



Consultation Statement

Supplementary Planning Document: The Conversion of Farm Buildings September 2018

REGULATION 12 OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (LOCAL PLANNING) (ENGLAND) REGULATIONS 2012

1. This statement sets out who was consulted in the preparation of the draft Supplementary Planning Document: The Conversion of Farm Buildings September 2018, how they were consulted, what issues were raised and how those issues influenced the preparation of the document.

2. Supplementary Planning Documents seek to expand on existing planning policy, to provide detail and depth that may not be possible in a Local Plan. In November 2005 the District Council formally adopted the Conversion of Farm Buildings Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document. This has, since that time, sought to provide complementary design guidance and advice for owners of farm buildings (or agents/advisors working on their behalf) when they are not required for their original purpose. The SPD has operated well since that time and has provided important design advice & guidance, however following the adoption of the Derbyshire Dales Local Plan in December 2017 it can no longer be used as a “material consideration” in the determination of planning applications.

3. To ensure that the Conversion of Farm Buildings: Supplementary Planning Document can continue to be given statutory weight in the determination of planning applications it has been necessary to update its contents to reflect changes to the Local Plan policies, legislation and the approach to biodiversity and landscape management. Once adopted it can be used in the determination of planning applications as a “material consideration”.

Consultation: Stage One

4. The revised draft Conversion of Farm Buildings: Supplementary Planning Document was subject to an internal consultation, from 30 April 2018 to 31 May 2018 with the following Officers:

- Development Management Team
- Planning Policy Team.

This took the form of discussions and meetings with individual officers. The principal issue which arose was that the document should include reference and guidance relating to ‘Class Q’ (*Agricultural Buildings to Dwelling Houses*) of the General Permitted Development Order 2015. No other substantive issues were raised, although some minor amendments and a general refreshing & up-dating

of the whole document have been made relating to such items as glazing, structural works to existing farm buildings and extensions and additions.

Consultation Process

5. A six week consultation period ran from 14th September 2018 to 26th October 2018. An email or letter will be sent to targeted contacts contained on the Council's Local Plan consultation database. This included statutory consultees, Parish and Town Councils, neighbouring authorities, agents and developers and landowners.

6. In addition, the consultation documents were available online and in the following locations:

- Derbyshire Dales District Council, Town Hall, Bank Road, Matlock DE4 3NN
- The Arc Leisure Centre, 1 Bakewell Road, Matlock DE4 3AZ
- Matlock Library, Steep Turnpike, Matlock DE4 3DP
- Ashbourne Leisure Centre, Clifton Road, Ashbourne DE6 1DR
- Ashbourne Library, Compton, Ashbourne DE6 1DA
- Wirksworth Leisure Centre, Hannage Way, Wirksworth DE4 4JG
- Wirksworth Library, Town Hall, Wirksworth DE4 4EU

7. People were invited to submit comments online or in writing to ensure that representations can be registered and considered by the Council. See www.derbyshiredales.gov.uk/farmbuildingsSPD

8. In accordance with the Derbyshire Dales District Council Statement of Community Involvement a press release was issued regarding the consultation.

9. A summary of the main issues raised and how the issue was addressed is included in the Appendix One. Proposed amendments to the SPD are shown in italics.

10. This statement and the main issues raised were reported to Members prior to adoption.

10th January 2019

Appendix One

This table sets out a summary of the main issues raised by the persons consulted and how those issues have been addressed. This approach complies with regulation 12 (b) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

The text that the Council propose to delete from the SPD is ~~crossed out~~. The new text that the Council propose to include in SPD is in *italics*.

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
Introduction	<p>Conversion of farm buildings situated in flood zones will need to ensure that it meets the requirements of the Policy PD8: Flood Risk Management and Water Quality, as well as the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, for example the production of a suitable Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), highlighting that the proposed usage after conversion is a suitable vulnerability class for the flood zones it is situated in etc. Whilst the requirements and criteria for development in flood zones 2 and 3 is defined in the adopted Local Plan, as well as national policy, it may be prudent to highlight this within this SPD as well.</p>	<p>Appendix 1 sets out the policy context for the SPD. This has been amended to reflect the comments made in the following way:</p> <p>Insertion of text: <i>PD8: Flood Risk Management and Water Quality</i> into the list of Local Plan policies.</p> <p>Insertion of text: <i>Where a farm building is situation in a flood zone the requirements of Policy PD8: Flood Risk Management and Water Quality will need to be met as well as the requirements of the NPPF, which may include the need for a Flood Risk Assessment.</i></p>
	<p>Biodiversity enhancement This SPD could consider incorporating features which are beneficial to wildlife within development, in line with paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework. You may wish to consider providing guidance on, for example, the level of bat roost or bird box provision within the built structure, or other measures to enhance biodiversity in the urban environment. An example of good practice includes the Exeter Residential Design Guide SPD, which advises (amongst other matters) a ratio of one nest/roost box per residential unit.</p>	<p>Biodiversity: pg 24, para 3 amended to take into account the issue raised. Amended text to read;</p> <p>When a formal application is submitted it will be expected that a protected species report (assessment, findings & recommendations, <i>including provision, where necessary, for bird/bat boxes</i>) accompanies that application.</p>
	<p>Landscape enhancement The SPD may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green</p>	<p>The section on Landscape on page 23 considers the built form in the landscape setting. The District Council has adopted a Landscape Character and Design SPD (September 2018) which seeks to offer a comprehensive guide to landscape issues in the Derbyshire Dales and additional advice for</p>

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
	<p>infrastructure provision and access to and contact with nature. Landscape characterisation and townscape assessments, and associated sensitivity and capacity assessments provide tools for planners and developers to consider how new development might makes a positive contribution to the character and functions of the landscape through sensitive siting and good design and avoid unacceptable impacts.</p>	<p>developers/agents/landowners when considering development in the countryside. A change to the text is proposed to include a reference to this SPD.</p> <p>Additional text to read: <i>The District Council has produced a Landscape Character and Design Supplementary Planning Document that reflects the landscape assessment work and offers advice on how to comprehensively consider all landscape issues. It can be seen here: www.derbyshiredales.gov.uk/landscapeSPD .</i></p>
	<p>Please could the document make it clear within the introduction that the SPD only relates to the areas of Derbyshire Dales that fall outside the Peak District National Park as the document uses statements such as ‘Within the Derbyshire Dales.’ throughout the document.</p>	<p>Insert into the introduction, page 1 sentence 3, the following change:</p> <p>This Supplementary Planning Document seeks to expand on existing planning policy, <i>which guides planning applications for the area of the Derbyshire Dales which falls outside the Peak District National Park</i>, to provide detail and depth that may not be possible in the <i>Derbyshire Dales Local Plan</i>.</p> <p>Where Derbyshire Dales is referred to Page 1, para2, text amended to read: Derbyshire Dales <i>Local Plan Area District</i></p>
	<p>We have read the SPD and fail to see any mention of steel portal frame buildings, can they be included in future planning applications seen as there are many of these in our countryside as brick buildings. Some no longer in use and would value development in keeping with the traditional look. Special consideration ought to be given to people already living in the countryside i.e farms, horticultural who wish to remain there who can offer a better understanding of the countryside and the protection of it.</p>	<p>The conversion of steel portal frame buildings falls under Class Q, see page 21. Guidance and regulations relating to their possible conversion is included in the relevant section of the GDPO in addition to the pre-application advice service that is available to offer advice to applicants/agents/developers who would like to progress a scheme of this nature.</p> <p>No change is necessary.</p>
<p>Status of</p>	<p>Listed Farm Buildings Page 1, 2nd column, end of first paragraph: Reference could be</p>	<p>The text on page 1 sets out the advice available from the District Council which goes beyond finding out if the property is listed.</p>

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
Farm Buildings	made to Historic England's website to find out about a listed building, as well as the District Council.	<p>However an additional reference can be inserted into page 26 to the search facility that Historic England have on their website.</p> <p>Additional text to read: <i>Find out if your property is listed by using the Historic England website: https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/</i></p>
	Page 2, 1st column, end of 2nd paragraph: 'and/or Listed Building Consent' should be deleted as reference to Listed Building Consent is described in the previous sentence.	<p>Amend text, page 2 paragraph 1, to reflect the issue raised. Amended text to read; Proposals for change of use and conversion also require an application for Planning Permission. and/or Listed Building Consent.</p>
	Curtilage Listed Farm Buildings, Page 2, could this section refer the reader to the Council's pre-app advice pages on your website regarding finding out whether a farm building is curtilage listed?	<p>If somebody would like to know if a building is curtilage listed to a principle Listed Building they are encouraged to contact the District Council. This is a factual check carried out and whilst not the interpretation of policy national advice may be relevant. It therefore would not be appropriate to insert a reference to the pre-application advice service in this section.</p> <p>No change is necessary.</p>
	Unlisted Farm Buildings, Page 2 Unsure if this is referring to 'non-designated heritage assets' or buildings that aren't heritage assets.	<p>The titles in the introductory section have been amended to provide clarity on the two types of terminology in use.</p> <p>Amended text to read: Listed Farm Buildings (<i>Designated Heritage Assets</i>) Curtilage Listed Farm Buildings (<i>Designated Heritage Assets</i>) Unlisted Farm Buildings (<i>Non-designated Heritage Assets</i>)</p>
	Page 10, 2nd column, 1st paragraph: Is the term 'unlisted' correct?	<p>The wording is correct. No change is necessary.</p>
	Page 2, There are farm buildings that are not listed but are non-designated heritage assets, which are afforded a level of protection (contrary to what this paragraph states) and then there are buildings that aren't heritage assets. The adopted Local Plan seems to allow the conversion of both heritage	<p>The NPPF affords a degree of protection to non-designated heritage assets, the wording in this section, page 2 para 4, has been amended to reflect this.</p> <p>Amended text to read: Within the Derbyshire Dales there are many farm buildings and</p>

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
	assets (Policy HC8) and existing farm buildings that aren't heritage assets (Policy EC10) and therefore should these be described in separate paragraphs?	groups of farm buildings that are not listed or are not adjacent to, or within, the curtilage of listed buildings. Although they do not benefit from statutory protection They may, however, have architectural & historic merit (<i>benefitting from protection as non-designated heritage assets</i>) and/or their form, grouping, massing and configuration may play an important part in their contribution within the landscape.
	Should the sub-headings be changed to separate non-designated heritage assets from buildings that aren't heritage assets?	The titles in the introductory section have been amended to provide clarity on the two types of terminology in use. Amended text to read: Listed Farm Buildings (<i>Designated Heritage Assets</i>) Curtilage Listed Farm Buildings (<i>Designated Heritage Assets</i>) Unlisted Farm Buildings (<i>Non-designated Heritage Assets</i>)
	Page 2 The last sentence: 'Proposals for change of use and conversion would require an application for planning permission' is incorrect due to Part Q of the GPDO that is referred to later in the document.	Introduction of additional text to include a cross reference to the Class Q section will further improve the accuracy of this section. Amended text to read: Proposals for change of use and conversion would require an application for Planning Permission, <i>unless the requirements of Class Q of the General Permitted Development Order (April 2015) are met, see page 21.</i>
	We should consider the environment and wildlife habitat.	Wildlife is considered in the proposed Conversion of Farm Building Design Guide: Supplementary Planning Document on page 24. No change is necessary.
	I would ask that the scope of the document includes all types of rural buildings including not just traditional buildings and Class Q buildings but also other rural building which are not in agricultural use but which are of permanent construction. Such buildings should include former stables, and buildings created to tourism or recreational uses. Portal frame farm buildings in other uses can be converted to form good, highly sustainable dwellings and with high quality design these can enhance the landscape in line with the advice in the NPPF (paras 79(c) and	All planning applications are determined in accordance with the Derbyshire Dales Local Plan. The SPD relates to farm buildings and seeks to add to the policies in the Local Plan providing additional guidance and advice. Class Q proposals are included in the SPD on page 21 for reference as proposals qualifying under Class Q do not require a planning application. No change is necessary.

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
	83(a) & (b). At the moment the document ignores the potential of these buildings and is contrary to national policy.	
Planning Policy	<p>The policy is excessively restrictive in both what can be done and the materials to be used. While there is some merit in preserving the existing form, it should not be at the expense of creating an improved and more energy efficient dwelling. The materials to be used are irrelevant provided that the desired visual aspect is retained. It needs to be recognised that these buildings were not built in aspic and will have already been modified during their life. It is, therefore, artificial to regard a chosen and arbitrary point in time as the ideal.</p>	<p>The policy approach is set out in the Derbyshire Dales Local Plan Adopted December 2017. The SPD intends to add detail and guidance to the existing policy and therefore does not represent a new policy direction. One of the primary objectives of the SPD is to conserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Derbyshire Dales District. The materials used are an integral part of that character.</p> <p>No change is necessary.</p>
	<p>The general attitude of the policy is far too prescriptive and tries to freeze the countryside at a moment in time. The countryside is an evolving scene. The farm buildings themselves would evolve and change if they were still in use. A more liberal attitude is needed to enable farm buildings to be converted into modern, efficient homes but retaining the general appearance of their earlier life</p>	<p>The policy approach is set out in the Derbyshire Dales Local Plan Adopted December 2017. The SPD intends to add detail and guidance to the existing policy and therefore does not represent a new policy direction. One of the primary objectives of the SPD is to conserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Derbyshire Dales District. The materials used are an integral part of that character.</p> <p>No change is necessary.</p>
	<p>“Disastrous - are the Councils and Govt intending to bury England under concrete?” Stop building everything including HS2 which is a farce”</p>	<p>This comment is not relevant to the Conversion of Farm Building Design Guide: Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>No change is necessary.</p>
	<p>At the moment this document is contrary to the NPPF policy regarding conversion of rural buildings. The existence of Class Q applications and other change of use/flexible use schemes permitted development schemes indicate that the government wishes to see all types of buildings put to good use. Instead of ignoring them this SPD should encourage their re-use and include ideas of how the appearance of these buildings can be improved and encourage high quality designs which will enhance the landscape.</p>	<p>The policy approach is set out in the Derbyshire Dales Local Plan Adopted December 2017. The Local Plan was subject to an Examination in Public in May 2017 and independent Inspector considered that the Local Plan did not contradict Government guidance and policy, including the NPPF. The SPD intends to add detail and guidance to the existing policy and therefore does not represent a new policy direction. Guidance relating to Class Q is set out on page 21.</p> <p>No change is necessary.</p>
Sustainability	Page 3, 1st column: Should the second paragraph refer to	Text amended to reflect comment and improve consistency (page 3)

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
	agents as well as developers/applicants, like the first paragraph?	<p>para 1&2).</p> <p>Amended paragraph 1 to read: The objectives of this Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) are to provide clear guidance to owners/developers/<i>applicants</i>/agents etc. on the conversion of farm buildings and to ensure that any alternative use of farm buildings is sympathetic to their character, appearance and surrounding landscape.</p> <p>Amended paragraph 2 to read: The Council has identified a number of sustainability issues that are important when considering the conversion of farm buildings. Appendix B provides a checklist to help identify relevant sustainability issues that <i>owners/developers/applicants/agents</i> should address as part of (or prior to) the submission of any planning application in order to assess the relative sustainability of their proposal.</p>
	Sustainability is vital and I assume that this include achieving a low energy footprint. At no time should an artificial desire to preserve a building at an arbitrarily chosen point of time be allowed to interfere with the achievement of a sensible level of sustainability.	<p>The sustainability checklist has been included to help building owners/agents/developers considering a conversion of a farm building to identify issues that need to be addressed as part of the submission of any planning application.</p> <p>No change is necessary.</p>
	"the Council ignore it"	<p>The sustainability checklist has been included to help building owners/agents/developers considering a conversion of a farm building to identify issues that need to be addressed as part of the submission of any planning application.</p> <p>No change is necessary.</p>
	Portal type buildings can be sympathetically designed to blend in with the surrounding countryside. The character of the countryside has changed over the past 60 years incorporating a large number of these portal frame buildings.	<p>The SPD intends to add detail and guidance to the existing policy in the Local Plan and does not represent a new policy direction. One of the primary objectives of the SPD is to conserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Derbyshire Dales District.</p>

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
	<p>In terms of sustainability I suggest that document should require positive statement that measures should be carried out to retain and/or add bat roosts and swallow, house-martin, house-sparrow, and swift nest sites. I appreciate the latter birds are not protected species but their numbers have declined drastically. Significant in that decline is the loss of nest sites through the conversion and demolition of rural buildings.</p> <p>I would also suggest that the Council require on all rural conversions, particularly tourism or residential conversions, the provision of charging points for electric cars.</p>	<p>Sympathetic changes and alterations can be achieved through good design.</p> <p>No change is necessary.</p> <p>Guidance relating to biodiversity is set out in pages 24-25 in the SPD. With regard to non-protected species it is currently beyond the scope of the SPD and planning policy. The provision of bat/bird boxes for protected species is recognised as important in the SPD.</p> <p>Amended text, page 24 column 2 paragraph 2. When a formal application is submitted it will be expected that a protected species report (assessment, findings & recommendations <i>including provision, where necessary, for bird/bat boxes</i>) accompanies that application.</p> <p>Alteration to sustainability checklist (energy efficiency), page 31, to reflect this issue.</p> <p>Amended text to read: <i>The provision and location of electric car charging points should be considered, subject to any planning restrictions that may apply.</i></p>
Building Regulations	"A farce. Anyone can build anything anywhere"	<p>Not relevant to the Conversion of farm Building Design Guide: Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>No change is necessary.</p>
Character and Context	<p>The title should be in bold, like the other titles.</p> <p>Page 4, 1st column, last paragraph refers to the diverse landscape of the Derbyshire Dales. Is this the Derbyshire Dales as a whole? Or the part that is outside the Peak District National Park?</p>	<p>The text is in bold.</p> <p>No change is necessary.</p> <p>The introduction as amended in response to comments made to the Introduction sets out that the SPD applies to the area of the Derbyshire Dales that lies outside the Peak District National Park and is covered by the Derbyshire Dales Local Plan (Adopted 2017). No further changes are necessary.</p>

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
	<p>Character and context are fine providing that they do not inhibit the function of the building as a sustainably acceptable dwelling. By definition these buildings are no longer in regular use for farming and thus the question of whether they should either be allowed to decay or altered and incorporated into the local housing stock needs to be considered more deeply than it appears to have been.</p>	<p>The SPD acknowledges that the owners/developers of disused farm buildings may be seeking an alternative use, the SPD provides guidance and parameters for those who would like to convert the farm building to a dwelling. No change is necessary.</p>
	<p>"It is ignored"</p>	<p>Not relevant to the Conversion of farm Building Design Guide: Supplementary Planning Document therefore no change is necessary.</p>
	<p>You note farm buildings have several constructural elements and it is fair to say a large number of buildings in the Derbyshire Dales are of steel portal frame construction because these were the types of building that came into use in the 1960's onwards and this has been the choice of farm buildings for the past 60 years. Therefore should be included in this document as they can be bought back to traditional character and offer the opportunity for a family home for the farming community</p>	<p>Under Class Q some steel portal frame buildings can be converted to residential however it is unlikely that such buildings could be given a "traditional character".</p> <p>No change is necessary.</p>
Roofs	<p>Page 5, 7th bullet point refers to flues. However flues are also mentioned twice in the section titled 'Interiors' and all three refer to different aspects. I assume flues should be included in this section rather than 'Interiors' as they talk about their external appearance, siting and design rather than anything internal.</p>	<p>It is appropriate that flues are mentioned in both the External Elements and Interiors sections with regard to consistency, however to improve clarity the following text will be added to the External Elements section, bullet point 7, this text duplicates the Interiors section advice.</p> <p>Amended text to read: <i>It is desirable to locate flue terminals so that they do not project / protrude above the existing roof ridgeline. However, such elements must comply with the requirements of the Building Regulations and, in this regard, their location and height must be clearly indicated on any proposals.</i></p>
	<p>Roofing materials and styles have varied so much with time, more tolerance should be shown to innovations such as dormer windows.</p>	<p>Dormer windows are resisted as they represent the introduction of a non-original detail. See page 5 which sets out guidance regarding the installation of rooflights.</p> <p>No change is necessary.</p>

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
	<p>“Ignored by you”</p>	<p>The Conversion of farm Building Design Guide: Supplementary Planning Document seeks to offer advice concerning the treatment of Roofs in conversions. No change is necessary.</p>
	<p>Galvanised sheeting has been used on many buildings and can be supplemented with modern coloured sheeting (green) to ensure they fit within the countryside, look original and which meets modern insulation requirements.</p>	<p>It is recognised that existing roofs may be of non traditional materials and guidance regarding its replacement is relevant for inclusion in the SPD. Additional bullet point (page 5) to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Where the existing roof covering material is non-traditional there would be a programme for a non-shiny, non-reflective material to be used when replacement is occurring.</i>
Walling	<p>Page 5, 2nd column: The 3rd sentence in the 3rd paragraph beginning, ‘Their transient nature...’ does not relate to anything to do with walling. Should this be deleted?</p>	<p>The term “transient” is being used in this context to describe the type of building construction within the farmstead that has a more temporary life. The building and its walls will therefore be “transient in nature”. It is important that the SPD recognises the variety of farm buildings. No change is necessary.</p>
	<p>If dismantling and rebuilding is required for either safety or sustainability, it should be allowed. It may well give the building in question a much greater longevity and thus preserve its character for future generations.</p>	<p>An assessment of the structural suitability of the building for conversion to a dwelling is considered important pre-requisite in determining its potential for conversion. It is recognised that some farm buildings will require structural works prior to conversion works. See page 6 for more guidance. No change is necessary.</p>
	<p>“Ignored by you</p>	<p>The Conversion of Farm Buildings: Supplementary Planning Document seeks to offer advice concerning the treatment of walls. No change is necessary.</p>
	<p>Disagree with the comments suggesting all walls are made of limestone. Generally farm building built over the past 60 years have been of concrete block construction or some form of metal sheeting. So as suggested on the document this can be rendered and metal sheet work re-painted and internally insulated to give these buildings look original and with an</p>	<p>Page five states that farm buildings are “generally constructed of limestone, sandstone (or sometimes a mixture of both) and brickwork”. The section on Walling, page 5, recognises that there are buildings within farmsteads that have a functional or ancillary purpose which may be more simply constructed with timber boarding or metal sheeting. Wording on page 5 column two</p>

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
	updated look.	<p>amended to reflect the issue raised.</p> <p>Amended text to read: <i>Modern farm buildings are generally constructed from concrete bases and timber/metal cladding.</i></p>
Window and door openings	<p>i) Page 9, 2nd column, 1st bullet point states that UPVC would not be an appropriate material for replacing existing, historic timber window frames, but would UPVC be an appropriate material in any circumstance on a heritage asset, both designated and non-designated?</p> <p>ii) Also, if the building already has UPVC/ inappropriate windows, should the text state that the replacement window should be timber?</p> <p>iii) Is UPVC acceptable in those buildings not deemed to be heritage assets?</p> <p>Page 9, 2nd column, 6th bullet point: 'The depth/recess of existing window frames should be used to inform the depth/recess of any replacement/new windows'. What if the existing window frame isn't original and the depth/recess isn't correct? You wouldn't want the replacement window frame to match the existing window in this scenario.</p> <p>Listed and Curtilage-Listed Farm Buildings Page 9, 2nd column: The paragraphs that follow this sub-</p>	<p>i) The material changes that uPVC would bring to a traditional farm building (designated and non designated) would generally be unacceptable to its character and appearance. No change is necessary.</p> <p>ii) Suggest additional 7th bullet point, page 9. Amended text to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Where window frames are considered inappropriate in pattern, material and form these should be replaced with window frame and form of appropriate pattern, material and form for the building.</i> <p>iii) There may be circumstances under Class Q where this is appropriate for modern arm buildings, see page 21 for more guidance. No change is necessary.</p> <p>Changes to the text on page 9, column two, to reflect the issue raised. Amended text to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The depth/recess of a window frame is an important element of the character and appearance of the farm building. The depth/recess of existing window frames should be used to inform the depth/recess of any replacement/new windows <i>unless that window is not original or appropriately recessed.</i> <p>The intention of the paragraphs is to identify the presumption in favour of single glazing but providing detailed guidance where</p>

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
	heading relate to double-glazing units and would be applicable to all heritage assets. The title should be changed to 'Double-glazing units in Heritage Assets'.	double glazing may be appropriate. No change is necessary.
	Page 10, 1st column, last paragraph: This states 'any conversion scheme' however this would include those buildings not deemed to be heritage assets, where-as the title refers to listed and curtilage-listed farm buildings.	Amended text, page 10, to clarify that the reference made is to Listed and Curtilage-Listed farm buildings. Amended text to read: Proposals for double-glazed windows, which comply with all of the above criteria, will be considered as part of any a conversion scheme, with the important caveat that they will only be deemed acceptable if the introduction of double-glazing is considered not to harm, or be detrimental to, the building's character and appearance.
	Unlisted Farm Buildings Unsure if this is referring to 'non-designated heritage assets' or buildings that aren't heritage assets.	The titles in the introductory section, page 2, have been amended to provide clarity on the two types of terminology in use. No additional change is necessary.
	Page 10, 2nd column, 1st paragraph: Is the term 'unlisted' incorrect?	The term 'unlisted' is correct. No change is necessary.
	Non-designated heritage assets do benefit from a level of protection.	Amended text on page 10 to reflect the guidance in the NPPF regarding non-designated heritage assets. Amended text to read: Whilst historic, un-listed, farm buildings still present and display a strong agricultural character and appearance, they do not benefit from statutory protection. In this regard, it <i>It</i> is unlikely that the Local Planning Authority would raise any objection to the introduction of double-glazed windows, <i>where this does not affect its significance</i> . However, in terms of advice and guidance in relation to an application for conversion, it is considered that the above criteria are pertinent and should be utilised for un-listed historic farm buildings.
	Is 'double-glazed windows' referring to UPVC window frames or double glazed window panes within a wooden/power-coated metal frame? (Could this be clarified?) If it's referring to the	The text refers to meeting all of the criteria including the use of timber.

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
	<p>former, UPVC shouldn't be considered acceptable in non-designated heritage assets, only buildings that aren't heritage assets. If it's referring to the latter, would the previous paragraphs regarding double-glazed units in listed and curtilage-listed buildings be applicable?</p>	<p>No change is necessary.</p>
	<p>Doors Should the sub-headings be changed to separate non-designated heritage assets from buildings that aren't heritage assets?</p>	<p>The titles in the introductory section, page 2, have been amended to provide clarity on the two types of terminology in use.</p> <p>No additional change is necessary.</p>
	<p>i) Page 11, 1st column, 3rd bullet point: Would UPVC be considered acceptable in farm buildings that aren't heritage assets?</p> <p>ii) Also, this only refers to UPVC and powder-coated metal doors being an unacceptable replacement for existing timber doors/ doorframes.</p> <p>iii) Also, if the building already has UPVC/inappropriate doors/door frames, should the text state that the replacement door/door frame should be timber?</p>	<p>i) The material changes that uPVC would bring to a traditional farm building (designated and non-designated) would generally be unacceptable to its character and appearance.</p> <p>No change is necessary.</p> <p>ii) Insertion of "historic" to provide clarification and consistency with the section on windows.</p> <p>Amended bullet point 3 to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative materials such as UPVC and powder-coated metal, as a replacement for existing <i>historic</i> timber doors/doorframes will not be considered appropriate or acceptable. <p>iii) Suggest additional 3rd bullet point, page 11.</p> <p>Amended text to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Where doors and doorframes are considered inappropriate in pattern, material and form these should be replaced with window frame and form of appropriate pattern, material and form for the building.</i>
	<p>Issues regarding 'Listed and Curtilage-Listed Farm Buildings', 'Unlisted Farm Buildings', no mention of non-designated heritage assets, the use of the term 'unlisted' etc. (See previous comments).</p>	<p>The titles in the introductory section, page 2, have been amended to provide clarity on the two types of terminology in use.</p> <p>No additional change is necessary.</p>
	<p>Page 11, 2nd column, 2nd to last paragraph, (text starting 'Where a new glazed...'): The text doesn't states that the use of single glazing is the first preference. It goes straight into talking about 'thin double glazing'.</p>	<p>There is a distinction between an opening or aperture within a door or a glazed element in a former doorway. The paragraph states that single glazed elements where the area of glazing is relatively small is likely to be appropriate and a new glazed element in a former doorway thin double glazing is likely to be appropriate.</p>

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
		No change is necessary.
	Page 12, 1st column, 1st paragraph after the bullet points: The text refers to 'any conversion scheme' but it is under the sub-heading 'Listed and Curtilage-Listed Buildings' so it wouldn't relate to 'any' conversion scheme, just those involving listed and curtilage listed buildings.	Change to text to reflect the issue raised and for consistency with the section on windows. Amended text to read: Proposals for double-glazed elements, or installations to existing doorway openings, which comply with all of the above criteria, will be considered as part of a any conversion scheme, with the important caveat that they will only be deemed acceptable if the introduction of double-glazing is considered not to harm or be detrimental to the building's character and appearance.
	Page 12, 1st column, last paragraph: There is an issue regarding 'double-glazed elements' as previously discussed in the Windows section under the sub-heading regarding unlisted buildings.	Amended text on page 12 to reflect the guidance in the NPPF regarding non-designated heritage assets. Amended text to read: Whilst historic, un-listed, farm buildings still present and display a strong agricultural character and appearance, they do not benefit from statutory protection. in this regard, it is unlikely that the Local Planning Authority would raise any objection to the introduction of double-glazed elements or installations to existing doorway openings <i>where this does not affect its significance</i> . However, in terms of advice and guidance in relation to an application for conversion, it is considered that the above criteria are pertinent and should be utilised for un-listed historic farm buildings.
	Double glazing should be allowed in all cases as should the use of either metal or up can, providing that the general appearance is maintained. Doors should be able to be upgraded to modern standards.	The material changes that uPVC would bring to a traditional farm building (designated and non-designated) would generally be unacceptable to its character and appearance. No change is necessary.
	"Hideous whenever planning is granted"	The Conversion of Farm Buildings: Supplementary Planning Document provides advice on the treatment of doors and doorframes and does not propose a change in policy approach therefore no change is necessary.
Other Openings	Hayloft Openings Page 13, 1st column, list of bullet points: The reference in the original SPD regarding 'UPVC alternatives will not be acceptable' should be put back into this list.	Bullet point was omitted as an error, re-instate text to correct. Amended bullet point 3 text to read:

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
	<p>Unused or unneeded openings should be allowed to be closed up permanently</p> <p>“Hideous whenever planning is granted”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>UPVC alternatives will not be acceptable.</i> <p>The material changes that uPVC would bring to a traditional farm building (designated and non-designated) would generally be unacceptable to its character and appearance. No change is necessary.</p> <p>The Conversion of farm Building Design Guide: Supplementary Planning Document considers the treatment of openings and does not propose a change in policy approach to that set out in the Local Plan. No change is necessary.</p>
Architectural & Decorative Features	<p>Page 15, 2nd column, first bullet point: ‘...that all such features, and any others, are retained...’ should be changed to ‘...that any such features should be retained...’</p> <p>If significant these should be retained.</p> <p>“A standing joke what is got away with”</p> <p>A general comment covering all the above external element - walls, roofs , etc- in relation to portal frame or other modern farm or rural buildings is that the use of modern materials can change these often unattractive buildings onto ones which can enhance and grace the landscape, Why not do this instead of adopting a negative approach.</p> <p>The Council have recently required that a new build outside Brassington be designed to look like a modern farm building</p>	<p>The existing wording is considered more pertinent to this part of the guidance “all such features” is considered correct. No change is necessary.</p> <p>The Conversion of Farm Buildings: Supplementary Planning Document considers the treatment of architectural and decorative features that are integral and significant to the character and appearance of farm buildings. The SPD does not propose a change in policy approach to that set out in the Local Plan, therefore no change is necessary.</p> <p>The Conversion of Farm Buildings: Supplementary Planning Document considers the treatment of architectural and decorative features and does not propose a change in policy approach to that set out in the Local Plan, therefore no change is necessary.</p> <p>The SPD is not advocating a negative approach but on the contrary is aiming to retain the character and appearance of farm buildings within the Derbyshire Dales context. No change is necessary.</p>

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
	<p>which has been converted to a house but should not look like a dwelling. This application (17/00999/FUL) was recently approved. I appreciate that this was new build but it shows what can be achieved through high-quality design and the right approach. shows what can be achieved through good.</p>	<p>Your comments are welcomed. The design ethos taken with the scheme identified and others reflects the Council's approach.</p>
New Services	<p>Page 15, 2nd column, last bullet point: A satellite dish would look like an alien feature on any agricultural building, not just listed/curtilage-listed buildings. Satellite dishes would be inappropriate on all heritage assets, including 'non-designated heritage assets'.</p>	<p>A new bullet point on page 16 is proposed to reflect the issue raised concerning unlisted farm buildings converted to a dwelling house. Additional bullet point to read: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The introduction of a satellite dish and solar equipment to an unlisted farm building (converted to a dwelling house) is likely to be restricted by the removal of Permitted Development Rights.</i> </p>
	<p>Page 16, 1st column, 1st bullet point: Regarding solar equipment, the paragraph should also refer to non-designated heritage assets, not just listed/curtilage-listed buildings.</p>	<p>A new bullet point on page 16 is proposed to reflect the issue raised concerning unlisted farm buildings converted to a dwelling house. Additional bullet point to read: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The introduction of a satellite dish and solar equipment to an unlisted farm building (converted to a dwelling house) is likely to be restricted by the removal of Permitted Development Rights.</i> </p>
	<p>Within reason I agree, but regard the idea that security alarms must not be visible as ludicrous. Visibility is part of their effectiveness</p>	<p>The SPD does not refer to the concealment of security alarms however each proposal will be considered on a case by case basis. No change is necessary.</p>
	<p>"All awful"</p>	<p>The Conversion of farm Building Design Guide: Supplementary Planning Document considers the treatment of new services and does not propose a change in policy approach to that set out in the Local Plan, therefore no change is necessary.</p>
	<p>New services is only applicable to incoming services such as Electric, water and telecoms. The document does not address outgoing services such as sewage and water run off. Rural communities often deal with sewage by discharging to septic</p>	<p>The reason this is not included in the SPD is because sewerage and water run off are issues which are required to be satisfied under the Building Regulations. No change is necessary.</p>

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
	<p>tank. It is essential that for new development sewage is discharged in a safe way on not just linked up to existing sewage discharge systems as it will cause the systems to become over capacity and become an environmental hazard as is the case on my land. The document is silent on this. It needs to address this directly so capacity is increased in line with increased demand but it also needs to address the 2020 Environment Agency change in legislation outlawing discharge septic tank.</p>	
Interiors	<p>The commas at the end of the bullet points should be changed to full stops for consistency.</p>	<p>Changes made to the document to correct this typing error.</p>
	<p>Same issue previously raised regarding the use of the headings 'Listed and Curtilage-Listed Farm Buildings' and 'Un-listed Farm Buildings' and the lack of clarity surrounding 'non-designed heritage assets' and farm buildings that aren't heritage assets.</p>	<p>The titles in the introductory section, page 2, have been amended to provide clarity on the two types of terminology in use.</p> <p>No additional change is necessary.</p>
	<p>Listed and Curtilage-Listed Farm Buildings The first two paragraphs relate to all agricultural buildings, not just listed/curtilage-listed buildings. The 'Listed and Curtilage-Listed Farm Buildings' sub-heading (or preferably a new heading 'Heritage Assets') should go before the list of bullet points in the 2nd column on page 16.</p>	<p>It is intended to move the sub heading to precede the bullet points on page 17 to address this point.</p> <p>Change of position of heading "Listed and Curtilage-Listed Farm Buildings" to preceded the bullet points on page 17.</p>
	<p>Page 16, 1st column, 1st paragraph: Is there a word missing? Should it read 'harness racks' not just 'harness'?</p>	<p>Amend text to correct error.</p> <p>Amended text to read:</p> <p>The interior spaces of most farm buildings generally consist of large open spaces, sometimes open to the roof, together with other examples of the surviving paraphernalia of their agricultural use, such as feeders, stall dividers, harness <i>and</i> hay racks, etc.</p>
	<p>Page 17, 6th bullet point, 1st column: This relates to flues outside of the building, therefore it is not relevant under the 'Interiors' heading. Should this be moved to the Roofs section?</p>	<p>The nature of a flue is that the point of projection through the roof is directly related to the location of the flue in the interior, therefore the reference to flues is in the Interior section and the Roofs section of the SPD.</p>

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
		No change is necessary.
	Page 17, 1st bullet point, 2nd column: This relates to flues outside of the building, therefore it is not relevant under the 'Interiors' heading. Should this be moved to the Roofs section?	The nature of a flue is that the point of projection through the roof is directly related to the location of the flue in the interior, therefore the reference to flues is in the Interior section and the Roofs section of the SPD. No change is necessary.
	Page 17: Issues regarding 'Unlisted Farm Buildings', no mention of non-designated heritage assets, the use of the term 'unlisted' etc. (See previous comments).	The text refers to internal works only. Text amended to provide additional clarification. Amended text to read: On un-listed farm buildings, it is desirable to respect and retain the internal character of the building wherever possible. <i>Whilst there is no statutory protection for the interior of an unlisted farm building. However, there is no statutory protection in this regard.</i>
	The interior should not be subject to these sort of planning constraints, provided that any installations do not directly impact the external aspect.	The section is intended to give additional advice and guidance where the farm building being converted is listed or curtilage-listed. In these circumstances they are subject to planning constraints. No change is necessary.
	"Who knows"	The Conversion of farm Building Design Guide: Supplementary Planning Document considers the treatment of interiors and does not propose a change in policy approach to that set out in the Local Plan, therefore no change is necessary.
	In general all interiors need to be upgraded with sufficient insulation to ensure building are meeting modern eco guidelines as regards heat conservation as cutting down on oil, gas, electric etc.	Energy efficiency measures will be considered on a case by case basis. No change is necessary.
Extensions & Additions	The commas at the end of the bullet points should be changed to full stops for consistency.	Changes will be made to the document to correct this typing error.
	This is a very confusing section of the document. It is noted that a lot of additional text has been included on page 18, in the first column, however: The last paragraph, 2nd column, page 17 should be joined to the	This layout was intended to clarify the guidance within this bullet point. No change is necessary.

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
	first bullet point in the 1st column on page 18.	
	The 1st paragraph, 1st column, page 18 talks about conversion schemes in general rather than extensions and additions. Should this be moved to the Introduction?	This is an introduction to this section and it is considered that it should remain as a bullet point in this location. No change is necessary.
	The 2nd paragraph, 1st column, page 18 talks about this document primarily being about the conversion of farm buildings, not extensions to farm buildings. Again, should this be moved to the Introduction?	This is introductory in nature and it is considered that it should remain in this location. No change is necessary.
	Most of the 3rd paragraph, 1st column, page 18 repeats what is said in the first paragraph (bottom of page 17) and the bullet point (top of page 18) under the 'Extensions and Additions' heading.	The third paragraph, 1st column, refers to extensions and additions whereas the reference on page 17 refers primarily to the nature, function and spaces, gaps and separation of farm buildings. No change is necessary.
	The 4th paragraph doesn't flow correctly. The sentence should begin 'The LPA would be unlikely to support a proposed extension/addition. However, if an extension/addition...' and then continue as is.	It is considered that the SPD paragraphs in this regard are the link between paragraph 3 and 4 and are deemed acceptable. No change is necessary.
	Page 18, 2nd column, 8th bullet point: The text refers to 'separate building' however this is a section on extensions and additions. Separate buildings are covered in the section on 'Outbuildings and Curtilage'. This term should be deleted from this section.	Text alteration is suggested for clarity. Amended text to read: Where, the principle of extending a farm building or structure may be considered acceptable, the following will be expected: 8th Bullet point amended to read: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building materials will need to be given very careful consideration and be appropriate to the design concept of the extension, or addition or separate building.
	Page 18, 2nd column: The text introduces the term 'farm building or structure' a number of times. This is an SPD on the conversion of farm buildings, therefore references to structures isn't applicable. This term should be deleted from the text.	Text alteration is suggested for clarity. Amended text to read: Where, the principle of extending a farm building or structure may be considered acceptable, the following will be expected: 8 th Bullet point amended to read: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building materials will need to be given very careful consideration and be appropriate to the design concept of the

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
		extension, <i>or</i> addition or separate building.
	<p>Conservatories, Sun-Lounges, Garden Rooms, Porches and Porch Canopies, Page 19</p> <p>The paragraph under this heading should be deleted. It refers the reader to the previous guidance regarding extensions and additions being applicable to these types of development however the previous guidance outlines how an extension/addition should be designed in order for it to be acceptable. Whereas these types of extension/addition are unacceptable on converted farm buildings and couldn't be made acceptable by better design/materials etc. The paragraph is also located under the sub-heading 'Extensions and Additions' and therefore it is not necessary to state that they comprise extensions/additions.</p>	<p>It is considered that the introductory paragraph is necessary within the 'extensions and additions' section to refer back to aforesaid guidance and as a preamble to the bullet points under this heading. No change is necessary.</p>
	<p>Page 19, 1st column: The two bullet points should be removed and made into two paragraphs. These two paragraphs say everything that needs to be said.</p>	<p>This is a layout issue and not a comment on the content. No change is necessary.</p>
	<p>Page 19, 1st column, 2nd bullet point: The terms 'principal' and 'or associated farm buildings' should be deleted from the text as the former is confusing and the latter isn't applicable.</p>	<p>The term principle relates to the existing building which may or may not have already been converted. It is considered 'associated farm buildings' term to be important as identifying those other farm buildings within the curtilage of the primary building. No change is necessary.</p>
	<p>Garaging, Page 19</p> <p>The sub-heading should be changed to 'Parking and Garaging'.</p>	<p>Amendment to title to reflect this comment. Amended title to read: <i>Garaging and Parking</i></p>
	<p>The sub-heading should be changed to a main heading as the text talks about garages as an extension to a converted farm building, as well as surface parking and detached garages.</p>	<p>The garaging sub section referred to sits within the Extensions and Additions section. It is considered that this is the most appropriate location for this topic in the SPD. No change is necessary.</p>
	<p>The text on page 19 regarding garaging is confused by the new text that is included at the top of the 2nd column which seems to</p>	<p>The text indicates that the construction of a new building to provide parking can be "explored" and the bullet point sets out the issues</p>

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
	indicate that new garage buildings are acceptable. Where-as the bullet point list that follows states that new detached garaging will be resisted.	and constraints to such a development that will be considered as part of the planning application process. No change is necessary.
	The last paragraph at the bottom of column 1, page 19 should end with 'This may take the form of:' and the text regarding 'discreet areas of hard standing' should be included as a bullet point.	The paragraph forms part of the context setting for the section, the bullet points refer to a structure specifically used for parking. No change is necessary.
	The bullet points regarding the different forms of parking/garaging could be listed in order of preference.	The bullet points on page 19-20 list the options for garaging in appropriate order, firstly using the existing spaces within the farm building, secondly constructing an attached garage and thirdly a detached garage. No change is necessary.
	Derbyshire County Council archaeological advisers would welcome pre-application enquires in relation to extensions or additions to farm buildings. NPPF para 198 which requires developers to establish the significance of any heritage assets which will be affected by their proposals, requires that the minimum an applicant should do when assessing this is contact the County Historic Environment Record. It would be appreciated this recommendation could be included in para 4 under this section.	The insertion of an additional bullet point on page 19 will raise awareness of archaeology within the extensions and additions section. Appropriate contact information has been included on page 26 and archaeology is addressed in a separate section on page 22. Additional bullet point, page 19, to read: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Consideration of potential impacts on archaeology and biodiversity.</i> Additional contact information: <i>Derbyshire County Archaeology Services can be contacted on 01629 539773 see:</i> https://www.derbyshire.gov.uk/environment/conservation/archaeology/archaeology.aspx
	These should be subject to normal planning rules only, provided they are in keeping. Conservatories, etc.; should be allowed as they can enhance the look of the building.	The Conversion of farm Building Design Guide: Supplementary Planning Document considers the issues of extensions and additions and does not propose a change in policy approach to that set out in the Local Plan. Conservatories are considered to be in contrast and oppose the agricultural nature of the original building

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
	<p data-bbox="315 309 779 341">"Terrible, uniformly out of character"</p>	<p data-bbox="1182 236 1346 268">and setting.</p> <p data-bbox="1182 272 1503 304">No change is necessary.</p> <p data-bbox="1182 309 2056 448">The Conversion of farm Building Design Guide: Supplementary Planning Document considers the issues of extensions and additions and does not propose a change in policy approach to that set out in the Local Plan.</p> <p data-bbox="1182 453 1503 485">No change is necessary.</p>
<p data-bbox="107 497 280 561">Outbuildings & Curtilage</p>	<p data-bbox="315 497 1115 600">Page 20, 1st column, 1st paragraph: Refers to listed buildings and curtilage-listed buildings but not non-designated heritage assets.</p> <p data-bbox="315 606 1115 746">Page 20, 1st column, 1st bullet point: It should say 'traditional outbuildings' or 'outbuildings that are heritage assets' not just 'outbuildings', as not all outbuildings are worthy of being retained.</p> <p data-bbox="315 791 1137 932">Page 20, 1st column, 2nd and 3rd bullet points: How will these features be resisted when the majority do not comprise development and therefore cannot be controlled by the removal of permitted development rights?</p>	<p data-bbox="1182 497 2033 600">The titles in the introductory section, page 2, have been amended to provide clarity on the two types of terminology in use.</p> <p data-bbox="1182 568 1637 600">No additional change is necessary.</p> <p data-bbox="1182 606 1733 638">Text amended to provide additional clarity.</p> <p data-bbox="1182 644 1473 676">Amended text to read:</p> <ul data-bbox="1182 683 1966 785" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1182 683 1966 785">• Outbuildings shall be retained, repaired and re-used wherever possible. Their demolition of <i>outbuildings deemed heritage assets</i> will be resisted in most cases. <p data-bbox="1182 791 1989 932">The SPD used to guide applicants as to the features that are undesirable in the conversion of the property. With a heritage asset such features can be resisted where not they would be undesirable. The text is altered to reflect this.</p> <p data-bbox="1182 976 1608 1008">Amended bullet point; 2, to read:</p> <ul data-bbox="1182 1015 2033 1187" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1182 1015 2033 1187">• The over-domestication of the setting of a converted farm building (in terms of patios, timber-fencing, railings, extensive garden landscaping, ornamental ponds, lamp posts and pergolas) will <i>would be undesirable unless that building/site is deemed a heritage asset. resisted,</i> <p data-bbox="1182 1193 1592 1225">Amended bullet point 3 to read:</p> <ul data-bbox="1182 1232 2056 1334" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1182 1232 2056 1334">• The formation of ornamental water features, fountains, fish ponds and larger bodies of water will generally be resisted, <i>would be undesirable unless that building/site is deemed a heritage asset.</i> <p data-bbox="1182 1340 1592 1372">Amended bullet point 6 to read:</p>

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The entrance or approach to a converted farm building, or group of buildings, should retain its original rural and agricultural character. Over prestigious entrances, with gateposts and gates, extensive block paving, setts or tarmac, will be resisted, <i>would be undesirable unless that building/site is deemed a heritage asset.</i> Amended bullet point 8 to read: • Decorative and fussy metal or timber gates will be resisted, <i>would be undesirable unless that building/site is deemed a heritage asset.</i> Amended bullet point 9 to read: • The widening of existing gateways (vehicular or pedestrian) will generally be resisted, would be undesirable unless that building/site is deemed a heritage asset. Amended bullet point 13 to read: • External swimming pools and tennis courts, with or without enclosure, are considered to be detrimental to the character, setting and grouping of a farmstead and their introduction will, therefore, be resisted. <i>would be undesirable unless that building/site is deemed a heritage asset.</i>
	The commas at the end of the bullet points should be changed to full stops for consistency.	Changes will be made to the document to correct this typing error.
	Page 21, 1st column, paragraph in bold: Should this also refer to the removal of permitted development rights for gates, walls and fences as these fall outside the scope of residential permitted development rights? This would tie-in with the text within 'Post-Conversion' that refers to inappropriate alterations/additions within its curtilage including fences.	Amend the paragraph to reflect the GDPO Part 2. Amended text to read: In order to retain and protect the character, appearance and setting of the buildings any grant of planning permission would normally remove residential <i>and minor operations</i> permitted development rights.
	There is nothing in the text regarding the care needed when creating a residential curtilage. Most farm buildings don't have a defined curtilage associated with them, particularly isolated	It is considered that bullet point 12 on page 20 adequately addresses this point. No change is necessary.

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
	buildings within fields. The size of the curtilage should be carefully controlled and may even be unacceptable in its own right due to the landscape character of the area.	
	There is nothing in the text that states that the creation of garden areas and hard standings, or the domestic paraphernalia, associated with a converted residential farm building can be unacceptable in landscape terms and can render a proposed conversion unacceptable in certain locations.	These issues are deemed to be covered by existing paragraphs/bullet points in the SPD. No change is necessary.
	When in use for farming, these would have been altered as necessary in order to satisfy current requirements. This rule should continue and changes thus allowed.	The use of a farm building and its setting for agriculture does not have the same impact on the landscape as domestic curtilage. Approved changes may be allowed subject to the guidance of the SPD. For this reason the advice in this section is included in the SPD. No change is necessary.
	"should be stopped"	The Conversion of Farm Building Design Guide: Supplementary Planning Document considers outbuildings and curtilage and additions and does not propose a change in policy approach to that set out in the Local Plan, therefore no change is necessary.
Class Q	"?"	Information about Class Q is set out in the SPD to give additional guidance and advice. No change is necessary.
	It is clearly the intention of the Council to try to refuse permission to as many proposed conversions of farm buildings to houses as possible. Yet the conversion of these very often redundant buildings to housing use is the only economic way that they can be saved and improved, in many cases removing an eyesore and replacing it with a nice new building of real use. The text of the section on Class Q indicates that no permission will be given if there is any alteration whatsoever in the building to convert it	The Class Q regulations are not in place to oppose the conversion of farm buildings to residential use, however this piece of legislation (Class Q) has now been tested on occasion through appeals and the Courts and the information provided in the SPD reflects the current and up to date decisions made.

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
	to become a house. This is clearly done to prevent any such conversions and the whole tone of this section needs to be made more favourable to conversion to residential use. As it is currently written, we feel this section is against the spirit of the National Planning Policy Framework and government policy which is much more in favour of the conversion of farm buildings to residential use.	
	What about conversions to other types of use? Surely these should be included in the document with advise on how to achieve a good quality design. Again advise on how to achieve good design when converting Class Q buildings would be helpful and raise the standard of design.	The SPD provides guidance for conversion of farm buildings to other uses, the majority of applications received by the District Council are for conversion to dwellings however the principles and guidance can apply to all future uses. Where conversion of a farm building to a residential use meets the requirements of Class Q the conversion is not guided by planning conditions that may specify design elements and would normally form part of a planning consent. No change is necessary.
Post conversion	If the initial planning approach is balanced, sensible and reasonable then this should not be a major issue, but normal planning rules should apply	The policies in the Derbyshire Dales Local Plan will be applied to all planning applications. The Conversion of Farm Building Design Guide: Supplementary Planning Document provides additional advice and guidance to applicants and will be a “material consideration”. No change is necessary.
	“?”	Information about post conversion issues is set out in the SPD. No change is considered necessary.
Archaeology	Paragraph 1: suggested text: <i>Both listed and non-listed traditional farm buildings are deemed heritage assets in NPPF. When considering the potential impact on the significance of both the buildings themselves and, potentially, below ground archaeology associated with the use of the buildings through time, advice on such should be sought at a pre- application</i>	Insert additional paragraph, page 22 to read: <i>Both listed and non-listed traditional farm buildings are deemed heritage assets in NPPF. When considering the potential impact on the significance of both the buildings themselves and, potentially, below ground archaeology associated with the use of the buildings through time, advice on should be sought at a pre- application</i>

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
	<p>stage. Derbyshire County Council archaeological advisers would welcome such pre-application enquires.</p>	<p>stage. Derbyshire County Council archaeological advisers would welcome such pre-application enquires.</p> <p>Additional contact information on page 26. Amended text to read: Derbyshire County Archaeology Services can be contacted on 01629 539773 see https://www.derbyshire.gov.uk/environment/conservation/archaeology/archaeology.aspx</p>
	<p>Paragraph 2: Suggest a slightly more accurate wording for the second paragraph would be: <i>‘With regard to the buildings themselves any works deemed to have a potential impact on archaeological deposits ...(retain existing text in brackets) will need to be monitored in order to safe guard archaeological interest. This should be undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced archaeological practitioner . Derbyshire County Council archaeological advisers can assist in the scoping of the necessary archaeological input and where to source archaeological contractors.</i></p>	<p>Amend 2nd paragraph to reflect these comments.</p> <p>Amended text to read:</p> <p>With regard to the buildings themselves, any works deemed to have archaeological interest and potential impact on deposits (for example the (part or total) excavation of floors within the building; excavation works adjacent to the building; excavation works for new footings and service trenching and proposed works for the repair/replacement of historic timbers, etc.) will need to be recognised and appraised and monitored in order to safeguard archaeological interest. <i>This should be undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced practitioner. Derbyshire County Council archaeological advisers can assist in the scoping of the necessary input and where to source archaeological contractors.</i></p>
	<p>Final bullet point: suggested change that the term <i>‘in conjunction with’</i> be replaced with <i>‘in line with’</i>.</p>	<p>Amend final bullet point to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Archaeological works shall be undertaken conjunction in line with the advice & guidance as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (and Guidance) and in-conjunction with <i>in line with</i> other guidance from Historic England and the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists.
	<p>“Ignored by Council and developers”</p>	<p>The Conversion of Farm Buildings: Supplementary Planning Document considers archaeology and does not propose a change</p>

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
		<p>in policy approach to that set out in the Local Plan.</p> <p>No change is necessary.</p>
Landscape	<p>Page 24, 2nd column, 3rd bullet point: Should the text read ‘...identifying the species, size (including canopy spread), age, class...’ rather than ‘...identifying the species, size – including canopy spread, age, class...’?</p>	<p>Change to text to improve clarity. Amended bullet point 3 to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The retention of existing trees and hedgerows will be expected. Where any work is proposed within their proximity, an accurate survey of the location and canopy spread of all the trees and hedgerows (which may be affected) shall be submitted with the application. In some cases, the Council will expect to see a full arboricultural report, identifying the species, size, (including (canopy spread), age, class, condition and retention value for each tree. Early advice should be sought from the Council’s <i>Trees and Landscapes Arboriculture Officer</i>,
	<p>Page 24, 1st column, 4th bullet point: Should this refer to the requirement to submit a Hedgerow Removal Notice to the Local Planning Authority for consideration rather than simply stating the removal of hedgerows will be resisted?</p>	<p>Additional text inserted to include a reference to Hedgerow Removal Notices and contacting the Council. Additional wording to replace “resisted” in line with the tone of the SPD in other section. Amended bullet point 4 to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The breaching and removal of historic hedgerows, or other historic boundary treatments, to form new access or entrance ways, together with their removal to form associated visibility sight-lines will, generally, be <i>undesirable resisted</i>. <i>Advice should be sought from the District Council Trees and Landscapes Officer to see if a Hedgerow Removal Notice is required.</i>,
	<p>Scarred by our criminal councils and government.</p>	<p>The Conversion of Farm Buildings: Supplementary Planning Document considers farm buildings in the landscape and does not propose a change in policy approach to that set out in the Local Plan. The Council has also adopted a Landscape Character and Design Guidance SPD.</p> <p>No change is necessary.</p>

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
	We agree the least disturbance to wildlife and birds, trees is important to uphold.	The support is welcomed. No change is necessary.
Wildlife	We fully support the requirement for a ‘comprehensive survey and assessment’ and the advice that ‘any farm building can have potential to support protected species’. We also welcome the clear requirements for this information to be provided prior to validation.	The support is welcomed. No change is necessary.
	It may be helpful to refer to the British Standard for Biodiversity (BS: 42020: 2013), which provides further detail on what is considered ‘up to date’ survey and also on planning conditions relating to protected species.	The British Standard is not a free publication or available online and therefore not accessible to all agents/developers/owners. The SPD advises that the Derbyshire Wildlife Trust is contact for help and advice. No change is necessary.
	It may also be useful to state that mitigation will be required when impacts to protected species are likely and that this is often required as part of obtaining a licence. The LPA should be provided with sufficient information at the planning stage to be confident that a licence is likely to be granted, based on a consideration of the ‘three tests’ set out in the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. Mitigation is different to enhancement, which is required to provide a net biodiversity gain in accordance with the NPPF 2018.	Amend text to provide additional clarity and reflect the comments made. Amended paragraph 4 to read: On receipt of the application, the Local Planning Authority will seek professional/specialist advice on the report and take this advice into consideration as part of the determination of the application. It is unlikely that an application will be validated without such a report forming part of the submission. <i>The Local Planning Authority should be provided with sufficient information at the planning stage to be confident that if a license is required it is likely to be granted.</i> Amended paragraph 5 to read: Should Planning Permission be granted for the conversion of the farm building(s), this shall not absolve the applicant from obtaining the requisite licence(s) from the statutory authorities (e.g. Natural England). <i>In obtaining a licence mitigation measures will be required where impacts on protected species are likely.</i> Page 25 amended paragraph 1 to read: The National Planning Policy Framework (and Guidance) advocates biodiversity enhancement, <i>providing a net biodiversity</i>

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
		<i>gain</i> , as part of any development proposals. Such enhancements should be clearly identified in any application.
	Page 24, 1st column, 1st paragraph: Should the text refer to Natural England when stating 'protected species are subject to strict licensing procedures...'?	Natural England is referred to in the text on page 25. No change is necessary.
	Page 24, 2nd column, 1st paragraph: The sentence, 'Any farm building has the potential to be a habitat for protected species' repeats what is said in the first sentence of the first paragraph under the Wildlife heading.	The first paragraph provides a broad context referring to farm buildings, in and out of use, land and hedgerows. The subsequent paragraphs are written to provide further explanation and more detailed advice relating specifically to the conversion of buildings. No change is necessary.
	Page 24, 2nd column, 1st paragraph: Should the text be amended to state that Derbyshire Wildlife Trust 'should' rather than 'could' be consulted?	It is not possible to oblige the applicant to consult the Derbyshire Wildlife Trust through the SPD. No change is necessary.
	Page 25: The 3rd and 4th bullet points should be joined together.	Merge the two bullet points referring to ponds to remove duplication. Amended text to read: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing ponds shall be retained (with safety measures put forward where applicable). • Existing ponds, associated with farmsteads, also provide important habitats for wildlife and should be respected, retained (<i>with safety measures put forward where applicable</i>) and protected in any development scheme.
	I agree that wildlife needs protection but we should not lose sight of the need to create reasonable accommodation for human beings.	The Conversion of Farm Buildings: Supplementary Planning Document seeks to provide guidance and advice for owners considering conversion and the measures that need to be taken to accommodate wildlife. No change is necessary.
	"Ignored and destroyed"	The Conversion of farm Building Design Guide: Supplementary Planning Document considers wildlife in the context of farm buildings. Regarding biodiversity there are further policies are contained within the Local Plan and advice in the Landscape

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
	<p>As stated earlier this should not just relate to protected species. Wildlife in general is in decline; a 50% decline in species nationally in the last twenty years. The document should protect existing nest and roosting sites for not just protected species but also require positive measures, such artificial nesting boxes/nests on all conversions.</p>	<p>Character and Design SPD. No change is necessary.</p> <p>Amended text on page 24 to reflect the need to provide bird/bat boxes where necessary. Amended text to read: When a formal application is submitted it will be expected that a protected species report (assessment, findings & recommendations <i>including provision, where necessary, for bird/bat boxes</i>) accompanies that application. The report should be up to date at the time the application is being submitted.</p>
Appendix A Planning policies	Local Plan Policy HC8, 2nd column: It is my understanding that this policy only relates to the conversion of heritage assets (i.e. listed buildings, curtilage-listed buildings and non-designated heritage assets) due to criterion (b), therefore it would not be applicable for all conversion schemes involving farm buildings, as stated in the text.	Policy HC8 in the Local Plan refers to the conversion and reuse of buildings in the rural area, for residential accommodation and is not only referring to Heritage Assets. Paragraphs 6.15-6.18 explain the approach in more detail. No change is necessary.
	Local Plan Policy PD2, 2nd column: This policy doesn't just refer to listed or curtilage-listed buildings it also refers to non-designated heritage assets. The text fails to address non-designated heritage assets.	Amended text to improve clarity. Amended text to read: Where a farm building is <i>a designated or non-designated heritage asset listed (or curtilage-listed)</i> , Policy PD2: Protecting the Historic Environment will apply to ensure that the heritage asset is conserved in a manner appropriate to its significance.
	“?”	No change is necessary in response to this comment.
Appendix B Sustainability Checklist	The introduction to Appendix B in the original SPD was useful and should be incorporated into this SPD.	The introduction to Appendix B was inadvertently omitted from the consultation version of the SPD. Reinsertion of the text to correct the error. Amended text to read: <i>You are advised to consider and address the following sustainability issues before submitting your application. The checklist aims to assist applicants to give full consideration to these issues before discussing their proposals with the Council. Failure</i>

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
	<p>Where reference is made to contacting a specialist member of the District Council (i.e. Conservation Officer, Tree Officer etc.) should this be deleted and instead a note attached about submitting a pre-application request and directing the reader to the relevant page on your website?</p>	<p><i>to take account of this may result in your application being delayed.</i></p> <p>Owners/agents/developers are encouraged to contact the District Council in the first instance. If the query is appropriate for the pre-application advice service they will be directed towards this service. Seeking a good dialogue with people who are involved in the conversion of farm buildings from an early stage is intended to secure a good quality conversion. The contact details for the District Council will be included on page 25 under "Further Guidance & Advice"</p> <p>No change is necessary.</p>
	<p>Page 27, Legally Protection Species, Action, 2nd paragraph: 'Records' is repeated.</p>	<p>Amend text to provide clarification. Amended text to read: Have you discussed with English Nature and/or Derbyshire Wildlife Trust whether they have any records <i>entries</i> on <i>the</i> Protected Species records?</p>
	<p>Page 28, Wildlife Habitats, Action, 2nd paragraph: 'Application site' is repeated.</p>	<p>Typographical error to be corrected. Amended text to read: Your proposal, where appropriate, should identify conserve and enhance existing biodiversity. You are advised to employ ecological consultants to survey the application site to establish the ecological value of the application site.</p>
	<p>Page 28, Traffic, Action: Should the text direct the reader to contact the Highways Authority?</p>	<p>Amend text to provide clarification: Amended text to read: You should undertake an assessment of how the site links with existing and potential links to the public transport network. <i>You are advised to contact the Highways Authority for further advice.</i></p>
	<p>Page 30, Landscape, Issues for Consideration, Historic Landscape Issues: Should this paragraph also refer to the impact that forming residential curtilages can have on the landscape, as well the impact of domestication of the landscape from any residential paraphernalia (i.e. washing lines,</p>	<p>Text amended to reflect this comment and the potential impact of establishing a domestic curtilage.. Amended text to read: Historic landscape issues – The special character and appearance of the area is an invaluable asset. The appearance of barns and</p>

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
	trampolines etc.) that cannot be controlled by removing permitted development rights?	farm buildings and the relationship they have with their surroundings, is an important element of local landscape character, which varies throughout the District. The landscape that provides the immediate setting for barns and farm buildings makes a significant contribution to their character and to the character of the site itself. <i>The conversion of farm buildings and the establishment of an associated curtilage may have an impact on the landscape and this impact will be considered as part of an application.</i>
	Page 30, Landscape, Issues for Consideration, Trees: Amend text to read ‘...or be protected by virtue of being sited within a Conservation Area.’	Additional text to provide clarification regarding trees situated in Conservation Areas. Amended text to read: Trees - Barn conversions can have an impact on trees within or close proximity to the application site. Some or all of them may be protected by a Tree Preservation Order or be <i>protected by virtue of being sited</i> within a Conservation Area.
	Page 29, Landscape, Action: Bullet points are missing from the text towards the end of the table.	This is a layout issue. No change necessary.
	Page 30, Heritage Assets, Issues for Consideration: There is no mention of curtilage-listed buildings or non-designated heritage assets in the text.	Amended text to improve clarity and the use of all terminology. Amended title to read: Heritage/ <i>Archaeological</i> Assets Amended “issues for consideration” to read: Many farm buildings are listed, <i>curtilage-listed or are non-designated heritage assets</i> . by the District Council for their special architectural and historic interest. Any works of alteration, however subtle, which would be considered to affect the special character or appearance of a <i>designated heritage asset listed building</i> would require an application for Listed Building Consent.
	Page 30, Heritage Assets, Action: Should people be advised to	Insert additional text to provide information and contact details.

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
	consult the Historic Environment Record and Historic England website?	Amended "action" section to read: <i>Have you checked to see if your property is listed by using the Historic England website? See https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/</i> <i>Have you checked to see if your property is included on the Historic Environment Record? See: https://www.heritagegateway.org.uk/Gateway/CHR/</i>
	Heritage assets box page 30: the Sites and Monuments Record Officer is now called the Historic Environment Record Officer	Correction to page 30 Heritage Assets. Amended text to read; You will be expected to contact the County Archaeologist and <i>Historic Environment Record Officer</i> Sites and Monuments Records Officer at Derbyshire County Council to establish whether the building (s) and site contains, or is adjacent to, archaeological interest and value.
	“?”	No change is necessary in response to this comment.
General Comments	Very little is discussed about the pre-application advice service the Council has in place. Should this be included?	There is a reference to the pre-application advice service on page 18, however it is acknowledged that additional text inserted into the Further Guidance and Advice section page 25 would be a positive addition to the SPD. Amended text to read: <i>The District Council operates a pre-application advice service, more information can be seen here: http://www.derbyshiredales.gov.uk/planning-a-building-control/submit-a-planning-application/pre-application-advice</i>
	There is no mention in the document about removing undesirable extensions/additions as part of a conversion scheme to reveal the original structure/significance of the building, particularly if the building is a heritage asset.	There is a perceived difficulty in defining what would and what would not be an ‘undesirable’ extension or addition to an existing farm building. An assessment on a case by case basis will be made relating to existing extensions and additions. No change is necessary.
	No mention is made of the Council having a Local List of non-	The District Council does not have a Local List, the reference in

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
	designated heritage assets, even though the Local Plan at Table 7 and the definition of 'Heritage Asset' in Local Plan's Glossary suggests there is one.	Table 7 of the Local Plan includes a Local List as one of many implementation mechanisms, should the Council have one in future it would be a way of implementing the policy. No change is necessary.
	<p>I have read these proposals. and I think that they are unnecessary.</p> <p>i) I note that the stated intention is to "provide detail and depth that may not be possible in the Local Plan. It intends to provide complementary guidance and advice for farm building owners who are seeking to find alternative uses for their farm buildings without having an adverse impact on their character, appearance and setting". Some of these residents are farmers who need to diversify their property if they are to survive.</p> <p>ii) I think that the proposals seek to make it all the more difficult for owners of such buildings to negotiate the planning process. The existing process is already difficult and highly subjective. Use of language such as 'will be rested', "will not usually be approved" and 'it is unlikely' does nothing to clarify the situation for any prospective developer. Either something is allowed or it isn't; lets have a document that gives clarity, or why bother publishing it?</p> <p>iii) The council needs to take in to account that barns converted to residential form part of the housing stock of our area. People moving into a barn conversion may free up housing further down the chain. The Council should not deter barn conversions as this will impact on the availability of housing in the area.</p> <p>iv) Also barn conversions tend to be more expensive to build than 'new builds'; it is easier to build a house from scratch rather than work around something that needs upgrading to conform with building regs, never mind also having to negotiate</p>	<p>i) The Council recognises the issue and importance of rural diversification, see Policy S9 in the Local Plan.</p> <p>ii) With regard to buildings deemed to be heritage assets the SPD has a responsibility to identify those works of alteration or development that would be detrimental to their character and appearance. Such considerations with regard to heritage assets cannot be simply binary.</p> <p>iii) The Council does take into account that converted farm buildings form part of the housing stock for the District. The Local Plan Policy HC8 refers specifically to the conversion and reuse of buildings for residential accommodation. Those proposed conversions which would not be deemed acceptable will be usually be for reasons of design, extent of alterations, materials and changes to their context.</p> <p>iv) Building costs are beyond the scope of planning functions. The Council recognises that building works undertaken with</p>

Section	Summary of main issue	How the issue has been addressed
	<p>the whims of the local planning department. Let's also recognise that the conversion of these buildings provides employment in the local area.</p> <p>v) If the additional expense of converting a barn to a residence is not enough, the council resists the addition of environmentally friendly products such as solar panels. WHY?</p> <p>vi) I accept that barn conversions should retain their distinctive appearance as much as possible, but this must be balanced with the fact that they are being converted for habitation by people, who require different types of types of comfort and convenience to that needed in the prior usage of the building.</p> <p>vii) In short, the Council should adopt a reasonable approach to the conversion of farm buildings. From what I've experienced of the planning process it is arbitrary and difficult. Will the residents of this area really benefit from even more petty conditions and requirements, especially as they will not be applied uniformly?</p>	<p>approval in the District may employ local contractors and be of benefit to the local economy.</p> <p>v) The Local Planning Authority is not resistant to the concept of products such as solar panels but has to take into account with any development proposal an assessment whether those panels will be detrimental to the character and appearance of the farm building or the setting and context.</p> <p>vi) A fundamental consideration relating to a barn conversion will be to retain as far as possible its distinctive appearance. In that regard the buildings innate character should be safeguarded as part of the proposals for residential conversion.</p> <p>vii) The SPD is supplementary guidance with the primary objective of seeking alternative uses for redundant farm buildings but safeguarding their character, appearance and setting.</p>