

# Planning Committee 11<sup>th</sup> April 2023

<b>APPLICATION NUMBER</b>		22/01010/FUL	
<b>SITE ADDRESS:</b>		Woodside, Chesterfield Road, Rowsley, Matlock, DE4 2NL	
<b>DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT</b>		Erection of 2no. holiday let accommodation units and erection 1no. holiday pod	
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	Adam Maxwell	<b>APPLICANT</b>	Mr & Mrs James
<b>PARISH/TOWN</b>	Rowsley	<b>AGENT</b>	Simon Foote Architects
<b>WARD MEMBER(S)</b>	Cllr Mathew Buckler	<b>DETERMINATION TARGET</b>	14.04.2023
<b>REASON FOR DETERMINATION BY COMMITTEE</b>	Major development	<b>REASON FOR SITE VISIT (IF APPLICABLE)</b>	For Members to appreciate the site in context

## MATERIAL PLANNING ISSUES

- Whether the development is acceptable in principle
- Visual and landscape impact of the development
- Impact upon cultural heritage and archaeology
- Impact upon amenity
- Impact upon highway safety

## RECOMMENDATION

That the application be refused for the reasons set out in section 8.0 of the report.

## 1.0 THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 1.1 Woodside comprises a group of existing dwellings occupied by the applicant / let as holiday accommodation located in open countryside off Chesterfield Road east of Rowsley. The property is accessed by a winding drive through large grounds with open fields to the south bounded by mature trees and hedgerows and low drystone walls.
- 1.2 Public footpath 12 crosses the access to the property before heading west towards Rowsley. Public footpath 11 crosses the western corner of the site before heading south through the fields. The nearest neighbouring property is Toll Bar Cottage located on the opposite side of Chesterfield Road to the north east of the site. East Lodge Country House Hotel is located approximately 150m to the west.



## 2.0 DETAILS OF THE APPLICATION

- 2.1 The application proposes the erection of two units of holiday let accommodation units and one holiday pod at the site.
- 2.2 The amended plans show that the proposed holiday let accommodation units would be sited east of the property adjacent to the existing drive and parking spaces. These units would be two bedroom timber chalets providing 63m<sup>2</sup> and 55m<sup>2</sup> of floor space respectively. The proposed holiday pod would be sited further to the east adjacent to an existing stone outbuilding. The pod would also be clad in timber with a single bedroom / living area providing 15m<sup>2</sup> of floor space.

2.3 The submitted plans show that new pedestrian pathways would be created to link the accommodation units to the existing driveway and that planting would be carried out to the south and east of the proposed units.

### **3.0 PLANNING POLICY AND LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK**

#### **3.1 Adopted Derbyshire Dales Local Plan (2017)**

S1 Sustainable Development Principles  
S4 Development in the Countryside  
PD1 Design and Place Making  
PD2 Protecting the Historic Environment  
PD3 Biodiversity and the Natural Environment  
PD5 Landscape Character  
PD6 Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands  
PD7 Climate Change  
PD9 Pollution Control and Unstable Land  
HC19 Accessibility and Transport  
HC20 Managing Travel Demand  
HC21 Car Parking Standards  
EC1 New and Existing Employment Development  
EC8 Promoting Peak District Tourism and Culture  
EC9 Holiday Chalets, Caravan and Campsite Developments

3.2 National Planning Policy Framework (2021)  
National Planning Practice Guidance

### **4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:**

None relevant

### **5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

#### **5.1 Rowsley Parish Council**

No response to date.

#### **5.2 Peak District National Park Authority**

“Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above application.

The PDNPA OBJECTS to the application on the basis that the submitted LVA does not adequately consider potential effects on the setting and visual amenity of users in the National Park. The findings of the effects on the visual amenity of receptors within the National Park are poorly evidenced and lack robustness.

The LVA defines visual receptors within the National Park as having a high sensitivity, with which we agree. However, in terms of the assessment of potential affects (below) we disagree with the LVA findings.

Para 6.51 (VPs 10 -12) ‘The distance to the site, extent of the views and comparative size of the site in relation to the overall visible landscape would mean that if any of the new lodges were to be visible from these locations, they would have little or no impact on the overall experience of these receptors’.

Para 6.58 (VPs 13 -14) ‘These views are naturally panoramic and encompass a large extent of distant landscape along the valleys. Whilst the setting of the site and susceptibility of the

receptors is undoubtedly highly sensitive the extent of the development in relation to the overall panorama available, combined with the sensitivity of a design proposal that incorporates small built forms of natural materials means development would have minimal impact only on receptors at this distance during construction and completion, dropping to negligible impact as associated vegetation further assimilates it into the surrounding landscape’.

Whilst we agree that views for VPs 10 -12 are distant, we disagree with the finding of the LVA (that there would be little or no impact) – a high sensitivity combined with a low adverse impact potentially results in a moderate level of effect. Similarly, for VPs 13 – 14 we find that the assessment again under-assesses potential effects given the high sensitivity of receptors.

As defined in the NPPF para. 176, ‘Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks.....while development within their setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas’ and we do not believe that the submitted LVA considers potential effects or demonstrates sensitive design.”

The following comments have been received on the revised scheme:

“The amended plans are a significant improvement on the original application, reducing the impact of the development on the setting of the National Park, however it is unfortunate that the applicant has not produced images showing the worst case situation. Namely some of the images should have been taken and assessed when there are no leaves on the trees. I would have liked to have seen an attempt to show the buildings in their proposed location, as such I am unable to fully assess the impact of the development upon the setting of the National Park.

A landscaping plan will be required to help assimilate the proposed buildings within the landscape. Consideration is also needed for the type and size of external lighting and internal lighting especially during the winter months. External lighting should also meet the requirements of dark skies.”

### 5.3 Environment Agency

No comment

### 5.4 Derbyshire Wildlife Trust

“We have reviewed the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) (Baker Consultants, July 2022), along with the proposed plans and Arboricultural Method Statement (AWA, June 2022). We advise the LPA that a suitable level of survey effort has been undertaken and that sufficient information has been provided to enable the application to be determined. We do recommend that the metric spreadsheet should also be submitted with the application, rather than just the summary in the PEA.

Protected species constraints are limited at the site and habitat loss is relatively minor, except for the removal of part of the woodland block (TN11 in PEA report). The Arboricultural Method Statement shows that this will comprise a sycamore and a number of silver birch trees, along with associated ground flora. One of these trees has ‘low’ bat roost potential and therefore will require a soft fell approach to safeguard roosting bats, in accordance with best practice guidelines (Collins, 2016).

A net loss of -0.59 habitat units (-5.67%) is predicted from current proposals. Baker Consultants have proposed a strategy to address this and achieve a gain of +0.08 habitat

units (+0.79 %). This is outlined in the PEA report and would be achieved through enhancement of retained woodland and grassland habitats and new woodland planting. This would be considered acceptable and would comply with local and national net gain policies. The applicant should confirm that these proposals are acceptable to them and achievable. Details should then be secured via a suitable Landscape Plan and a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) condition.”

Planning conditions are recommended to be attached to any consent including submission and approval of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP: Biodiversity), Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) and lighting scheme.

#### 5.5 Local Highway Authority

“The application details do not appear to show detailed drawings of the access points, showing what visibility sightlines can be achieved, also although speed readings have been submitted it is not clear at which location these have been taken from. The field access which is proposed to be used for the new dwelling is unacceptable in terms of its geometry and will need to be altered along with being provided with suitable visibility sightlines.

All parking spaces need to measure 5.5m x 2.5m with 6m manoeuvring space for vehicles to manoeuvre into and out of the spaces. Space will also be required within both sites for the manoeuvring of service and delivery vehicles.

Please hold the application in abeyance until full details of both access point have been submitted.”

Officer Note: These comments are on the basis of the application as originally submitted. The Highway Authority has been re-consulted on the basis of the revised scheme, however no further comments have been received to date. Any further comments will be updated at the meeting as a late representation.

#### 5.6 Lead Local Flood Authority

“Due to the nature and scale of the proposed development the LLFA has no formal comment to make.”

#### 5.7 Trees and Landscape Officer

“I have no reason to disagree with the submitted Landscape and Visual Appraisal

The sensitive design should consider the existing trees on the site. As many as possible of these should be retained and successfully incorporated into the scheme for the long term. Because of the site’s size, there is scope to potentially add to the tree stock of the site. This should aim to replace any trees removed and further diversify, increase the resilience of the existing stock and provide screening of the proposed buildings. I recommend that a planting specification and plan be submitted for approval.

The submitted arboricultural survey report and impact assessment identified 111 arboricultural features of a range of species, dominated by Scots pine and birch. The stock comprised of 107 individual trees and 4 groups of trees.

Of the surveyed on-site trees, 2 trees were considered to be of sufficiently high quality to be classed as retention category ‘A’, 19 trees or tree groups were retention category ‘B’ and the remaining 86 trees or tree groups were low quality retention category ‘C’.

Only 6 trees would require removal to facilitate the development. These are all of low value (retention category 'C'). Accordingly, the required tree removals would have only a negligible negative arboricultural impact.

Should planning consent be granted, then I recommend that a condition require that the contents of the submitted Arboricultural Method Statement must be adhered to, before, during, and after the construction phase. This would allow the proposed development operations can be undertaken with minimal risk of adverse impact on the trees to be retained.

No trees at the site are protected by DDDC Tree Preservation Order or are within a Conservation Area.”

## 5.8 DCC Archaeology

“The proposed development area encompasses the upstanding remains of a mostly preserved 19th century farm which is recorded as a non-designated heritage asset in the Derbyshire HER (MDR22263). A rapid glance at publicly available historic mapping would seem to suggest that it encompasses a drovers road (now a footpath) to the northwest, a pinfold to the northeast which questionably (from the 1835 Sanderson map) appears to have had one or two buildings adjacent to it with a holloway (or drovers road) opposite, leading up onto the moorland.

Rapid scanning of Bing Satellite also seems to suggest that the fields adjacent to the west retain some evidence (as soil marks) of medieval ridge and furrow. My cursory glance over these sources would seem to suggest that there might be an impact of development on heritage assets and this aspect is not explored within the application itself.

I would therefore advise that a desk based archaeological assessment/heritage Impact assessment is required, as per Para 194 of NPPF, pre-determination to establish what, if any, impacts development may have on below ground archaeology. This assessment should include amongst other things:

- Historic map regression using publicly held maps in the HER and the County Record Office.
- A study of the situation of the site within the context of the aforesaid drovers road from Rowsley, up through little Rowsley, toward Fallinge Edge and Beeley moor.

The HIA/DBA should be prepared by an experienced Heritage/Archaeological professional with demonstrable landscape analysis experience preferably with accreditation to the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists. Said heritage professional should pass a draft of the report to me for consideration prior to submission to establish its fitness for purpose and to avoid delays.”

## 5.9 DCC Footpaths

“Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the amended plans. Both Rowsley Public Footpaths No. 11 and No. 12 still run through the application site, but footpath 11 is no longer adversely affected by the proposed development.

The Definitive line of footpath 12 is shown as a purple line on the attached plan. The plan shows the line in relation to the line of an unmade path that has been marked on the amended plan as a broken pink line. The Definitive line of the path crosses the driveway close to the road. Please advise the applicant that this path must be open, unobstructed and on its legal alignment. Consideration should be given to the erection of such warning signs or other features as may be necessary to help protect path users from vehicles on the

driveway. If the applicant wishes to legally divert the path, information and guidance can be found at Public Path Orders - Derbyshire County Council.”

#### 5.10 Derbyshire Dales Ramblers

“Ramblers Derbyshire Dales Group objects to this application:

- i) Rowsley FP 11 starts from the secondary entrance off Chesterfield Road. This is an already busy and dangerous for walkers to use and access. The increase of vehicular traffic would increase the danger both on the highway and on the FP
- ii) The proposed dwelling is very near to the existing DM FP line. This may discourage walkers use of the FP
- iii) The proposed parking space is inappropriate. It is adjacent to the FP and puts walkers' safety at risk
- iv) Rowsley FP 12 should remain unaffected at all times, including the path surface, both during and after any development
- v) Any encroachment of the RoW FPs would need consultation with the DCC Rights of Way Team.

Re-consultation on revised scheme: Ramblers Derbyshire Dales Group continues to object:

- i) Previous comments from 14-10-22 submission still hold
- ii) Further note and support PRow's comments on 14-10-22 on:
  - a) FP 12 previous unofficial diversion
  - b) FP 11 - three points on enjoying open countryside, FP running close to the dwelling and safety implications for walkers

These comments add to the concern for the RoWs from this application

- iii) In the amended D&AS, RoWs are referred to in 2.2.2 only in description. No other detail is given to any impact on the two FPs”

#### 5.11 Peak and Northern Footpaths Society

“I have concerns about this application. These are mainly in relation to the use of Rowsley Footpath 11, which passes close to the proposed new dwelling and along the new access road to the dwelling, and shares a common entrance/exit from and on to Chesterfield Road with the new access drive. How will walkers using the footpath be protected from conflict with vehicles? Will there be a pedestrian gate installed at the junction with the road so that walkers have a segregated access from and on to the road? Will walkers be deterred from using the path because of the proximity to the new dwelling? Is the applicant aware that any changes to any part of the surface of the path must be authorised by the county council? The full width of both this path and Rowsley Footpath 12 must be unobstructed at all times. Much more detail is needed.

See comments from the county council's rights of way officer.”

### **6.0 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

6.1 No representations have been received to date.

### **7.0 OFFICER APPRAISAL**

#### Principle

7.1 The site is located within the open countryside, therefore Local Plan Policy S4 is relevant. This states that planning permission will be granted for development where it represents

sustainable growth of tourism or other rural based enterprises in sustainable locations where identified needs are not met by existing facilities. Policy EC1 provides support for proposals for new business development in sustainable locations that contribute toward the creation and retention of jobs and employment opportunities.

- 7.2 Policy EC8 deals specifically with promoting Peak District tourism and culture and supports new tourist provision and initiatives in towns and villages, and in the countryside through the reuse of existing buildings or as part of farm diversification, particularly where these would also benefit local communities and support the local economy.
- 7.3 Policy EC9 relates specifically to proposals for holiday chalets and caravan and campsite developments. Development will be permitted provided that:
- a) the development would not have a prominent and adverse impact on the character and appearance of the immediate and wider landscape;
  - b) any visual impact would be well screened by existing landscape features from areas outside the site to which the public has access for the whole of its proposed operating season;
  - c) any on-site facilities are of a scale appropriate to the location and to the site itself;
  - d) the site is in a sustainable location within, or in close proximity to an existing settlement with good connections to the main highway network, and the public rights of way network and/or cycleways, and is either served by public transport or within a safe attractive ten minute walk of regular public transport services;
  - e) the development would not adversely affect the amenity, tranquillity or public enjoyment of any adjacent area.
- 7.4 The site is located in open countryside east of Rowsley which is the nearest settlement. The site is not within Rowsley but is in relatively close proximity being 500m to the east of the centre of the village (measured in a straight line). The site is approximately a 10 minute walk from the village along Chesterfield Road and around a 5 minute walk via footpath 12 which runs along the northern boundary of the site.
- 7.5 The site is not served by public transport but is within a safe and attractive walk of shops and services in Rowsley and regular public transport services along the A6. Therefore the site is located within a sustainable location in accordance with policy S1, S4 and EC9 (d). Therefore the development of holiday chalets / camp sites in this location would in principle be a sustainable form of rural tourism. The key issues therefore are the impacts of the development upon the site, its surroundings and the setting of the Peak District National Park.

#### Impact of the development

- 7.6 Policy S4 seeks to ensure that new development protects and where possible, enhances the intrinsic character and distinctiveness of the landscape, including the character, appearance and integrity of the historic and cultural environment.
- 7.7 Policy PD1 requires development to be of high quality design that respects the character, identity and context of the Derbyshire Dales townscapes and landscapes, development on the edge of settlements to enhance and/or restore landscape character, contribute positively to an area's character, history and identity in terms of scale, height, density, layout, appearance, materials and the relationship to adjacent buildings and landscape features. Policy PD2 requires development to conserve and enhance cultural heritage assets including designated and non-designated heritage assets and archaeology.
- 7.8 Policy PD5 seeks to resist development, which would harm or be detrimental to the character of the local and wider landscape and requires developments to be informed by and



sympathetic to the distinctive landscape character areas as identified in 'The Landscape Character of Derbyshire' and 'Landscape Character of the Derbyshire Dales' assessments. Development must conserve the setting of the Peak District National Park.

- 7.9 The site is located 500m east of the boundary of the Peak District National Park (which runs along the River Derwent through Rowsley). For the purposes of the adopted Landscape Character of Derbyshire assessment the application site is located within the Dark Peak and the Settled Valley Pastures landscape character type (LCT). This landscape is characterised by moderate to steep lower valley slopes, pastoral farming with extensive improved pasture with a wooded character associated with tree belts along streams and cloughs, scattered hedgerow trees and groups around settlements and farmsteads with small irregular fields and winding lanes. The landscape in and around the application site reflects this character.
- 7.10 The proposed chalets would be located to the north of the field adjacent to the existing access and parking area associated with the residential property. The proposed camping pod would be located in a smaller field adjacent to Chesterfield Road. These fields form are located on the valley side and rise up to meet the level of Chesterfield Road allowing open views from the highway and footpath 11 over the valley and towards the National Park to the west. Mature trees around the property, field boundaries and along the highway provide some visual screening around the fields.
- 7.11 The proposed chalets would be located between two existing groups of trees which would act to limit visibility of the structures from the north. However, the proposed chalets would be clearly visible from Chesterfield Road and footpath 11. The proposed chalets would also be visible in longer distance views across the valley within the National Park. The proposed camping pod would be well screened from wider views in the landscape, however, would also be prominent from Chesterfield Road and nearby footpaths where it would be viewed in the context of the Toll House on the north side of Chesterfield Road and an existing traditional stone outbuilding / barn.
- 7.12 Therefore the development would not be well screened by existing landscape features contrary to policy EC9 b). The fields have an open pastoral character with surrounded by groups of mature trees and boundary trees and therefore make a positive contribution to landscape character. Existing buildings at and adjacent to the site are traditional in design and materials and of stone construction with some drystone walling also evident.
- 7.13 The proposed use of timber for the chalets would not reflect existing buildings but would be more appropriate given the backdrop of mature tree planting. However, the chalets would be of a significant scale and domestic appearance and given the prominence from Chesterfield Road and footpath 11 in particular would result in a degree of visual harm. The application proposes additional planting around the chalets, this would act to mitigate the visual impact to a degree but would take a significant amount of time to establish and mature.
- 7.14 The proposed camping pod would be of a significantly smaller scale than the chalets but its position north of the site would be in the most prominent location from Chesterfield Road and adjacent footpaths. The camping pod would introduce a domestic element immediately adjacent to the existing traditional outbuilding harming its setting and that of the Lodge to the North West.
- 7.15 The development would therefore be prominent and would result in an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the immediate and wider landscape contrary to policy EC9 a). The visual impact of the development would not be well screened by existing landscape features from areas outside the site to which the public has access contrary to policy EC9 b). The development would impact upon the setting of the Peak District National Park, however, subject to mitigation in the form of additional landscaping, appropriate colour

finishes and minimal external lighting would not result in harm to the setting of the Peak District National Park.

#### Impact upon cultural heritage and archaeology

- 7.16 Policy PD2 requires development to conserve and enhance cultural heritage assets including designated and non-designated heritage assets and archaeology. Paragraph 194 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.
- 7.17 The County Archaeologist has been consulted on the application and advises that the proposed development area (PDA) encompasses the upstanding remains of a mostly preserved 19th century farm which is recorded as a non-designated heritage asset in the Derbyshire HER (MDR22263). It is likely to encompass a drovers road (now a footpath) to the northwest, a pinfold to the northeast a holloway (or drovers road) opposite, leading up onto the moorland. Fields adjacent to the west retain some evidence (as soil marks) of medieval ridge and furrow.
- 7.18 The proposed development comprises the erection of buildings, footpaths and tree and hedge planting and therefore has the potential to impact upon below ground archaeology. The development also has the potential to impact upon the setting of this non-designated heritage asset and the setting of the Toll House which while not listed possesses architectural and historic significance. The application is not supported by a heritage impact assessment or archaeological assessment contrary to the requirements of policy PD2 and paragraph 194 of the NPPF. The County Archaeologist advises that this information is required prior to determination of the application.
- 7.19 Therefore, insufficient information has been submitted with the application to assess potential impacts of the development upon the setting of affected non-designated heritage assets and below ground archaeology contrary to policy PD2 and paragraph 194 of the NPPF.

#### Highway safety and amenity

- 7.20 The site would utilise the existing access onto Chesterfield Road. The Highway Authority has been re-consulted on the reduced scheme but has not provided further comments to date. Given the submitted speed surveys and the reduced intensity of the development now proposed it is considered that the development would be served by safe access and that the development would not harm highway safety. Sufficient parking would be provided on site in accordance with adopted local standards and this could be secured by planning conditions.
- 7.21 The development would provide a limited number of chalets and a camping pod and would attract up to three groups of visitors at any time. The local road network is rural narrow lanes and therefore sensitive to increases in vehicular traffic. Nevertheless, given the relatively small scale of the development additional vehicle movement would be limited and therefore unlikely to result in any significant adverse impact upon the road network or the amenity of road users.
- 7.22 The proposed camping pod would be located approximately 23m from Toll Bar Cottage. Given the scale of the pod and the distance there are no concerns that the development would be overbearing or result in any significant loss of light or privacy. The occupants of the pod would generate noise however, given the distance it is considered unlikely that this would result in any significant harm to the amenity of occupants of Toll Bar Cottage.

## Other issues

- 7.23 The fields are improved grassland and therefore of limited biodiversity value. Nevertheless the site is close to existing trees and therefore activity and lighting at the site could impact upon protected species. A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) has been submitted and Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (DWT) consulted. The report concludes that there would be no significant impacts upon protected species and DWT raise no objection subject to conditions to control lighting and to secure an appropriate scheme to secure biodiversity net gain. These conditions are considered to be reasonable and necessary for the development to meet the requirements of policy PD3 and therefore if permission were granted planning conditions would be recommended.
- 7.24 Surface water would be to soakaways around the structures which is acceptable. The development is within Flood Zone 1 and therefore at the lowest risk of flooding. The development would not increase the flood risk to neighbouring properties. The application states that foul drainage would be to a septic tank and it is unknown if the existing system would be utilised. Given the distance to the main sewer it would not be practicable or viable to connect, however, in accordance with national planning policy guidance a septic tank would not be acceptable. A package treatment plant would be required to serve the development to conserve the water environment and mitigate pollution in accordance with policy PD9. If permission were granted a planning condition would be recommended to secure a treatment plant to be installed and operational before the first use of the development.
- 7.25 The development would provide tourist facilities which would likely contribute to the local economy and provide a full time job on the site. These economic and social benefits are welcomed in principle.
- 7.26 Policy PD7 states that the Council will promote a development strategy that seeks to mitigate global warming and requires new development to be designed to contribute to achieving national targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by reducing energy consumption and providing resilience to increased temperatures and promoting the use of sustainable design and construction techniques to secure energy efficiency through building design. The development does not include any specific measures to mitigate the impacts of climate change. The proposed buildings would however be constructed from timber which could be sourced from sustainable locations and could incorporate measures to mitigate energy consumption. If permission were granted a planning condition could be imposed to secure a scheme of climate change mitigation measures.

## Conclusion

- 7.27 The proposal comprises the development of chalets and camping pods in a relatively sustainable location close to shops, services and public transport links at Rowsley. Therefore in principle policies are supportive of tourism development in this location.
- 7.28 The proposed chalets would be screened to an extent by the existing mature trees, particularly from the north. However, the chalets and camping pod would be prominent from Chesterfield Road and public footpaths and would also be visible across the valley from the Peak District National Park. Additional planting is proposed around the development but this would not sufficiently mitigate visual impacts of the development around the site.
- 7.29 The development would therefore be prominent and would result in an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the immediate and wider landscape contrary to policy EC9 a). The visual impact of the development would not be well screened by existing landscape

features from areas outside the site to which the public has access contrary to policy EC9 b).

- 7.30 The development would also affect the setting of a non-designated heritage asset and insufficient information has been provided to assess potential impacts upon below ground archaeology contrary to policies PD2 and the NPPF.
- 7.31 Subject to planning conditions the development would not harm highway safety or the amenity of neighbouring properties. However, these issues do not weigh heavily either for or against the proposed development. The development would result in benefits to biodiversity and the local economy but these would not override or outweigh concerns about the impact of the development.
- 7.32 Taking the above into consideration the application is not in accordance with the Adopted Derbyshire Dales Local Plan (2017). Relevant policies are up-to-date and in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In the absence of any further material considerations indicating otherwise, the application is recommended for refusal.

## **8.0 RECOMMENDATION**

- 8.1 The proposed accommodation units and holiday pod would be prominent and result in an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the immediate and wider landscape and setting of non-designated heritage assets. The visual impact of the development would not be well screened by existing landscape features. The development is therefore contrary to policies PD2, PD5 and EC8 of the Adopted Derbyshire Dales Local Plan (2017) and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 8.2 Insufficient information has been submitted with the application to assess potential impacts of the development upon archaeology contrary to policy PD2 of the Adopted Derbyshire Dales Local Plan (2017) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

## **9.0 NOTES TO APPLICANT:**

The Local Planning Authority considered the merits of the submitted application and met with the agent and discussed potential amendments to the development. The Local Planning Authority accepted the submission of a reduced scheme and amended / additional supporting information. Nevertheless, it was judged that the proposal was contrary to the development plan and therefore the application was taken to planning committee for determination at the earliest possible opportunity and within an agreed extension of time thereby allowing the applicant to exercise their right to appeal.

This Decision Notice relates to the following documents:

Application form  
21/698/E03 Rev A – Existing Site Plan  
21/698/P01 Rev E – Proposed Site Plan  
21/698/P02 – Proposed Holiday Chalet Floor Plans  
21/698/P03 – Proposed Holiday Chalet Elevations  
21/698/P04 – Proposed Site Location Plan  
Trial Hole Location Plan - 01

Arboricultural Method Statement – AWA4351AMS  
Arboricultural Report & Impact Assessment – AWA4351  
Design and Access Statement  
BRE365 Infiltration Test – Summary  
Flood Risk Assessment

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal  
Landscape and Visual Appraisal – INF\_N0839\_R01  
Landscape and Visual Appraisal – Addendum  
Visibility Splay Calculator – ATC1  
Visibility Splay Calculator – ATC2  
Summary of ATC1 Data  
Summary of ATC2 Data