

---

**16. 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>
3000787 Enf. 11/0222	Erection of a building without planning permission and the change of use of the land for storage purposes at OS Field No.0171, Stanedge Road, Bakewell, Derbyshire	Written Representations (Enforcement)	Delegated

---

**2. APPEALS WITHDRAWN**

There have been no appeals withdrawn during this month.

---

**3. APPEALS DECIDED**

The following appeals have been decided during this month.

<u>Reference</u>	<u>Details</u>	<u>Method of Appeal</u>	<u>Decision</u>	<u>Committee/ Delegated</u>
2226137 NP/DDD/0414/0375	Section 73 application to amend condition 5 - use as holiday accommodation on NP/DDD/1104/1215 at The Old School House, Lower Farm, Brushfield, Taddington	Written Representations	Dismissed	Delegated

---

Although the Inspector accepted that the use of the building as a permanent dwelling would not have an harmful impact on the character and appearance of the building or its surroundings, it was concluded that the proposal to remove the condition to create a permanent dwelling would not meet the tests of the National Planning Policy Framework, and would not achieve the aims of either Policy HC1 or Policy LH1, which accepts that affordable housing in the countryside can be provided to meet local need. The Inspector dismissed the Appeal.

---

2224971 NP/SM/0114/0064	Section 73 - the removal of condition 4 - to allow use as a permanent dwelling on NP/SM/0211/0086 – The Old School House, Newtown, Longnor	Informal Hearing	Dismissed	Delegated
----------------------------	--	------------------	-----------	-----------

No suggestion had been made that the dwelling would be suitable for a key worker, and that the Appellant considered that the sale of the building as an affordable unit for local people would not be viable. The Inspector therefore considered that the condition was reasonable and necessary in order to prevent the creation of an open market dwelling, which would have conflicted with Core Strategy HC1 and LH1 of the Local Plan. The Appeal was dismissed.

---

---

2225840 NP/DDD/0414/0357	Construction of a roof over an existing silage clamp at Braemar Farm, Earl Sterndale, Buxton, SK17 0AA	Written Representations	Allowed	Delegated
-----------------------------	--	----------------------------	---------	-----------

The Inspector considered that the proposed development would conserve and enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the National Park and would not result in significant environmental harm. It would also be economically and socially sustainable, and it therefore constituted sustainable development. Some planting on surrounding land to the north and west would help assimilate the building into the landscape and scenic beauty of the area, but walling, fencing or ground surfacing was not necessary to make the development acceptable. The specific colour identified by the Authority was not necessary to make the development acceptable, as the plans specified a slate blue colour which could be achieved through a standard materials samples condition, and neither was it necessary to remove the building after its use had ceased, because the Inspector concluded that the building would not cause significant landscape harm, therefore the Inspector allowed the Appeal.

In allowing the appeal the Inspector also made a partial award of costs against the Authority. This followed a suggestion in the Authority's initial response to the appeal that the Authority considered the appellant's submission of an LVIA (Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment) to be unreasonable at that stage and that this could result in a claim for costs against the appellant. In these circumstances a response to that claim was necessary by the appellant and the additional work and expense associated with that could not have been avoided. In the event, the Authority did not submit a claim for costs. Whilst this is unfortunate, the scale of costs is unlikely to be high because it is limited to the additional work undertaken to respond to the Authority's statement about the LVIA.

---

4. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**That the report be received.**

---