



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 October 2025

by **K Savage BA(Hons) MPlan MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 February 2026

### Appeal Ref: **APP/M9496/W/25/3367230**

### Site of former NatWest Bank, The Green, Bamford S33 0AT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Dr Daniel Hale against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
- The application reference is NP/HPK/0125/0061.
- The development proposed is demolition of derelict outbuilding and construction of two-bedroom detached dwelling with front garden to street, and smaller private amenity space to rear.

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of a derelict outbuilding and construction of a two-bedroom detached dwelling with front garden to street and smaller private amenity space to rear, at Site of former NatWest Bank, The Green, Bamford S33 0AT, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref NP/HPK/0125/0061, and subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The NPA has confirmed that a previous planning permission<sup>1</sup> on the land has been commenced and therefore remains extant and capable of implementation. This represents a fall-back position for the appellant.
3. The evidence before me includes comparison of the appeal proposal and the extant planning permission. There is some dispute from an interested party as to the accuracy of some of the appellant's comparison drawings within the design and access statement (DAS). These are not measured plans and I have treated them as illustrative, noting the discrepancies raised. I am not provided with scaled or annotated plans of the approved scheme, and it is evident that some figures quoted are not directly comparable as they refer to building heights at different ground levels. I have ultimately considered the appeal on its own merits and on the basis of the drawings before me. Where relevant to refer to measurements, I have relied principally on annotations on the submitted plans.

### Main Issues

4. The main issues are i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including the effect on the significance of the Bamford Conservation Area (BCA) and other heritage assets; and ii) the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupants, with respect to outlook and sense of enclosure.

<sup>1</sup> NPA Ref NP/HPK/0811/0828

## Reasons

### *Character and Appearance*

5. The appeal site is a largely open plot of land to the eastern side of The Green, located between Lea House and Nos 1 and 3 Fidlers Close. It contains a small, single storey building understood to have been used as a bank until the 1990s, since when it has been unused and increasingly derelict. A partially demolished stone wall marks the front boundary of the site. The boundary of the BCA runs immediately to the rear of the site, beyond which are more recent buildings forming part of the Fidlers Close development, all of which lie outside of the BCA.
6. The BCA encompasses a large part of Bamford, including the village core centred around The Green and development along roads radiating in different directions, including for some distance to the south to include Bamford railway station. The Green is noted as having been laid out to commemorate the Diamond Jubilee of Queen Victoria in 1897, lending it distinct cultural significance.
7. Notable buildings near to the appeal site include the Grade II listed Moore's Farmhouse and its barns to the north-western side of The Green, noted for its retained fabric showing historic building techniques and vernacular architectural design, with the functional relationship between the buildings creating group value.
8. Two stone troughs stand to the front of the appeal site, a traditional feature which historically would have been used as a water source for the village and continue to be the site of annual well dressings. The troughs have evident local importance and are recorded on the Derbyshire Historic Environment Record. Accordingly, I concur with the parties that they can be regarded as non-designated heritage assets (NDHAs).
9. Lea House dates from 1825 and is noted by the NPA and in public representations as an NDHA, pointing to surviving features including its riven stone roof and chamfered quoins which are rarities within the Hope Valley. It is also stated to have strong group value with nearby assets, including Moore's Farmhouse and the stone troughs, forming part of the historic core of the village. I saw on site that Lea House occupies a prominent, elevated position on The Green where its architecture is readily appreciated. Through its design and common materiality, it integrates with the other built form surrounding the green and contributes positively to the character and appearance of the BCA. On the evidence before me, I find that it can be regarded as an NDHA of local importance.
10. Therefore, the significance of the BCA arises from its extensive historic fabric that survives in good condition, exhibiting a long history of settlement and gradual development. This is seen in the intricate, organic layout and varied scale, form, massing and orientation of dwellings and other buildings around The Green. The built form is further influenced by the sloping topography, with noticeable variations in scale and undulating roof heights. This eclectic pattern is unified by consistency in materials, notably stone, and other features including fenestration, chimneys and boundary walls, which contributes architectural interest in addition to historic interest. Indeed, the Conservation Area Appraisal for the BCA states that the 'real diversity of form, function and location is a key characteristic of this central area.'
11. Amid this setting, the appeal site represents a negative feature of the BCA. The surviving structure on site is a twentieth century addition of no architectural merit

and a diminutive scale that does not reflect the surrounding pattern of development. The open areas of the site are unkempt and detract from the otherwise well maintained townscape, whilst the stone wall to the front is incomplete. I note that the visual impact of the site as a backdrop for the well dressings is a source of concern locally.

12. The principle of new residential development on the site is accepted by the NPA, as evidenced by the extant planning permission and I garner that there is significant local support for redevelopment of a site vacant for over 30 years.
13. The proposal comprises a single dwelling with two distinct sections – a lower section parallel to the street with the main front elevation facing the public realm, and a taller, perpendicular section offset to one side at the rear with a front facing gable and side facing dormer window on the inner roof slope. Based on the plans, the rear section would be some 2.57m taller to the ridgeline and of a similar height to the ridge line of 1 and 3 Fidlers Close.
14. The appellant's DAS sets out a detailed townscape analysis undertaken in developing the proposal. I am unconvinced that the building would reflect the layout of a traditional farmstead with detached outbuildings, but its clustered massing would break up the overall bulk of the building and would reflect the arrangement of other nearby buildings with primary and secondary elements, including Lea House and Lea Cottage next door.
15. The lower, cottage scale of the front section would form the most prominent element in the streetscene, where it would reflect the traditional form of nearby dwellings including Willow, Ivy and Rose Cottages. The taller section to the rear would represent a departure from the permitted scheme, which would have a lower overall height, broader, more rectangular footprint and more condensed massing. The NPA refers to such plan forms being more characteristic of the BCA, and I note points made in representations, including that previous approvals included conditions controlling the height of the building. However, I must consider the proposal before me, and in this context, the increased height of the rear section would respond to the surrounding building heights, resulting in a dwelling more consistent in scale with its neighbours to either side. This would provide the dwelling with a stronger presence in the streetscene compared to the lower height of the fall-back scheme. The taller rear element would also bridge the difference in height to the substantial, blank gable wall behind and help to moderate its presently dominant scale and overbearing presence in the streetscene.
16. The NPA is further critical of various detailed design elements of the building. The design may depart from the vernacular in some respects, but this is not to its detriment or that of the BCA. The dwelling would include roof pitches in two directions that would reflect both the pitch angle and ridge line of the roof of 1 and 3 Fidlers Close that aligns parallel to the street and the perpendicular roof to Lea House and the Guinness Partnership housing to the rear. The fenestration, though not symmetrical or rigidly ordered, would nonetheless reflect the proportions of traditional cottage windows and would achieve a suitable solid-to-void ratio that would not appear discordant within a streetscene that includes a variety of window patterns and sizes.
17. There is criticism of the size and proposed fenestration in the west-facing gable. The NPA's Design Guide (2007) sets out principles including keeping a narrow

gable width and the number of openings on gables to a minimum where possible. However, the surroundings are not uniform in having blank gables, with examples of several windows on the side gables of Lea House and Hancock House. The proposed openings would respect the guidance in that they would be modest and proportionate in size to the gable itself and other gable openings. They would not dominate the fenestration to the main front elevation, but in articulating a street facing gable, they would add to the visual interest of the building.

18. The Design Guide also notes that dormer windows are 'not generally a feature of the Park and are therefore best avoided unless they are part of the building tradition in the village.' I saw some limited examples of dormer windows on properties to the south of the site. They are evidently not widespread features, but nor are they completely absent. The proposed dormer would be modest in size and located to the rear roof slope. In this position, it would not be prominent in views from properties or the public realm within the BCA and would not form a detracting feature that would demonstrably undermine the overall quality of the building or the immediate townscape.
19. Concern is raised in public comments over the proposed boundary wall treatments, namely indications on plans that small sections of railings would be installed, rather than fully restoring the stonework. Railings exist to the front of the site and elsewhere, and would not be wholly anomalous as a modest feature of the otherwise reinstated stone wall. However, to ensure the overall quality of the scheme, precise details of the boundary treatment can be sought by condition.
20. Elsewhere, there is no objection from the NPA to the proposed use of materials, namely gritstone and blue slate. Provided these materials are used, and similar attention to detail is afforded to other elements including fenestration, the proposal would deliver a building of high build quality.
21. In terms of the effects on specific heritage assets in the area, the NPA accepts that the proposal would not have an adverse setting on the listed Moore's Farmhouse. Having observed the relative location of the farmhouse across the green, the provision of a dwelling on the appeal site, sensitively continuing the varied pattern of development within an established built-up context, would not materially harm the setting of the listed building.
22. In respect of Lea House, its perpendicular orientation to the street means its front elevation directly addresses the site and would be partially obscured in some views from the southern corner of The Green. However, the front elevation would remain visible from other parts of the adjacent public realm, including the benches to the centre of the space. The proposed articulation of massing and the recess of the rear element of the building from the side boundary would assist in this respect, drawing the building back and allowing more of the front elevation of Lea House to be seen across The Green, including its significant architectural features. The proposal would also address the unsightly condition of the existing site which presently detracts from the appreciation of Lea House in the streetscape. Therefore, I find that the proposal would preserve the setting of this NDHA. The positive redevelopment of the site would also significantly improve the setting of the stone troughs, and provide a more attractive backdrop for well dressings.
23. There would be a loss of view of Lea House and Bamford Edge from the public realm in Fidlers Close, but this is a narrow, glimpsed view between buildings and

one which would remain visible from the more well-travelled route along Fidler's Well in front of the site, As such, the loss of this view would not undermine the ability to understand the setting of Lea House or the relationship of the BCA to the wider, rural hinterland surrounding Bamford.

24. Drawing these considerations together, I find that the appeal scheme would represent a positive and well-considered response to a challenging, constrained site. The scale, articulation and overall appearance of the building would complement the high quality, historic townscape which survives within the BCA and The Green in particular. It would replace a longstanding, negative feature and in doing so would elevate the setting of the historic stone troughs and preserve the settings of other nearby heritage assets.
25. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would enhance the character and appearance of the BCA. It would also preserve the settings of the aforementioned designated and non-designated heritage assets. The proposal would therefore accord with Policies GSP2, GSP3, L3 and HC1 of the Peak District Core Strategy (October 2011) (the CS) and Policies DMC3, DMC5, DMC8 and DMH6 of the Peak District Development Management Policies document (May 2019) (the DMP). Together, these policies seek to ensure that development respects, conserves and enhances the valued characteristics of the site, the landscape and the National Park, and preserves or enhances the significance of heritage assets, by ensuring it is appropriate in scale and design to local character, conservation areas and the National Park.
26. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. There is also the statutory duty to seek to further the purposes of the National Park. As I have found the proposal acceptable in terms of its effect on character and appearance, it would accord with the purpose of the National Park to conserve and enhance its natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage. By improving the appearance of the site and The Green, the proposal would also enhance appreciation of one of the National Park's historic villages, and so would promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of national parks by the public.

### *Neighbours' Living Conditions*

27. The nearest affected dwelling would be Lea House, the front elevation of which stands perpendicular to the street and directly addresses the appeal site at a distance of some 6.7m to the shared boundary. The intervening space is used as a garden and includes a timber outbuilding and trellis fencing along the boundary. The NPA's concern is that the proposed dwelling, due to its height and massing, would have an overbearing effect on the neighbouring dwelling, resulting in a loss of outlook and increased sense of enclosure for occupants.
28. The rear element of the dwelling would stand closest to Lea House, at a distance of some 7.4m between the two elevations. The plans before me indicate that the ridgeline would stand some 7.87m above the ground level of Lea House and the eaves would stand some 4.62m high.<sup>2</sup> At these heights and some 6.6m wide, the massing of the rear section of the proposed dwelling would be considerable. The

---

<sup>2</sup> Difference in AOD measurements – Drawing 08310 Rev P01

NPA's committee report indicates the permitted scheme would have a lower eaves height of 1.8m, with the appellant's DAS indicating the side wall to be 7m in width and separated by 6.7m as the dwelling would stand on the site boundary. An interested party indicates that the approved ridge height of the fall-back scheme was limited to 7m built not higher than 0.15m above the lower level of the site.

29. It is evident that the two schemes contain several points of difference, with each having elements that are larger or smaller in size than the other. This makes a judgment based solely on measurements difficult. The determination to be made is whether the effects of the proposal would be significant and lead to material harm to living conditions, and whether those effects would be demonstrably worse than the fall-back position.
30. The outlook at present from Lea House takes in the appeal site itself, although from the ground floor and the garden views are filtered by the neighbours own shed, trellis and trees. Views beyond the appeal site are heavily curtailed on two sides by the imposing gable walls of the Guinness Partnership building and 1 and 3 Fidlers Close. Consequently, the principal outlook from the dwelling and front garden is to the west and south-west towards the public realm of The Green.
31. Although the proposal would have a slightly shorter width to its side elevation than the fall-back, the taller eaves and ridge height would result in a greater extent of massing facing the neighbouring property. Ultimately, the proximity of Lea House means that both developments would have an inevitable effect on the outlook enjoyed by neighbouring occupants, but the appeal scheme would appear more dominant in overall scale.
32. However, the proposed setting back of the side elevation from the boundary would create marginally more separation between the buildings that would help to maintain a clear line of sight towards The Green, thus retaining the key vista from the front windows and garden. There would be some loss of longer vistas south of The Green towards Main Road, but this would be a comparable consequence of either scheme. Overall, the position and arrangement of massing of the proposed dwelling would ensure Lea House retains a sufficiently open aspect to the front and over the public realm. In this respect, I find that the appeal scheme would not be demonstrably worse than the fall-back scheme in terms of the degree to which outlook would be affected.
33. The appellant has submitted analysis which demonstrates that losses of sunlight and daylight to the front windows of Lea House would be no greater than 20%, and thus would remain within BRE guidelines<sup>3</sup> as still receiving adequate light levels. The evidence also indicates that shadowing in the front garden would not increase beyond acceptable tolerances. I have noted the detailed concerns raised by the occupant of Lea House in respect of the appellant's Sunlight and Daylight Assessment, but I can find no clear evidence that the inputs to this assessment, including the heights and massing of the buildings, are incorrect. I am not provided with any results of similar analysis of the fall-back scheme, but I am mindful that it would also have some effect on sunlight and daylight given its proximity and massing to the south of Lea House. Ultimately, I do not have evidence to demonstrate that the appeal scheme would lead to a harmful loss of sunlight

---

<sup>3</sup> Building Research Establishment's (BRE) guidance 'Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: A guide to good practice' (BRE 209 2nd edition, 2022).

and/or daylight to the neighbouring property, or that any loss would be materially worse than that which would result from the fall-back scheme.

34. Drawing these considerations together, occupants of Lea House would retain acceptable levels of sunlight and daylight to the front windows and garden, and would continue to benefit from the open aspects and principal views over The Green. Nevertheless, the proposal would lead to an increase in the sense of enclosure experienced due to the height and massing of the proposed dwelling. However, the principle of residential development on the appeal site has been established, and when impacts on outlook, light and enclosure are considered cumulatively, I find that the degree to which the appeal scheme would be more harmful than the fall-back is limited. Still, as there would be harm to neighbours' living conditions, there would be conflict with the requirements of CS Policy GPS3 and DMD Policy DMC3 that developments pay particular attention to amenity and the impact on living conditions of communities.

### **Other Matters**

35. The NPA indicated in its committee report that the appeal scheme would be exempt from mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), on the understanding that the proposal would be a self-build dwelling. However, the appellant has acknowledged that no mechanism has been advanced to secure the development as self-build. The appellant has therefore completed a BNG matrix which indicates a required uplift of 0.02 habitat units to achieve a 10% gain. The appellant signals an intention to secure these gains off-site, with the details set out in a Biodiversity Gain Plan required to be submitted through the statutory BNG condition. The NPA has not commented on the appellant's updated position on BNG.
36. In this case, the expected uplift is modest, reflecting both the small size of the site and that it is previously developed. The site constraints are also such that meaningful areas of habitat creation would be difficult to achieve on the site. Therefore, in this instance, the delivery of off-site gains would be acceptable. I am satisfied that this can be secured via the statutory BNG condition set out in Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), which is applicable to all relevant planning permissions granted.
37. The NPA did not refuse the proposal on other grounds. I have considered its findings in respect of other matters, including highway safety, ecology and energy efficiency. I have also had regard to points raised in public representations. With respect to parking, there is no objection from the NPA or Derbyshire County Council as the local highway authority. Whilst noting the prevalence of on-street parking in the area, I have no substantive evidence to indicate that the proposal would generate significant levels of parking that would cause unacceptable harm to highway safety. In the other matters, I have no evidence to counter the conclusions of the NPA. Neither have I evidence to support the assertion that the previous planning permissions have in fact lapsed.
38. There is also nothing before me to suggest a policy presumption in favour of another form of development, such as a commercial use. The NPA has raised no objection to the principle of residential development, and I am required to consider the proposal before me.

## Planning Balance

39. For reasons set out above, the proposal would accord with the development plan in terms of its effect on character and appearance, but would conflict with the development plan in respect of neighbours' living conditions. However, the weight I afford to this conflict is tempered by the limited additional impact in these respects over and above that arising from the fall-back scheme.
40. Set against this harm, the proposal would enhance the BCA through redevelopment of the site, would provide a new dwelling for the housing stock that would achieve higher levels of energy efficiency and sustainability than the fall-back scheme through its design and use of heat pumps, PV panels and water capture. These are important public benefits that accord with key aims of the Framework to achieve high quality design, boost the supply of housing and meet the challenge of climate change. Taken together, I consider that these are significant material considerations weighing in favour of the proposal which outweigh the limited harm to neighbours' living conditions and so justify a decision other than in accordance with the development plan in this case.

## Conditions

41. I have had regard to the list of conditions forwarded without prejudice to its case by the NPA, and to the appellant's responses to these. I have set out conditions to accord with the tests for conditions set out in the Framework. Where necessary, I have amended and/or amalgamated conditions for clarity and precision, and to avoid duplication. The respective condition numbers are indicated in brackets.
42. In addition to the time limit [1], a condition setting out the approved plans is necessary, to provide certainty [2]. Precise details of the front wall reinstatement, external materials, finishes and fenestration are also required to ensure a suitable standard of development within the BCA [4, 5, 6]. I have amended the trigger points to provide clarity as to when details should be submitted and ensure enforceability. Not sought by the NPA, but also necessary to ensure a high standard of development, are details of hard and soft landscaping [7]. For the same reasons, a condition is also necessary to specify the materials and means of installation of rainwater goods [8].
43. The appellant has agreed to a pre-commencement condition relating to the submission of a construction management plan [3], which is required to be pre-commencement as it relates to impacts for neighbours and highway safety that would arise from the outset of works on site, and would be ineffective if sought at a later point in the development.
44. Details of an integrated bat box [5] and any external lighting scheme [9] are required in the interest of protected species and promoting biodiversity net gain.
45. The appellant cites the Building Regulations controlling the installation of air source heat pumps (ASHPs), but Part L does not specify measures to control noise and vibration generated by compressors. Rather, it advises that compressors are selected to minimise disturbance to neighbours, while remaining in compliance with planning requirements. Given the proposed location of the ASHP close to the boundary and garden area of Lea House, I consider it necessary to impose a condition to secure details of the ASHP, including noise

and vibration suppression measures where necessary, to protect the living conditions of neighbouring occupants [10].

46. Finally, it is necessary to restrict permitted development (PD) rights to extend and alter the dwelling under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), as the site's location within the BCA, the bespoke nature of its design and the proximity to neighbouring dwellings mean that certain development under PD may give rise to unintended adverse effects to the appearance of the area or neighbours' living conditions [11].

### **Conclusion**

47. For the reasons set out, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*K Savage*

INSPECTOR

### **Schedule of Conditions**

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings:
  - 08000 Rev P01 (Site Location Plan)
  - 08001 Rev P01 (Block Plan – Existing)
  - 08101 Rev P01 (Floor Plans 00 & 01 – Existing)
  - 08101 Rev P01 (Block Plan – Proposed)
  - 08111 Rev P01 (Floor Plan 00 & 01 – Proposed)
  - 08200 Rev P01 (Street Elevation – Existing & Proposed)
  - 08201 Rev P01 (Elevations 01 & 02 – Existing)
  - 08202 Rev P01 (Elevations 03 & 04 – Existing)
  - 08211 Rev P01 (Elevations 01 & 02 – Proposed)
  - 08212 Rev P01 (Elevations 03 & 04 – Proposed)
  - 08213 Rev P01 (Building Elevations – Proposed)
  - 08300 Rev P01 (Site Sections – Existing)
  - 08310 Rev P01 (Site Sections – Proposed)
  - 08112 Rev P01 (Floor Plans – Roof – Proposed)
  - 08400 Rev P01 (Typical Details – Proposed)
- 3) No development shall take place until a demolition and construction management plan or demolition and construction method statement has been submitted to and been approved in writing by the National Park Authority. The statement shall provide for the storage of plant and materials, site accommodation, loading, unloading of goods' vehicles, parking of site operatives' and visitors' vehicles, hours of operation, method of prevention of debris being carried onto highway and any proposed temporary traffic management. The approved plan/statement shall be adhered to throughout the demolition/construction period.
- 4) Notwithstanding the approved plans, no works shall be undertaken to the walls to the front of the site until detailed specifications of the design, materials and methods to be used in the reinstatement of the walls has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the National Park Authority. The development shall be carried out only in accordance with the approved details.
- 5) Notwithstanding the approved plans, no development above slab level shall take place until a sample panel of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces and window surrounds of the dwelling has been prepared on site for inspection and approved in writing by the National Park Authority. The sample panel shall be at least 1 metre x 1 metre and show the proposed stone colour, size, texture, coursing and pointing to be used in the

development. The approved sample panel shall be retained on site until the work is completed and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved sample panel.

- 6) Notwithstanding the approved plans, no development above slab level shall take place until details of the following have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the National Park Authority:
- a) details of doors and windows' (including rooflights) materials, colour, frame profiles, recesses and finishes
  - b) external cladding to the dormer window
  - c) specification and location for an integrated bat box on the south gable
  - d) the specification for a bat safe membrane

The development shall be carried out only in accordance with the approved details.

- 7) The development shall not be occupied until a hard and soft landscaping scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the National Park Authority. The soft landscaping details shall include the type, height, species and location of any proposed trees and shrubs. Notwithstanding the approved plans, the hard landscaping details shall include the location and extent of all hard surfacing areas and their material finish and detailed specifications of the design, materials and methods to be used in the reinstatement of the walls to the front of the site.
- The approved hard landscaping and means of enclosure shall be completed prior to first occupation of the dwelling.
  - All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the dwelling or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.
- 8) Notwithstanding the approved plans, rainwater goods shall be metal and painted black. Gutters shall be fixed directly to the stonework with brackets and without the use of fascia boards. There shall be no projecting or exposed rafters.
- 9) No external lighting shall be installed other than in complete accordance with a scheme which shall be first submitted to and approved in writing by the National Park Authority.
- 10) The air source heat pump shall not be installed other than in complete accordance with a specification which shall have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the National Planning Authority. The specification shall include details of noise and vibration outputs and suppression measures where necessary to minimise the transmission of structure-borne sound. The approved specifications shall thereafter be maintained.
- 11) Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A, AA, B, D and E and Schedule 2, Part 2, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order

revoking and re-enacting that order) no alterations to the external appearance of the dwelling shall be carried out without first obtaining planning permission from the National Park Authority and no extensions, porches, ancillary buildings, solar or photovoltaic panels, walls, fences, gates or other means of enclosure shall be erected on the site without first receiving planning permission from the National Park Authority.

---