

## 16. **HEAD OF LAW REPORT - PLANNING APPEALS (A.1536/AMC)**

### 1. **APPEALS LODGED**

There have been no new appeals lodged during this month.

### 2. **APPEALS WITHDRAWN**

There have been no appeals withdrawn during this month.

### 3. **APPEALS DECIDED**

The following appeal has been decided during this month.

<b><u>Reference</u></b>	<b><u>Details</u></b>	<b><u>Method of Appeal</u></b>	<b><u>Decision</u></b>	<b><u>Committee/ Delegated</u></b>
NP/S/0216/0142 3160867	Retention of existing building with alterations and use for agricultural purposes at Wigtwizzle Barn, Lee Lane, Wigtwizzle, Sheffield, S36 4ZA	Written Representations	Dismissed	Delegated
The Inspector felt that the proposal did not appear to have been designed as a functional agricultural or forestry building, and was in a prominent location in close proximity to a road junction and readily visible from the public highway. The Inspector considered that the proposal did not conserve the landscape and scenic beauty or the valued characteristics of the National Park which is a statutory duty, and would have been in conflict with GSP1 of the Core Strategy and LC13 of the Local Plan, which includes seeking new agricultural or forestry development that avoids harm to the area's valued characteristics. Taking all that into account the Inspector concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.				
NP/DDD/0616/0559 3162214	Extension to existing workshop/store/office at the Station House, Station Road, Upper Padley, Grindleford	Householder	Dismissed	Delegated
The Inspector considered that the large flat roof on the extension contrasted sharply with the roof design of the majority of the building, and constituted an unsympathetic addition that significantly detracted from the more traditional non-domestic character and appearance of the host building. The extension was readily apparent to passers-by and could be seen in glimpsed views from medium and longer distances despite some screening on site. In conclusion the Inspector felt that the development materially detracted from the character and appearance of the conservation area and conflicted with GSP3 and L3 of the Core Strategy and LC4, LC5 and LH4 of the Local Plan. The appeal was dismissed.				

### .4 **RECOMMENDATION:**

**That the report be received.**