

---

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

### 1. APPEALS LODGED

The following appeals have been lodged during this month.

<u>Reference</u>	<u>Details</u>	<u>Method of Appeal</u>	<u>Committee/ Delegated</u>
NP/DDD/0117/0080 3179328	Alterations and extensions to create bedsit and ground floor shower room for disabled resident at Aston Grange, Oker Road, Matlock, DE4 2JJ	Householder	Delegated
NP/HPK/0317/0330 3182213	Porch extension to rear of detached dwelling at Rushup Cottage Farm, Rushup Lane, Chapel-en-le-Frith, SK23 0QT	Householder	Delegated
NP/HPK/0517/0475 3182026	Drop the shared western boundary wall to 900mm high and a footway crossing/dropped kerb to allow vehicular access to the property at 24 Hernstone Lane, Peak Forest	Householder	Delegated

### 2. APPEALS WITHDRAWN

There have been no appeals withdrawn during this month.

---

### 3. APPEALS DECIDED

The following appeal has been decided during this month.

<u>Reference</u>	<u>Details</u>	<u>Method of Appeal</u>	<u>Decision</u>	<u>Committee/ Delegated</u>
NP/DDD/0616/0548 3166812	Conversion of outbuilding to holiday let and leave part as ancillary accommodation at Station House, Upper Padley, Grindleford	Written Representations	Split Decision	Delegated

The Inspector considered that the proposed extension to create a single storey study/workshop and office to the property would harm the character and appearance of the host building, due to its unsympathetic design. Although the site would be relatively screened, the extension could be seen from the access road and in glimpsed views from the wider area. It would appear as an incongruous addition that would detract from the quality of the development as a whole. It would also adversely affect the significance of the Conservation Area and did not meet the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework. Therefore this part of the appeal was dismissed.

As regards to the proposed conversion and alterations, the Inspector felt that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host building, nor would it affect the historic significance of the Conservation Area or the setting of Station House. Although it is possible to see the building from the adjoining vehicular access, the window and door materials do not stand out, and the fact that the building is well screened mitigates the harm that results from the use of uPVC. This part of the appeal was allowed and planning permission granted subject to conditions.

The Inspector concluded that a split decision was appropriate in this case.

---

4. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**That the report be received.**