Julian Townsend
Executive Director (Operations)
Development Management

Town Hall
Ripley
Derbyshire DE5 3BT
Tel: 01773 570222
Fax: 01773 841523
Minicom: 01773 841490
Email: enquiry@ambervalley.gov.uk
Web: www.ambervalley.gov.uk

Mr Malik
39a Main Street
Kimberly
Nottingham
NG16 2NG

Mr Mark Jermy
Halsall Lloyd Partnership
53 Forest Road East
Nottingham
NG1 4HW
England

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

In pursuance of the powers vested in the Amber Valley Borough Council under the above Act and Orders and taking into account Government policy and guidance and the saved policies of the Adopted Amber Valley Borough Local Plan 2006, and with reference to your application (**Office Code: AVA/2020/1144**) which was valid on the 14 December 2020 for permission for **Minor alterations to the existing house to convert to lettable accommodation (C1) with extension to one end to provide new annex property. The erection of a new conference centre (F1(e) use) with ancillary parking spaces, and new subsidiary dwelling within the existing grounds at St Elizabeths Convent Matlock Road Belper**

In the manner described in the application and shown on the accompanying plan(s) and drawing(s) **NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that permission for the proposed development is **REFUSED for the following reasons:**

Conditions/Reasons

1. The building St Elizabeth, dates back to 1896 and was commissioned by George Herbert Strutt for his private secretary John Hunter. The house was one of the most notable residences built by the Strutts in Belper. The building and its grounds are therefore an attribute of the World Heritage Site contributing to its outstanding universal value and makes a positive contribution to the character of the Belper and Milford Conservation Area. The proposed development, which includes incongruous and prominent building works and other harmful development, will result in harm to the character and appearance of the area and setting of this building which will through loss of authenticity and integrity of an attribute will result in harm to the Outstanding

Date : 11 March 2022

Signed

Julian Townsend
Executive Director (Operations)

Universal Value of the WHS and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The proposal is therefore contrary to saved policy EN29 of the Adopted Local Plan 2006 as it does not preserve or enhance the setting of the World Heritage Site; contrary to EN27 of the Adopted Local Plan 2006 as it does not contribute to the preservation or enhancement of the Conservation Area and contrary to Part 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework as it does not sustain or enhance the significance of the World Heritage Site or the Conservation Area. The public benefits arising from the change of use of the former Convent building and re-development of the application site would not outweigh the 'less than substantial' harm caused to the setting of the designated heritage assets, having weighed the harm against the public benefit in accordance with paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

In the finding of 'less than substantial' harm and without the public benefits outweighing the harm, the restrictive policies, which seek to protect the historic environment as set out in Part 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework, therefore provide a clear reason to refuse this development in accordance with paragraph 11, d i of the NPPF.

2. The proposal would result in harm to the setting and special interest of the Grade II Listed Building (St Elizabeth House) through the introduction of significant inappropriate development, including two new dwellings and a conference centre, and associated significant inappropriate engineering works within the grounds of the building.

The proposal is therefore contrary to Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which sets out a statutory duty to preserve the Listed Building and any features of special architectural historic interest which it possesses, including through its setting. The proposal is contrary to saved policy EN24 of the Adopted Local Plan 2006 as it does not contribute to the preservation of the setting of the Listed Building and contrary to Part 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework as it does not sustain or enhance the significance of the setting of the Listed Building.

The public benefits arising from the re-development of the Listed Building and its associated grounds would not outweigh the 'less than substantial' harm caused to the setting of the designated heritage asset, having weighed the harm against the public benefit in accordance with paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Date : 11 March 2022 Signed



Julian Townsend
Executive Director (Operations)

In the finding of 'less than substantial' harm and without the public benefits outweighing the harm, the restrictive policies, which seek to protect the historic environment as set out in Part 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework, therefore provide a clear reason to refuse this development in accordance with paragraph 11, d i of the NPPF.

3. The design, layout and massing of the proposed development, including the associated significant engineering works, will be harmful to the visual amenity of the area. This is contrary to saved policy LS3 (a) and (b) of the Adopted Amber Valley Local Plan 2006 which seek to conserve or enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of the natural and built environment, respect the character of the locality, including, the scale and nature of development, its layout, density, height, massing, style, materials and landscaping; saved policy H12 (a) of the Amber Valley Borough Local Plan 2006, which requires that proposals are in scale and character with their surroundings; saved policy EN7 of the Adopted Amber Valley Local Plan 2006 which requires the design of development to be appropriate to the landscape character type within which it is proposed and have regard to the pattern and distribution of settlements and road, the presence and pattern of historic landscape features and the scale, layout, design and detailing of local buildings and other traditional man made features; the Borough Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Development which requires development to respect established patterns of development; and part 12 of the NPPF which seeks to secure good design.

   The proposal therefore fails to meet the social objective of sustainability as set out in paragraph 8 of the NPPF. The harm identified in this case is considered to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits arising from the proposed development. The proposal is refused in line with paragraph 11 d) ii of the NPPF.

Notes

Attention is drawn to the attached notes:

In detail:

The processing of this planning application has been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Dialogue between the applicant and Local Planning Authority has been undertaken to try and address the issues associated with the proposal. This includes the request for amended plans/additional information and allowing a delay in the determination of the application to give the applicant the opportunity to address the concerns. However, the issues have failed to be resolved.

Date : 11 March 2022 Signed

Julian Townsend
Executive Director (Operations)

NOTES

1. **If the applicant is aggrieved by the decision of the Local Planning Authority to refuse planning permission or approval for the proposed development or to grant permission or approval subject to conditions, he may appeal to the Secretary of State for the Environment in accordance with Section 78/79 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, within six months of the date of this notice. The Secretary of State has power to allow a longer period for the giving of a notice but will not normally be prepared to exercise this power unless there are special circumstances, which excuse the delay in giving notice of appeal. The Secretary of State is not required to entertain an appeal if it appears to him that permission of the proposed development could not have been granted by the Local Planning Authority or could not have been so granted otherwise that subject to the conditions imposed on them, having regard to the statutory requirements, to the provision of the development order, and to any directions given under the order.**
2. **If permission to develop land is refused or granted subject to conditions, whether by the Local Planning Authority or by the Secretary of State for the Environment, and the owner of the land claims that the land has become incapable of reasonably beneficial use in its existing state and cannot be rendered capable of reasonably beneficial use by the carrying out of any development which has been or would be permitted, he may serve on the Council of the County/District in which the land is situated, a purchase notice requiring that council to purchase his interests in the land in accordance with the provisions of Section 180 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.**
3. **In certain circumstances a claim may be made against the Local Planning Authority for compensation where permission is refused or granted subject to conditions by the Secretary of State on appeal or on a reference of the application to him. The circumstances in which such compensation is payable are set out in Sections 137 and 138 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.**
4. **This permission relates to planning controls only. Any other statutory consent necessary including submission under the building regulations must be obtained from the appropriate Authority.**
5. **If it is intended to give notice of appeal in accordance with Paragraph 1 above, this should be done on the appropriate form obtainable from:-**

   The Planning Inspectorate
   3/23 Hawk Wing, Temple Quay House,
   2 The Square
   Temple Quay
   Bristol
   BS1 6PN
   (Tel. No. 0117 372 8000)
   www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk

6. **If the condition of consent or reasons for refusal, make reference to a Division of the Department, the appellant may, if he so wishes, require the attendance of a representative from the Department by notification to the Local Planning Authority. Such a representative would not be liable to cross-examination on questions of departmental policy, but only on matters of fact and expert opinion in relation to the appeal site.**
7. **Where a vehicle is habitually drive across a grass verge or kerbed footway to and from premises adjoining a highway, the occupier of the premises may after being given due notice by the appropriate authority, be required to pay the cost of construction of a carriage crossing or the strengthening of a footway, as the authority considers it necessary, or may be required to comply with conditions imposed by the authority.**
8. **In the case of building or premises to which the public are to be admitted whether on payment or otherwise, attention is drawn to Sections 4 and 7 of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970 and the associated Code of Practice (BS5810:1979). In the case of premises to which the Offices, Shops and Railway Premises Act 1963 or the Factories Act 1962 applies, attention is drawn to Sections 7 and 8A of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act and to the same code of practice. In the case of Educational Buildings, attention is drawn to Sections 7 and 8 of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1978 and to the Design Note 18 "Access for the Physically Disabled Educational Buildings".**
9. **If the development site is crossed by an electric line or is within 15 metres (50ft) of the nearest part of a line (measure horizontally along the ground) or if there is reason to believe that it may be crossed by an underground electric cable, the applicant should contact the Electricity Board to ascertain if and what special safety precautions are necessary.**
10. **The grant of planning permission does not entitle developers to obstruct a public right of way. Development on so far as it affects a right of way, should not be started, and the right of way should be kept open for public use, until the necessary order under Section 247 and 257 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the diversion of extinguishment of the right of way has been made and confirmed.**