OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS DMPA/2026/0687 and DMPA/2026/0755

Change of use from (C3) residential to form a fractured hotel/guest house accommodation (C1)

Location: Trusley Village, South Derbyshire, DE6 5JG

Submitted by: Barbara and Michael ("Mike") Lake, The Old Rectory, Trusley, on 20th July, 2026

Preamble

We are concerned because this application is not about restoring neglected buildings. Everyone welcomes their restoration. It is about what Trusley will become afterwards. For centuries it has been a living rural settlement. If permission is granted, every dwelling within the Conservation Area currently available for ordinary residential tenancy will disappear, and the historic core of the village will become overnight accommodation principally serving a commercial wedding venue. That is the change which the Authority is asked to approve.

The scale of the proposal is huge – affecting 63% of all homes in Trusley village. A proposal on a similar scale in Ticknall would affect 180 homes, in Etwall 840 homes, in Melbourne 1,260 homes, and in Swadlincote 9,600 homes.

This document uses "applicant", "applicants", "Trusley Estate" and "Estate" interchangeably. Information quoted here is in the public domain: Land Registry entries etc.

Much of this document relates to specific planning issues. For a short read, these sections are recommended: Executive Summary, 1, 5, 7.5 and 8.6.

Contents

Executive Summary

1 Introduction

2 Summary of objection

3 The principle planning issue

4 The nature of Trusley and the conservation area

5 The scale of change and public need

6 Conflict with national and local planning policy

7 Viability and alternative options

8 Planning balance

9 Conclusion

Appendix A: Relevant planning principles

Appendix B: Planning benefits claimed by the applicant and the objectors' response

Appendix C: Trusley Estate and recent history

Appendix D: Map of the changes

Executive Summary

- With the exception of The Old Rectory, the Trusley Estate (Coke-Steel family members and trusts) holds all the freeholds in Trusley village and Conservation Area.
- Trusley village has 11 dwellings (homes). (See Section 1 below).
- Trusley Conservation Area contains 10 of those homes.
- The application bundles two applications as one: renovation and change of use.
- We support the renovations as described in the application's Summary of Works.
- The change of use proposal affects 7 homes – 70% of homes in the Conservation Area.
- The change of use proposal removes 100% of residential homes for rent in the Conservation Area.
- We object to the change of use proposal which will turn homes into hotel rooms.
- The Conservation Area already has 2 Airbnbs (The Manor and The Old Courthouse) providing 10/11 rooms for 20/22 guests. (See Section 5.2 below)
- The proposal claims that change of use to hotel rooms is the **only** way to fund renovations.
- We present financial alternatives to retain the homes for rent. (Section 7.5 below).

The proposal claims, **without evidence**, that change of use is required because funding for the work must come from borrowings and the buildings concerned must be treated in isolation from the rest of the Estate.

For a proposal of this scale we ask:

1. would a proposal to change homes into additional Airbnbs be acceptable on its own?
2. would a proposal to change homes into 23 hotel rooms, be acceptable on its own?
3. why should it become acceptable merely because the applicant asserts, **without evidence**, that there is no alternative way to fund renovation?

The proposal will turn the centre of Trusley into a hotel with 23 rooms and 46 guests.

The change of use will have a huge impact in a tiny place like Trusley and will cause harm to the character, function and significance of the Conservation Area as a living historic settlement.

The proposal fails to mention the Grangefields wedding venue to the north of Trusley village. This is leased by the Trusley Estate to Cripps & Co under the company name Cripps Grangefields Ltd. The primary applicant is a shareholder and director of Cripps Grangefields Ltd. and the primary purpose of creating hotel rooms in Trusley is to maximise revenue from those visiting the wedding venue and requiring overnight accommodation.

A planning decision should be based on what is best for Trusley as a whole, not on what is most profitable and convenient for the applicant.

We respectively request that the Committee rejects the application and asks the applicant to return with a proposal that enables the renovation work to be done while retaining homes and life within the village.

---

1. Introduction

This representation is submitted in objection to planning applications DMPA/2026.0687 and DMPA/2026.0755: “Change of use from (C3) residential to form a fractured hotel/guest house accommodation (C1)”

Trusley Estate, controlled by the Coke Steel family, is the trading name associated with at least 20 different freeholds of property in or adjacent to Trusley civil parish and held in the name of family members and at least two trusts. In recent years David Coke-Steel handed over the management of the Estate to his son Edward (“Ed”).

The current application is in the name of one of the trusts: “Trustees of the Mrs F H Coke-Steel Settlement”. The objectors have advised the applicant to check that the freeholds or leaseholds relating to all the properties in the application are held by the trust as claimed in Certificate A of ownership. No response has been received as of the date of submitting this objection.

The objectors have asked SDDC asking for information that may be material to the committee's consideration, including advice provided during the pre-application process. Until that information is available, neither the public nor members can know whether the officer's recommendation fully reflects the history of the application. If the information has not been provided prior to the committee meeting, and in the interests of procedural fairness and informed decision-making, we respectfully request that determination be deferred until the relevant information has been disclosed.

The applicant has based its case on three propositions:

1. The buildings need renovation – we agree.
2. Residential use is no longer viable – we disagree.
3. Visitor accommodation is therefore the **only** sustainable future – we disagree.

The restoration of the historic buildings is welcomed. There is no objection in principle to the conservation-led restoration of listed buildings or to investment in the fabric of Trusley's historic environment.

The question becomes: **how will the restoration be paid for?**

The objection is directed solely at the proposed solution: **change of use**.

The principal issue before the Local Planning Authority is not whether the buildings should be repaired, but whether the permanent loss of **the whole of Trusley's rental residential accommodation** would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and accord with national and local planning policy.

It is submitted that it would not.

1.1 The Properties Concerned

Details of Trusley Estate are contained in Appendix C below.

Note: **none of the properties are at risk.**

There are only 11 dwellings in Trusley village, 10 of which are within the Conservation Area.

Seven dwellings covered by the application:

The Old Courthouse	Listed Grade 2. Early 18th century on a footprint shown on 1724 map. Previously Ivy Close Farmhouse. Occupied under a secure farming tenancy until the death of the tenant. Modernised about 10 years ago as an Airbnb. Currently occupied by a Coke-Steel family member, her husband and their children. The tenants from nearby Hardley Hill Farmhouse have been evicted and the family will be moving there when renovation is complete.
Trusley Manor	Built 1902 and partially demolished in 1948. Converted from three apartments and modernised in 2019. Currently occupied by a member of the Coke-Steel family, his wife and their family. Rented out as an Airbnb when the family is on holiday. Also has an apartment for a nanny.
1 Taylor's Lane	1950s semi-detached, "council house style", labourer's accommodation "of no architectural merit". Unoccupied since the death of the tenant in 2025.
2 Taylor's Lane	1950s semi-detached, "council house style", labourer's accommodation "of no architectural merit". The current tenants will be moving out in August 2026.
Tatlow Cottage	Listed Grade 2. 15th century. The oldest of the three listed buildings. At some time (before the Conservation Area was registered?) an architecturally wholly inappropriate back extension was added faced with an obvious "job lot" of plain faced bricks. Currently occupied by tenants.
Lane End Cottage	Listed Grade 2. Early 19th century on footprint shown on 1724 map. Unoccupied since the death of the tenant in 2020. It has been empty for six years.
Eaton's Cottage	Built on a footprint shown on 1724 map. Unoccupied since the death of the tenant in 2025. **Repair work began on 8th July, 2026 with the roof being raised by 175mm to install insulation.**

Four dwellings not covered by the application:

Home Farm	Listed grade 2. Victorian farmhouse and attached outbuilding. Held on a long term secure tenancy under the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1986.
The Old Hall	Listed grade 2. Parts early 17th century. Occupied by members of the Coke-Steel family. Also has an apartment for a general worker.
Gardener's Cottage	Located adjacent to the large derelict Edwardian walled garden associated with Trusley Manor. Unoccupied since the tenants were evicted in May, 2026. **It is not in the Conservation Area.**
The Old Rectory	Freehold. Erected in 1795. Transferred from the Coke family to the Church of England in the 19th century. Sold by the Church in 1948. The objectors purchased the property in 1986 and are the third freeholders since 1948.

As far as the objectors are aware the Estate has not tried to find new tenants for unoccupied properties.

The properties must meet minimum standards no matter what their future use:

- Fit for habitation.
- Current EICR.
- Fire safety – alarms on all floors.
- Carbon monoxide alarms as necessary.
- EPC rating of “E” or above.

The proposal does not provide the current status of each property in relation to the above.

---

2. Summary of Objection

This application represents far more than the conversion of individual buildings.

Taken together, the proposal would fundamentally alter the character and function of one of South Derbyshire's smallest and best-preserved Conservation Areas by replacing a settled residential community with Estate-managed visitor accommodation with most visitors staying only one or two nights.

The proposal would:

- remove every dwelling within the Conservation Area that is available to ordinary residential tenants;
- establish visitor accommodation as the principal use of almost all the village;
- provide overnight accommodation for those attending the nearby Grangefields wedding venue;
- replace permanent households with a continuously changing visitor population;
- materially alter the social and functional character of the Conservation Area.

Whilst the applicant places considerable emphasis upon the physical conservation of historic buildings, the application gives insufficient weight to the equally important role of the Conservation Area as a living rural settlement. Funding and profitability are the sole justifications offered for change of use. This is challenged in section 7.5 below.

Conservation Areas exist to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of historic places. That character derives not solely from buildings but from the continuing relationship between those buildings, their historic uses and the community that occupies them.

The proposal would substantially weaken that relationship.

---

3. The Principal Planning Issue

The application repeatedly presents the proposal as one concerned primarily with the repair of historic buildings. However, that is not the principal planning issue.

The buildings can be repaired regardless of whether they remain in residential use or become visitor accommodation.

The true planning question is therefore:

> **Is the permanent loss of all tenanted dwellings within Trusley Conservation Area justified when balanced against the public benefits claimed by the applicant?**

It is submitted that the answer is no.

Seven dwellings in a village of a hundred or more dwellings might be acceptable but in Trusley it is totally out of proportion since they represent **all the tenanted homes**.

The Planning Authority must consider not only the conservation of individual listed buildings but also the effect of the proposal upon:

- the character of the Conservation Area;
- the sustainability of the settlement;
- the availability of residential accommodation;
- the vitality of the rural community;
- and the cumulative consequences of introducing extensive visitor accommodation into a very small historic hamlet.

---

4. The Nature of Trusley and the Conservation Area

4.1 Introduction

Trusley is an exceptionally well-preserved historic settlement, it is not simply a collection of listed buildings.

Its significance derives from the survival of its historic layout, agricultural origins, relationship with the surrounding Estate and, importantly, its continuing residential occupation.

The significance of the Conservation Area lies in more than architecture.

It derives from:

- the historic street pattern;
- the grouping of cottages around the church;
- the agricultural setting;
- the relationship between Estate buildings and dwellings;
- and the continuing existence of a small permanent community.

These characteristics together create the special interest which justified designation of the Conservation Area.

The application places primary emphasis upon the physical preservation of the buildings and the continued unified ownership of the Estate. On their own these do not explain why Trusley was designated a Conservation Area.

The proposal would preserve the buildings but it would not preserve the settlement.

4.2 A Conservation Area is More Than Architecture

The statutory purpose of Conservation Area designation is not simply to protect attractive buildings.

It is to preserve or enhance the **character and appearance** of places whose special architectural or historic interest justifies their protection.

Character is wider than architecture.

It includes:

- the historic pattern of development;
- the relationship between buildings;
- traditional uses;
- historic street layout;
- landscape setting;
- and the way in which the settlement functions.

In rural settlements these elements cannot easily be separated.

Buildings derive much of their significance from the continuing existence of the community for which they were built.

4.3 Physical Conservation and Functional Conservation

Physical conservation involves renovation: repairing roofs, windows, chimneys, masonry and joinery.

Those works are welcomed.

Functional conservation is concerned with preserving the historic relationship between buildings and their use.

Trusley has always been a living village from its rural past to most recently when it has been lived in by those enjoying life here.

One of the strengths of Trusley is that it has avoided the cumulative changes experienced by many historic villages. Modern development has been limited, the historic layout remains legible and traditional buildings continue to dominate the settlement.

The current proposal introduces a different form of change, rather than altering the appearance of the village, it radically changes the character, function and significance of the Conservation Area as a living historic settlement. It shifts from being a settled population to one which changes every day.

Permanent residents:

- maintain gardens;
- participate in parish life;
- build relationships with neighbours;
- assist in case of need;
- provide informal surveillance;
- maintain traditions;
- contribute to the continuity of village life.

Visitor accommodation performs a different role. Its occupants are temporary and their relationship with the settlement is necessarily short-term – they may appreciate, but they don’t contribute.

A village occupied principally by overnight visitors is fundamentally different from a village occupied principally by residents, even if every building remains externally unchanged.

Planning policy requires consideration of both.

4.4 The Impact of the Proposal

Taken individually, the conversion of one cottage to visitor accommodation might have only limited consequences – as was the case when Ivy Close Farmhouse was renovated, renamed as “The Old Courthouse” and converted into an Airbnb.

Taken collectively, the proposed conversion has a fundamentally different effect, it removes every dwelling within the Conservation Area that is available to ordinary residential tenants.

The cumulative consequence would be that much of the historic core of Trusley would become visitor accommodation serving a commercial operation in which the applicant has a direct stake.

That is not simply a different planning use class, it is a different settlement.

The Planning Authority should therefore assess the proposal on the basis of its cumulative effect upon the character of the Conservation Area rather than considering each property in isolation.

4.5 Conclusion

The proposal would undoubtedly improve the physical condition of many buildings.

However, Conservation Area designation seeks to conserve more than building fabric. It seeks to preserve the special character of historic places.

In Trusley that character derives not only from its architecture but from its continuing role as a small inhabited rural settlement.

The proposal would substantially diminish that characteristic by replacing permanent residential occupation with Estate-managed overnight visitor accommodation.

It is submitted that this represents harm to the significance of the Conservation Area which has not been fully recognised within the application and which should attract substantial weight in the planning balance.

---

5. The Scale of Change and Public Need

5,1 The scale of change

The applicant describes the proposal as a change of use affecting seven properties.

That description understates the significance of the proposal.

In a large village the loss of seven dwellings may have little effect. In Trusley it represents 70% of dwellings and the effect is profound.

This proposal removes every dwelling within the Conservation Area that is available to ordinary residential tenants.

On a similar scale: imagine 840 families being evicted in Etwall and replaced with 2,520 hotel rooms or 180 families being evicted in the Ticknall Conservation Area and replaced with 540 hotel rooms.

The resulting change is not incremental, it is transformational.

Instead of a village containing permanent households, the historic core would become dominated by overnight accommodation occupied by successive groups of visitors.

That represents a fundamental alteration in the function of the settlement.

It is this cumulative change, not the refurbishment of buildings, which should form the focus of the Authority's assessment..

5.2 Failure to demonstrate Public Need for Accommodation

The proposal fails to answer these questions:

- Is there demand for overnight accommodation in the area? (Note 1)
- What is the evidence?
- Does the evidence primarily relate to needs for the Grangefields wedding venue?
- Could the accommodation be provided at Grangefields?
- Why not build a 23 bedroom hotel at Grangefields?
- The Grangefields wedding venue has been operating for almost five years. Guests have presumably found overnight accommodation. What has changed?
- Does the unemployment level in South Derbyshire call out for 3 more jobs? (Note 2)
- Why must the accommodation be inside the Conservation Area?
- We already have two Airbnbs in the Conservation Area (The Old Courthouse and The Manor – 10/11 rooms, 20/22 guests), why do we need more? (Note 3)
- Why not use Gardener's Cottage (**outside the Conservation Area**) to add 2/3 more rooms? It is unoccupied, has ample parking space and shares the same access as The Manor.
- Why must all seven dwellings change use?
- Why could fewer dwellings not achieve the same objective? The two existing Airbnbs for example.
- Why is 46 beds the right number?
- Is there anything we are not being told and previously discussed with planning and conservation officers since 2022?

Notes

1. There is no evidence of shortage of overnight accommodation in South Derbyshire – the district has over 1,300 holiday rentals, B&Bs, and countryside pubs.

2. Unemployment in South Derbyshire at 2.4% is almost half the national average of 4.1%. "Three jobs" (none for those in the Trusley) is not a justification for a change of this scale.

3. Links to Airbnbs (currently withdrawn from UK site):

   Old Court House: https://www.vrbo.com/en-gb/p1039128vb?pwaThumbnailDialog=thumbnail-gallery

   The Manor: https://www.Airbnb.gy/rooms/820886285250447211

---

6. Conflict with National and Local Planning Policy

The applicant concludes that the proposal accords with both national and local planning policy.

It is respectfully submitted that this conclusion is incomplete because it gives considerable weight to those policies supporting tourism, economic activity and the repair of heritage assets, whilst giving comparatively little weight to policies intended to protect the social, residential and historic character of rural settlements.

Planning policy requires these objectives to be balanced. In the present case that balance has not been adequately undertaken.

6.1 The Statutory Duty

Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the Local Planning Authority, when considering development within a Conservation Area, to pay **special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.**

This duty is a statutory obligation and extends beyond the appearance of individual buildings.

The Authority must consider the effect of development upon the character of the Conservation Area as a whole.

In Trusley that character derives not only from its buildings but from its historic function as a small rural settlement. The proposal would fundamentally alter that function.

6.2 National Planning Policy Framework

The application places significant reliance upon those sections of the National Planning Policy Framework which encourage rural tourism, rural enterprise and the reuse of existing buildings.

Those policies are relevant. However, they are only part of the planning balance.

The Framework also requires planning decisions to:

- support sustainable communities;
- create places in which people live and work;
- conserve heritage assets;
- recognise the contribution heritage assets make to sustainable communities;
- protect local character;
- and ensure that development responds positively to its surroundings.

These objectives should not be considered separately. They must all be weighed together.

The application gives relatively little consideration to the consequences of removing a substantial proportion of Trusley's permanent residential occupation.

6.3 Heritage Significance

The application repeatedly states that the proposal will preserve the historic character of Trusley through investment in its buildings.

The physical repair of historic buildings is unquestionably a public benefit.

However, heritage significance derives from more than building fabric.

Historic England guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework recognise that significance may arise from the historic use, setting, function and communal value of heritage assets.

The communal value of Trusley derives from its continuing existence as a small inhabited Estate village.

Replacing permanent households with successive groups of overnight visitors inevitably changes that significance.

Whilst the buildings remain physically intact, the historic settlement ceases increasingly to function as the community that created that significance.

The proposal therefore gives rise to a form of heritage impact that is not adequately considered within the application.

6.4 Sustainable Rural Communities

The National Planning Policy Framework repeatedly refers to sustainable rural communities rather than simply sustainable rural businesses.

The distinction is important.

Communities depend upon permanent occupation. Visitor accommodation cannot perform the same social function as permanent housing. Visitors do not participate in parish life. They do not establish long-term relationships with neighbours. They do not contribute to the continuity that characterises successful rural communities.

The proposal would therefore reduce, rather than strengthen, the permanent residential community within Trusley.

6.5 South Derbyshire Local Plan

The Local Plan similarly seeks to balance economic development with the protection of the District's rural settlements and heritage.

Policies supporting tourism cannot be read in isolation.

Those policies assume that tourism development remains compatible with the character of the settlement in which it takes place.

In this instance the proposal extends far beyond providing additional visitor accommodation. It would result in visitor accommodation becoming **the dominant land use** within the historic core of the village.

That represents a fundamental change in the character and function of the settlement.

The proposal therefore sits uneasily with those Local Plan policies intended to conserve the distinctive character of South Derbyshire's villages and Conservation Areas.

The objectors do not oppose tourism, nor do they object to the successful operation of the Grangefields wedding venue, in fact they provided comments in support of the planning application at Grangefields.

The Local Plan supports tourism where it is compatible with its surroundings but the issue is one of scale and location.

The proposal involves approximately forty-six guest spaces distributed across seven separate residential properties in one of the District's smallest historic settlements. It triples the overnight population from what it was in 2020 and will probably more than doubles the number of cars in the village at that time.

This is not tourism accommodated within an existing hotel. It is the conversion of a substantial proportion of the village's residential accommodation into hotel rooms primarily to meet the needs of overnight guests at the Grangefields wedding venue.

The scale of the proposal is therefore material.

6.6 Housing Loss

The application treats the loss of residential accommodation as a secondary consequence of the proposal.

It is, in fact, one of its principal harmful planning effects.

This proposal removes every dwelling within the Conservation Area that is available to ordinary residential tenants.

Whilst the application states that residential use could theoretically return in the future, that possibility is entirely speculative and should not influence the planning decision.

Planning permission should be determined on the basis of the proposed development, not on the possibility that it might one day be reversed.

For planning purposes the proposal represents the loss of residential accommodation.

That loss should be given substantial weight in the planning balance.

6.7 The Planning Balance

The proposal undoubtedly provides public benefits in terms of the renovation of buildings

The proposal claims that it will provide additional employment and economic activity. As with any development, even a home extension, this will be true in the very short term while building work is done, but in the long term it will not generate any work for those within the village. Those coming to work in visitor accommodation will live elsewhere and, given the price of property in the area around Trusley, almost certainly not in rural areas.

This temporary and minor increase in employment must be balanced against equally important planning harms.

- permanent loss of residential accommodation;
- erosion of the living community;

- fundamental change to the function of the Conservation Area;
- cumulative expansion of Estate-based tourism within the village;
- and the long-term replacement of permanent occupation by transient visitor use.

It is submitted that the application substantially understates these harms.

---

7. Viability and Alternative Options

7.1 Introduction

The principal justification advanced by the applicant is that continued residential occupation is no longer economically viable and that Estate-managed hotel rooms represents the only realistic means of securing the long-term future of the buildings.

There is no doubt that the renovation of the buildings will be expensive – though renovation as dwellings under current regulations would cost considerably less than renovation as high quality hotel rooms as outlined in the schedule of works accompanying the application.

The application treats the buildings and their use in isolation from the rest of the Estate. The financial argument against renovation as dwellings assume that the only funding available will be from borrowings at current interest rates.

Treating the Estate as a whole makes it obvious that this is not the case – particularly with the application for a 164 acre solar farm just south of Trusley village which is already generating significant annual revenue from option payments and which may generate tens of millions over the next 40 years.

It is therefore important that the Authority carefully examines the Estate-wide financial evidence supporting the applicant's conclusions (see section 7.5 below). The application does not provide any such evidence.

7.2 The Planning Question

The issue before the Authority is not whether hotel rooms would generate a higher financial return – that is self-evidently likely.

The relevant planning question is different.

It is whether the applicant has demonstrated that the permanent loss of residential accommodation is **necessary** because no less harmful alternative exists.

The application does not demonstrate this but assumes it.

Planning policy does not require the Authority to maximise the profitability of land. It requires the Authority to balance economic benefits against environmental and social impacts.

These are different tests.

7.3 Residential Demand

The application does not suggest there is any lack of demand for residential occupation within Trusley.

Indeed, the opposite is true since demand for residential accommodation, particularly in rural areas, is at an all time high. There is strong demand for rural housing in South Derbyshire with people willing to pay a premium to live in places like Trusley – sitting as it does in South Derbyshire's "Golden Triangle".

Historically the properties in Trusley have been occupied continuously for many decades. People who come here rarely leave of their own volition, most stay until they die (Eaton's Cottage, Lane End Cottage, No 1 Taylor's Lane, Ivy Close Farmhouse).

Recent vacancies have arisen primarily because elderly tenants have died, moved into care, been evicted or otherwise left Estate properties. These vacancies have not been advertised, even though one has been empty for over six years, so the Estate cannot assess demand.

Temporary and deliberate vacancy should not automatically justify permanent loss of housing.

7.4 Commercial Preference is not Planning Necessity

The application seeks a use that will generate sufficient income **in itself** to fund comprehensive restoration and continuing maintenance.

That is a legitimate commercial objective but assumes that the only source of funding is borrowing. This is not the case and alternatives are available.

A commercially preferable use is not necessarily the only planning solution.

Planning decisions frequently require balancing commercial aspirations against wider public interests.

Those wider interests include:

- maintaining sustainable communities;
- retaining residential accommodation;
- protecting Conservation Areas;
- and preserving settlement character.

The Authority should therefore distinguish between what may represent the applicant's preferred business model and what is necessary in planning terms.

7.5 Alternatives

The applicant asks the Council to accept that permanent homes must be lost because there is no financially viable alternative. Has that claim been demonstrated?

The objectors submit that it has not. No financial viability appraisal has been provided. No comparison has been made between residential and visitor accommodation. No evidence has been produced to show that borrowing is necessary or that hotel rooms are the only means of repaying it.

By claiming that borrowing is the **only** way to fund restoration the applicant introduces a financial justification for its proposal for change of use.

Without financial transparency it is not possible to properly assess the claims made by the application. Given the harm that will be caused by the loss of 100% of the village's homes for rent, this becomes crucial before any determination can be made.

It is therefore reasonable to deal with financial matters in depth.

Viability

Rural Estates routinely hold assets that produce differing financial returns.

Pressure on farming incomes, and the need to pay rent, recently forced one of Trusley Estates' agricultural tenants to sell land (held privately) in a neighbouring parish for **£17,500 an acre**. The objectors recently sold a 10 acre field in Egginton for a similar price.

Rural rents in South Derbyshire are between **£100 and £120 an acre**.

The Estate appears content to retain agricultural land producing an annual return of around 0.6%. Yet it argues that residential property producing several times that return is financially unviable. No explanation is given for applying fundamentally different investment criteria to different Estate assets

The fact that one use generates a lower yield than another does not demonstrate that it is unviable.

Many Estates with historic cottages also accept relatively modest yields:

- in expectation of long-term capital appreciation,
- for inflation protection,
- for inheritance planning,
- for stability of income throughout the year,
- to minimise the time and cost of day-to-day management,
- to enhance the wider Estate.
- for pride of ownership,
- for reasons of family tradition,
- as part of their "duty of care" towards the Estate and those who live on it.

Treating buildings in isolation

No business treats a new project in isolation from the rest of the business.

Many businesses borrow, often to cover the gap between providing a product or service and being paid.

Businesses routinely choose between funding projects from cash reserves, borrowing, asset sales or phased investment. The application assumes borrowing without explaining why these alternatives have been rejected.

All businesses have assets and, in many businesses, the most important asset is people – keeping teams of people together through the good times and the bad.

Some businesses have material assets: buildings or land. In hard times these can be converted into cash to pay the wages and see the business over the bumps.

Every business should be seen as a whole.

The application treats the 7 buildings in isolation from the income and capital of the rest of the Estate. By doing so it insists that the buildings must not only support themselves in the future (through rent) but they must also cover the costs of rectifying the neglect of the last few decades.

The application expects the community to cover these costs – through loss of homes for rent.

The claim

The applicants provide no evidence to support the assertion that hotel rooms are **the only viable financial option to support renovation.**

The applicants state (Section. 5.7 of the Design and Access Statement):

"Without a viable economic use, the investment programme cannot be funded and the properties will remain out of use indefinitely".

They do not provide financial calculations comparing the cost of renovation for residential rental (to meet legal requirements) with renovation for furnished hotel rooms (to a much higher standard), and they do not state what a viable return would be – though they are accepting a return of under 1% for their land.

They do not provide evidence for the viability and break-even point of hotel rooms taking into account daily running costs, staffing (someone has to meet-and-greet and provide the keys), maintenance, gardening, occupancy rates and debt repayment. They provide no details of occupancy rates in similar accommodation within a few miles of Trusley though we are aware of at least one business close by that has dropped out because of low take-up and unpredictable occupancy. The applicants do have the advantage of a captive market by promoting hotel rooms through Cripps & Co at the Grangefields wedding venue.

Obviously, if the properties were let as residential tenancies, the only funding gap that may occur is the difference between the gross rental income (over a period of 5 to 10 years) and the cost of the renovation.

It is worth pointing out that the applicant has already lost between £60,000 and £80,000 by not renting out properties as they become vacant, For example, Land End Cottage has been empty for 6 years losing rent and presumably paying Council Tax.

Without borrowing there may be no such funding gap and therefore no need for change of use.

Rental returns

The average annual gross return for rental property in England is between 5% and 6%.

Taking Lane End Cottage as an example. From figures provided by "OnTheMarket", based on location and reasonable quality renovation, we estimate that it should achieve a monthly rental of between £1,300 and £1,700 per month. At £1,500 p.m. this would produce £18,000 p.a.

This represents a 10% return on a renovation investment of £180,000, a 5% return on an investment of £360,000 and a 1% return on an investment of £1,800,000.

Even at 1% this is a higher rate of return than the Estate is currently accepting from agricultural rents.

The relevant planning question is whether long-term residential use is genuinely unviable, or whether hotel rooms have simply been selected because they maximise the income from the target market of guests at the Grangefields wedding venue.

Making use of capital and income

At different times over the last five years, and at the request of the applicants, one of the objectors has provided advice to the Estate about the best way to resolve problems with its complex land holding structure – a mixture of at least 20 freeholds held by individuals and trusts. The applicants see the existence the trusts, created to avoid tax and to hold land together, as the biggest barrier they face. There is nothing created by law that cannot be changed by law but the advice provided by the objector has not been accepted.

The structure of the Estate's land ownership and trust arrangements is a matter for the Estate and its owners. It is not the role of the local planning authority to remedy or compensate for the consequences of those arrangements. Unless it is clearly shown to be directly relevant to a material planning consideration, the Estate's internal financial and ownership structure should carry little or no weight in determining this application

The Estate controls substantial land holdings, residential property and commercial interests extending well beyond the seven buildings covered by this application.

Trusley Estate has long term income from agricultural rents. Taking farms in hand over the last few decades has reduced the number of farming tenancies and enabled the Estate to turn farm houses into residential homes. It has also given the Estate more control and a higher income from land, through business tenancies and short term annual field rents.

Trusley Estate possesses a range of assets and potential income streams that suggest alternative approaches exist that would allow the dwellings to remain in residential use – either tenanted or freehold.

Borrowing is a choice, the Estate is not forced to borrow.

Local examples and available assets

Nearby Estates have similar assets and income streams.

The neighbouring Radbourne Estate recently received massive windfall income when it sold farmland for building homes – Langley Country Park and Hackwood Grange. It has used the multi-million windfall to restore the roof at Radbourne Hall and to renovate many of the Estate buildings.

The neighbouring Sutton Estate, run by the Buckston family, has sold farmland and homes to generate cash.

Trusley Estate has at least one redundant and decaying farmhouse, Broad Close, outside and to the north of the Conservation Area. It has remained empty since the death of the farming tenant. This could be sold for private development bringing in a significant amount of cash for the Estate – possibly more than sufficient to cover the cost of renovating the properties to a standard suitable for letting as homes.

The sale of a single one of the properties in the Conservation Area, for example, The Old Courthouse, would bring in more than sufficient to cover the renovation of the others and provide funds, which, if invested well, could, along with rental income, more than cover the costs of future maintenance.

The sale of 20 acres of peripheral agricultural land lying outside Trusley parish could generate £350,000. This is less than 2% of the total land holding.

The proposal recognises that sale is an option (though it only talks about the sale of one or more of the properties covered by the application – it does not consider the Estate as a whole) but indicates that the Estate is reluctant to sell property to fund renovation for reasons of “stewardship” and “a unified whole”.

The argument relating to “stewardship” (covered in 8.6 below) falls since experience in Trusley and elsewhere shows that freeholders are far more likely to invest time and money in maintaining property than landlords. The argument relating to “a unified coordinated whole” falls because, no matter who owns the freehold, all development in the Conservation Area is tightly controlled by the planning authority.

Reluctance does not mean “impossible”, it means “unwilling” or “refusing”.

A precedent and future income streams

Within the last 15 years Trusley Estate sold the freeholds on two 1950s farm labourers’ cottages on the border of Osleston. These have now been demolished and replaced by new family homes. The sale raised approximately £650,000 at today’s values.

Trusley Estate has signed a long-term lease with Cripps & Co for the use of Grangefields as a wedding venue. The lease brings in significant income as well as dividends and a salary for the primary applicant who is a Director of Cripps Grangfields Ltd. and the parent company, Cripps Barn Group Limited.

The Trusley Estate has recently signed an option with Castleway Energy for a 164 acre solar farm associated with Goldhurst Farm in the south of the parish. Details are not public but this should, if it has been well negotiated, currently be generated a significant annual windfall income for the option.

If planning permission is granted for the solar farm the Estate will benefit from an index linked windfall of multiple millions over the next 40 years based on incomes from similar projects in other parts of the country.

As part of its effort to minimise objections, Castleway Energy has promised significant financial "community benefits". If the current application is approved Trusley will have no "community" remaining so the question arises: what will the community benefit be spent on and who will spend it?

Summary

The Estate has alternative sources of substantial amounts of cash – more than sufficient to renovate the cottages in the village centre so they can be rented out as family homes to bring life back to the village.

The Estate also has the option of phasing: renovating one property at a time, finding a tenant and gaining rent while the next property is tackled. As mentioned previously, the Estate has already lost between £60,000 and £80,000 by leaving properties empty. Phasing minimises up-front borrowing if the Estate refuses to use its own cash and assets.

Historic under-investment in maintenance does not, of itself, demonstrate that permanent residential use has become financially unviable

The application does not demonstrate that the Estate cannot retain residential use.

It demonstrates only that it prefers not to.

The Estate has choices:

Choice 1: Borrow or use existing capital?

Choice 2: Hotel rooms or homes for rent?

Choice 3: Sell peripheral assets or sacrifice homes?

Choice 4: Restore everything immediately or phase the work?

It is the objectors' claim that they have selected the wrong one.

Whichever choice is made, a village with a tiny minority of permanent residents is not a community.

7.6 Planning conclusion

The application has failed to demonstrate that the permanent loss of residential use is necessary to secure the future of these listed buildings.

The application asks the Council to accept an exceptional and permanent change to the character of Trusley. Such a change can only be justified if no realistic alternative exists.

The evidence before the Council does not demonstrate this. It demonstrates only that the applicant has chosen the option that best supports its preferred commercial model.

That is not the same as necessity.

---

8. Planning Balance

8.1 Introduction

The objectors acknowledge that the proposal would deliver a genuine public benefit, specifically the repair of historic buildings.

The issue before the Authority is whether this benefit outweigh the planning harm arising from the permanent loss of residential accommodation and the resulting change to the character of Trusley Conservation Area.

It is submitted it does not.

8.2 Heritage Repair

The comprehensive repair programme proposed by the applicant is a significant benefit. The repair of roofs, chimneys, masonry, joinery and traditional building fabric will undoubtedly improve the physical condition of the affected buildings.

The objectors support these works which are required to rectify the effects of decades of neglect.

However, those works relate to the condition of the buildings rather than the proposed change of use.

The Authority should therefore distinguish between:

- the benefit arising from restoration; and
- the planning consequences arising from converting residential properties into visitor accommodation.

These are separate issues. The first is welcomed. The second is the subject of this objection.

8.3 Economic Benefits

The application identifies employment opportunities arising from housekeeping, maintenance, management and associated services.

The scale of employment is modest.

The application anticipates approximately three full-time equivalent posts together with seasonal employment. None of these posts will go to those living in Trusley.

These minor benefits do not alter the fundamental planning issue concerning the future character of the settlement.

8.4 Tourism

Tourism is an important part of the rural economy.

However, planning policy does not require every opportunity for tourism development to be accepted regardless of location.

The principal question is whether the scale and nature of the proposed tourism use is compatible with the character of the place in which it is proposed.

In this case the proposal is not “tourism” in the broadest sense, visitors coming to admire an area, it is to provide overnight accommodation for guests at the Grangefields wedding venue.

In this case, the proposal removes every dwelling within the Conservation Area that is available to ordinary residential tenants.

That degree of change distinguishes this proposal from more conventional hotel or guest accommodation.

8.5 Public Access

The application argues that more visitors will experience and appreciate Trusley's historic significance.

There is merit in enabling greater public appreciation of heritage. Nevertheless, appreciation alone is not conservation.

The purpose of conservation policy is to preserve significance rather than simply increase visitor numbers.

A heritage asset can become more widely visited whilst simultaneously losing part of the character that made it significant. A visit to any of the tourist “hot spots” in Derbyshire and elsewhere shows how this can dramatically alter an area for the worse. It becomes a classic case of the observer destroying what is observed.

We are not suggesting that Trusley will become a “hot spot” (certainly not if the only people visitors see will be other visitors) only that its size and peacefulness as a small, occupied, rural settlement is its primary attribute.

Trusley is part of an extensive network of footpaths in the area and public access can remain as it is now without converting all residential dwellings into short-term accommodation

We will continue to welcome visitors and walkers – as we do now.

8.6 Stewardship and unified Estate management

The application places considerable emphasis upon stewardship and unified Estate management.

Estate management, “make do and mend”, over the last half century has led to almost all buildings on the Estate, not just those in the Conservation area, being in desperate need of renovation. The Estate’s self-described policy of “benign neglect” has brought us to where we are.

Unfortunately “benign neglect” has a cost. Buildings do not look after themselves, and, throughout the Estate the process of gradual decay is clearly visible. “Stewardship” has not been the watchword of the Estate.

There comes a time for reckoning – and that time is now.

Trusley Estate has the capital and income to restore its properties to a state where they can be lived in. (See Section 7.5 above).

Instead, it wishes to make the community pay, through loss of homes, by insisting that the only way to fund the update of properties is through borrowings and interest repayments. The implication is that the properties must be treated in isolation from the rest of the Estate and they must pay for themselves. These are the arguments of a corporate bean-counter rather than a responsible Estate owner.

This is a denial of responsibility, a denial of the duty of care that every Estate owner should have towards their land, their buildings and the people who live in them

Unified ownership is not itself a planning objective nor a guarantee of future maintenance.

It is not the role of a planning decision to overcome the past failures of the applicant by accepting a proposal that assumes a single answer to the problem: hotel rooms instead of homes.

The relevant planning question is whether the proposed use preserves or enhances the Conservation Area.

Ownership arrangements do not determine that question.

8.7 Housing Loss

Against the acknowledged public benefits must be weighed the principal planning harm: the proposal would remove all tenanted dwelling from the village.

In many larger settlements such a loss might be relatively modest. Within Trusley the effect is substantially greater.

The proposal would remove all the village's tenanted residential accommodation and replace it with visitor accommodation.

That represents a fundamental alteration to the balance between permanent occupation and temporary occupation within the settlement.

8.8 Community

Communities cannot be sustained solely through the maintenance of buildings. They depend upon people establishing long-term relationships with places.

Permanent residents contribute continuity.

Visitor accommodation provides activity but not permanence.

The proposal would therefore replace a settled residential population with successive groups of short-term visitors.

This represents a significant social change that should be given substantial weight.

8.9 Cumulative Impact

The proposal should not be considered in isolation since it forms part of a wider pattern of tourism-related development associated with the Estate.

Ivy Close Farm has been modernised, renamed “The Old Courthouse” and rented out as an Airbnb.

The Manor has been modernised and rented out as an Airbnb when Ed Coke-Steel’s family is on holiday.

Grangefields Farm now operates successfully as a wedding venue.

The current proposal is designed to provide overnight accommodation for guests at the wedding venue.

Planning decisions should consider the cumulative consequences of these changes and well as those in the current proposal.

Taken together these developments represent a progressive shift in the function of the historic village from a residential settlement towards a commercial visitor destination.

The cumulative effect is materially greater than the sum of the individual changes.

8.10 Irreversibility

The application notes that residential occupation could theoretically return because relatively few structural alterations are proposed.

The planning decision should be based upon what is proposed today rather than speculation on what may happened in the future.

If permission is granted there is no mechanism requiring future reversion to residential use. Indeed, commercial success would make such reversion increasingly unlikely.

The Authority should therefore treat the proposal as a long-term change in the character of the settlement.

8.11 Overall Balance

When all material considerations are weighed together, the proposal presents a mixed picture.

The repair of historic buildings is particularly welcome and a real public benefit.

However, the planning harms are equally real.

They include:

- permanent loss of residential accommodation;
- erosion of the living community;
- cumulative expansion of visitor accommodation;
- fundamental alteration to the character of the Conservation Area;
- replacement of settled occupation by transient use;
- and the progressive transformation of Trusley from a living village into accommodation principally serving overnight guests at the Grangfields wedding venue.

The objectors respectfully submit that these harms have been understated within the application and should attract substantial weight in the Authority's decision.

---

9. Conclusion

The objectors welcome the applicant's commitment to repairing and investing in Trusley's historic buildings.

There is no objection to the conservation of the built fabric.

The objection relates solely to the proposed needless change of use.

The application presents the proposal as the **only** means of securing investment in heritage assets.

Whilst the objective is commendable, it does not answer the principal planning question before the Authority.

The Authority must determine whether **the permanent loss of all of Trusley's residential tenanted accommodation** preserves or enhances the character and appearance of one of South Derbyshire's most distinctive Conservation Areas.

It is respectfully submitted that it does not.

The proposal would fundamentally alter the character and function of the village by replacing a settled residential community with Estate-managed visitor accommodation.

Although the buildings themselves would remain, an essential element of the Conservation Area's significance – its continuing role as a living rural settlement – would be materially diminished.

The application has also failed to demonstrate that permanent residential use is no longer a realistic option or that the proposed change of use represents the only means of securing the future of these buildings.

Accordingly, the planning balance favours the protection of the Conservation Area, the retention of residential accommodation and the preservation of Trusley as a living historic settlement.

For these reasons, the objectors respectfully request that South Derbyshire District Council refuses planning permission.

APPENDIX A

Relevant Planning Principles

The following planning principles are drawn from Planning Inspectorate decisions, Government guidance and the courts. While every planning application must be determined on its own merits, these authorities illustrate the approach commonly adopted when balancing heritage, housing and tourism.

---

1. Conservation Areas comprise more than buildings

Planning Inspectors consistently recognise that the character of a Conservation Area derives not only from the architectural quality of individual buildings but also from the historic pattern of development, the relationship between buildings, traditional uses and the way in which places continue to function.

The statutory duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 therefore requires consideration of the character of the area as a whole rather than simply the physical appearance of individual buildings.

This principle is directly relevant in Trusley, where the proposal would preserve building fabric whilst substantially altering the historic residential function of the settlement.

---

2. Heritage benefits must be balanced against heritage harm

Planning Inspectors regularly accept that restoring historic buildings represents a public benefit.

However, restoration alone does not determine the planning balance.

The Authority must also consider whether the proposed use causes harm to the significance of the heritage asset.

The National Planning Policy Framework requires both benefits and harms to be weighed before planning permission is granted.

---

3. Commercial preference is not the planning test

Planning decisions are not made by identifying the most profitable use of land.

The relevant question is whether the proposed development represents an acceptable planning outcome.

Applicants may legitimately seek the most commercially attractive option.

The Local Planning Authority must weight alternatives and determine whether a proposed option accords with planning policy after considering all material considerations.

---

4. Viability assertions should be supported by evidence

Planning Inspectors commonly give greater weight to viability arguments where they are supported by transparent evidence capable of independent examination.

Where proposals depend upon claims that an existing use is financially impossible, Inspectors frequently expect to see objective viability information rather than unsupported assertions.

Where such information is absent, as in this case, reduced weight may be attached to viability arguments.

---

5. Cumulative impact is a material planning consideration

Planning applications should not always be considered in isolation.

Where several developments combine or accumulate over time to alter the character or function of an area, Planning Inspectors frequently consider the cumulative effect rather than simply assessing each proposal separately.

This principle is particularly important in Trusley, where the proposed visitor accommodation follows the creation of Airbnbs at the Old Courthouse and The Manor. The proposal also seeks to capitalise on the change of use at the Grangefields wedding venue.

---

6. Loss of permanent housing can represent planning harm

Inspectors have accepted that the replacement of permanent residential accommodation by visitor accommodation may cause planning harm, particularly in areas where the permanent residential community contributes to local character or sustainability

Although every case depends upon its own facts, the principle that loss of permanent housing is capable of attracting significant planning weight is well established.

---

7. The planning balance is not determined by a single benefit

Inspectors consistently undertake an overall planning balance.

Economic benefits, employment, tourism and heritage repair are all capable of carrying significant weight.

Equally, harm to residential communities, Conservation Areas, housing supply and settlement character may also carry substantial weight.

The correct approach is therefore to balance all material considerations rather than allowing any single claimed benefit to determine the outcome.

---

8. Planning Inspectorate appeal decisions

Decisions concerning the loss of permanent housing to short-term visitor accommodation demonstrate that Inspectors may attach significant weight to the retention of permanent housing where local policy supports it.

Decisions concerning Conservation Areas consistently show that Inspectors assess the effect on the character and appearance of the area as a whole rather than solely on individual buildings.

APPENDIX B

Planning Benefits Claimed by the Applicant and the Objectors' Response

Applicant's claimed benefit	**Objectors' response**
Repair of listed buildings	Welcomed, but could be done without loss of residential use. Only three of the seven buildings are listed and none are at risk.
Tourism	The majority of visitors will not be tourists, they will be overnight guests from the wedding venue at Grangefields. South Derbyshire already has over 1,300 holiday rentals, B&Bs, and countryside pubs.
Jobs	Unemployment in South Derbyshire at 2.4% is almost half the national average of 4.1%. The possibility of three jobs is not a justification for a change of this scale. No one living in Trusley would gain.
Estate stewardship	A very poor record in the past. Stewardship can continue, and be improved, without change of use.
Parking improvements	Minor benefit carrying limited weight to the community as a whole. Outweighed by the probable doubling of cars in the village. Does the application offer off-road parking for at least 23 cars or will the area opposite the church become an unapproved car park?
Financial viability	Not supported by independently verifiable evidence. Alternatives are available that retain tenanted dwellings. Without financial transparency it is impossible to determine the validity of the applicant’s claims.
Public access	This will remain as it is now. Visitors may appreciate heritage, but appreciation is not the same as conserving a living historic settlement.
Future reversibility	Speculative and should attract limited weight.

APPENDIX C

Trusley Estate and recent history

The centre of Trusley became a conservation area in 1968 – the earliest in South Derbyshire – as a rare example of a small rural Estate village and community. The assessment of Trusley as a Conservation Area may be found here:

https://bitbarn.co.uk/trusley/documents/trusley_conservation_area.pdf

"Trusley Estate" is a trading name associated with over 1,100 acres of land in South Derbyshire including almost all the land in Trusley civil parish south of Long Lane. The Estate is under the control of the Coke-Steel family.

According to the Land Registry there are twenty plus freeholds that make up Trusley Estate and these are held by a mixture of Coke-Steel family members and two trusts. The properties covered by the planning application involve different freeholds and freeholders.

Until the early 20th century almost all the homes in the village were occupied by those working on the Estate: farmers, farmers' children, farm labourers and Estate workers – blacksmith, handyman etc. During the 20th century this gradually and inevitably changed.

The Coke side of the Coke-Steel family has held land in Trusley on and off for centuries through a mixture of descent, marriage, name changes and purchases.

The Coke family was absent from the village for almost two hundred years from 1718-1902 when it returned and built Trusley Manor. The nearby Old Hall Farm was converted into stables and living accommodation for staff and a new farmhouse, Goldhurst, was built south of the village for the farmer. The Manor was used as a school and occupied by the Land Army during WW2.

The Steel side of the family is descended from "The Leviathan Of The Ring", Henry Steel (1832 – 1925), fishmonger, bookmaker to the nobility and, eventually, co-owner of Steel, Peach and Towser steel works in Sheffield. Henry's grandson, Ronald Steel, married into the Coke family in 1940 when the Coke male line came to an end. The family was renamed Coke-Steel in 1945 and Ronald, then Managing Director of Daniel Doncaster & Sons, forgemasters in Sheffield; provided a welcome injection of capital enabling Trusley Estate to expand with the purchase in 1952 of Grangefields Farm with its 230 acres of land.

Ronald was very active within the Estate, regularly engaging with farming tenants, having his own herd of Red Poll cattle and providing, from Doncasters & Sons, some of the steel in Home Farm's buildings. After his death in 1963 this level of engagement gradually fell away.

In the mid 1940s Mr R. W. Sutton, the Derbyshire County Analyst (famous for his 1982 paper on "The Examination of Lard"), purchased the freehold of The Old Rectory when it became surplus to the Church of England's requirements. The Old Rectory remains the only independent freehold within the area covered by Trusley Estate.

In 1948 The Manor was considered too large to maintain and over half was demolished. The Coke-Steel family moved into Old Hall Farm (renamed The Old Hall) and the remaining part of The Manor became four apartments. Other homes were rented out by the Estate to those wishing to live in the countryside or, in some cases, to those who had fallen on hard times.

Until recently, to the north of the village, eight homes were occupied by non-members of the Coke-Steel family and their staff: Ivy Close Farm, Eaton's Cottage, Lane End Cottage, Tatlow Cottage, No 1 Taylor's Lane, No 2 Taylor's Lane, Home Farm and The Old Rectory

The most recent changes began following the death of the farming tenant at Ivy Close farm. After a long dispute over tenancy succession the farmhouse was taken in hand by the Estate, renamed The Old Courthouse, modernised and converted into a short term Airbnb let.

Lane End Cottage had modifications over the last quarter century, was taken in hand and has remained empty since the death of Michael Mallender (the former Estate solicitor) and the death of his wife Margaret in 2020.

Eaton's Cottage had modifications over the half century, was taken in hand and has remained empty since the death in 2025 of Peggy Wheatcroft whose husband's family owned one of the textile mills in Wirksworth.

No 1 Taylor's Lane was taken in hand and has remained empty since the movement prior to his death in 2025 of Robert Innes-Smith, retired editor of Tatler Magazine.

No 2 Taylor's Lane will be taken in hand when the tenants leave in August 2026.

Gardener's Cottage has been taken in hand following the eviction of the tenants in May, 2026.

Currently (July 2026) this leaves only three homes not occupied by the Coke-Steel family and their staff: Tatlow Cottage, Home Farm and The Old Rectory.

Note: Tatlow Cottage is included in the current proposal – though it still has a residential tenant.

APPENDIX D

Map of the changes

