended, the current proposal would not represent a sustainable pattern of development, and would be contrary to the principles of good design and sustainable development set out in the Authority's Core strategy policies GSP1, GSP3, DS1 and L1, and saved Local plan policies LC4 and LH5, and in national planning policies in the Framework.

Other elements of the scheme

The scheme also involves the erection of a contemporary single-storey extension, a substantial range of single-storey stables and garaging in the area to the north of the courtyard complex currently occupied by a dilapidated range of modern farm buildings. The stabling/garaging block is arranged in an 'L' plan form which links in with the existing traditional barns creating a further courtyard of buildings behind the main farmstead courtyard complex. The external dimensions of the 'L' plan arrangement measure 26.3m x 28.3m. The gable widths of the stables/garages are 5.0m/5.75m respectively. This provides stabling for four horses with associated tack/feed/storage buildings and garaging for four vehicles. The garaging takes the form of open-fronted car ports. The buildings are to be clad with roughly coursed natural limestone.

The most significant change concerns the replacement of the single-storey addition to the western side of the farmhouse, with an extension of largely the same form, but of a contemporary design and materials

This domestic extension was added to the farmhouse following the grant of planning permission in 1980. It was accepted as it created an enclosed courtyard with the adjacent traditional outbuildings. Whilst having an acceptable form and constructed of natural limestone, this building has a concrete slate roof and its detailing and opening proportions are considered to be inappropriate.

The proposed extension replaces the existing addition with a contemporary building that links the farmhouse to the rebuilt stable building that forms the western end of the courtyard complex. This is designed to reflect a simple open-fronted outbuilding with the south-facing wall clad with a combination of vertical boarded timber and large areas of glazing. The roof is to be clad with shallow-pitched metal roof cladding. The design approach here is to create a simple contemporary building based on that of an agricultural building, rather than to have a pastiche of a traditional agricultural outbuilding. As with the previously approved scheme in 2014, your officers consider that the form of the building is appropriate and emphasises that it is a subsidiary element to the main farmhouse. The contemporary style and materials are appropriate and provide a pleasing foil to the traditional buildings in the remainder of the courtyard complex.

The scheme requires the single-storey stable building which forms the western end of the courtyard to be rebuilt as it is in a poor structural condition. This is largely to be rebuilt the same size as the existing, but with a small 2.0m extension to bring its south gable in line with the frontage wall of the farmhouse and also in order to visually recess the intervening contemporary link extension in between the traditional forms of the farmhouse and the stable building. The stable building is to be provided with opening details that reflect the style of the existing stable building. The rebuilding of the stable building forms an essential component in re-establishing the integrity of the courtyard complex. Internally, this is to be used as additional living accommodation, which is considered to be an acceptable alternative to its previous stabling use.

The proposed new 'L' plan range of stable/garage buildings to the rear of the main farmhouse courtyard form a secondary courtyard with the adjacent traditional outbuilding and are considered to be of an acceptable form with traditional materials (natural limestone walling/natural blue slate roofs) used throughout. These are also considered to be acceptable in design and massing terms. The stabling is intended to be ancillary to and for the personal use of the occupiers of the farm complex and is not to be used for commercial purposes. Officers consider that provided that the stabling is used on this basis, it is acceptable and complies with the requirements of Local Plan policy LR7. It is considered therefore appropriate to attach a planning condition requiring that the stabling remains ancillary to and for the personal use of the occupants of Bleaklow farmhouse.

The scheme also involves the repair and refurbishment of the remaining two traditional buildings within the farm complex. Some repair works have already been undertaken on the two-storey barn which forms an integral part of the main courtyard complex. These refurbishments also involve the replacement of the existing corrugated sheet roofs with natural gritstone slates and sympathetic window frame replacements. The refurbishment of these buildings is welcomed as they contribute greatly to the character and setting of the farm complex.

Notwithstanding that the other elements of the scheme are acceptable, it is considered that the amended size, form and design of the replacement dwelling, including the inappropriate rear porch element would not comply with the terms of Local Plan policy LH5 and should be recommended for refusal on these grounds and as there is also a more appropriate scheme already approved for the replacement dwelling.

Issue 4 - Impact on Neighbours

It is considered that the proposal meets criteria (iv) of policy LH5 (and policy LC4) as, due to the isolated position of the property, there will be no impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties.

Issue 5 - Environmental Management

Core Strategy policy CC1 states that all development must make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources, must take account of the energy hierarchy and must achieve the highest possible standards of carbon reductions and water

efficiency. A minimum sustainability standard equivalent to that required by the government of affordable housing shall be achieved unless it can be demonstrated that this is not viable.

This present submission is accompanied by a schedule of environmental management measures, which are considered to be acceptable, with the exception of the reference to the provision of solar photovoltaic panels. No supporting information or elevational details have been submitted giving precise details of the type of solar panels or where they are to be installed on the development site. Therefore, it is considered that additional information needs to be submitted in respect of the provision of solar panels, to ensure that they would not compromise the architectural integrity of the scheme. It is considered, however, that these details can be provided and implemented through the attaching of a planning condition, in order to ensure compliance with SPD and Core Strategy policy CC1.

Issue 6 – Ecological Issues

Core Strategy policy L2 and Local Plan policy LC17 require that development must conserve and enhance any sites, features or species of biodiversity importance and where appropriate to their setting.

The application is accompanied by an updated great crested newt survey and mitigation strategy and relies on the bat report findings and mitigation strategy dated July 2013 submitted with the previous application. The Authority Ecologist's comments are awaited, but based on the comments in respect of the previous application it is considered likely that sufficient mitigation and enhancement measures in respect of bats and birds have been provided in the report. In respect of great crested newts it was considered that the mitigation strategy was sufficient subject to a timetable of works being submitted to and agreed by the Authority.

It is also noted that there is opportunity to provide further enhancement of this site by restoring the dew pond to the south of the site. This pond is surrounded by a mosaic of habitats and its restoration would make an excellent contribution to potential breeding sites in the area.

It is therefore considered that the impact on protected species can be adequately mitigated for and further ecological enhancement can be achieved, subject to the attaching of appropriate ecological conditions. The scheme therefore complies with the terms and objectives of Core Strategy policy L2 and Local Plan policy LC17.

Access and Parking

There is ample provision of car parking and garaging facilities within the site complex to cater for the dwelling and the associated ancillary stabling. The highway authority has confirmed that they have no objections to the scheme on highway grounds, subject to conditions requiring that the offices, stables and outbuildings be ancillary to the occupiers of the Bleaklow Farm.

The key concerns previously raised by Rowland Parish Meeting and the third party representations in respect of the 2014 approval, related to the use of the approach lane from Rowland hamlet and the resurfacing of this public highway with a tarmac surface by the applicant without the consent of the highway authority, and the re-establishing of the access track off this lane along the hillside up to Bleak House.

In respect of the resurfacing of the section of lane between Rowland hamlet and the access entrance to Bleak Farm, this was carried out by the applicant without the consent of the highway authority. Prior to this resurfacing, the lane had the appearance of a rough limestone track which was in keeping with the rural character of the locality. Notwithstanding that the tarmac surfacing detracts from the rural character of the locality, the Highway Authority confirmed that this is a public highway that they have responsibility for and there is no intention to require the applicant to remove the tarmac surface and reinstate it back to its former condition and appearance. This

matter was dealt with in some detail in the report in June 2014.

Conclusion

In conclusion, whilst there are several positive elements to the overall scheme, the proposed replacement dwelling, as under construction, is significantly larger than the original farmhouse, and is of an inappropriate design, character, form, massing and detailing that would be more intrusive in the immediate locality when viewed from the adjacent public footpath. Consequently, the current proposal would detract from the character and appearance the original farmhouse and its setting and would not provide the overall enhancement to both the appearance of the original dwelling site and its setting as was achieved in the previously approved scheme in 2014. The proposed scheme would therefore be contrary to Core strategy policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3 and L1 and Local plan policies LC4 and LH5, as well as guidance in the Framework.

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