

15. HEAD OF LAW - PLANNING APPEALS (A.1536/AMC)

1. **APPEALS LODGED**

No new appeals lodged during this month.

2. **APPEALS WITHDRAWN**

No appeals withdrawn during this month.

3. **APPEALS DECIDED**

There were 5 appeals decided during this month.

<u>Reference</u>	<u>Details</u>	<u>Method of Appeal</u>	<u>Decision</u>	<u>Committee/ Delegated</u>
NP/DDD/0914/1014 3007996	Use of yard for parking 2 lorries, in addition to retention of use of yard for agricultural purposes at Five Acres Farm, Narrow Gate Lane, Wardlow, SK17 8RP	Written Representations	Allowed with conditions	Committee
<p>The Inspector in allowing the Appeal, felt that the proposed parking of 2 commercial vehicles would be largely screened from distant views by existing buildings and elevated land, and that the introduction of the commercial vehicles would not appear unduly conspicuous within the farm setting, as there were already vehicles of a similar type often present in connection with agricultural activities, however the Inspector in one of his conditions has stated that there should be no more than 2 commercial vehicles parked on the site at any one time, nor should there be any parking of commercial vehicles outside the area to protect the character and appearance of the landscape, so it would be in accord with Policies L1, T4 and E2 of the Core Strategy, and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>				
NP/DDD/0115/0001 3011473	Siting of two shepherd's huts at far end of field for use as room only accommodation. Existing concrete stable forecourt to be utilised as parking for two cars. Change of use of land from agricultural to commercial at Land off The Lodge, Tideswell	Written Representations	Dismissed	Delegated
<p>The Inspector felt that the proposal would not represent sustainable recreational and tourism development with the National Park, and also concluded that because of its prominent position, permanence and paraphernalia associated with the proposed use, the development would detract unacceptably from the valued characteristics of this site, undermining the manner in which it sits in its surroundings and so failing to conserve the Park's landscape, cultural heritage and scenic beauty. As such it would also conflict with Policies GSP1, GSP3, L1 and RT3 in the Core Strategy and LC4 and LR3 of the Local Plan. The Appeal was therefore dismissed.</p>				
11/0222 Enforcement 3000787	Erection of building; and change of use of the land to use for storage purposes at Land on Stanedge Road, Bakewell	Written Representations	Dismissed	Delegated

The Inspector dismissed the appeal as he felt that the development which had been carried out, was materially different to the 1991 scheme when planning permission had been granted, so making the development as a whole unlawful. The Inspector also felt that the appeal building was a significant structure which had eroded the openness and rural character of the area and that the scenic beauty of the landscape and National Park had been harmed and that the building needed to be removed in order to remedy the injury to the amenity.

NP/DDD/0914/0997 3001876	Six number one bedroomed flats at Endcliffe Court, Ashford Road, Bakewell, DE45 1GT	Informal Hearing	Allowed with Conditions	Committee
-----------------------------	---	------------------	-------------------------------	-----------

The Inspector felt that the proposed development would be consistent with the principles of sustainable development. Whilst the proposal would be contrary to the Development Plan, he considered its compliance with the Framework and the benefits that the proposal provided outweighed this in this particular case. The Inspector allowed the Appeal.

NP/DDD/0814/0917 3009008	Change of use of agricultural land for the proposed implement store, static stables and menage at land at Eastmoor, Baslow, DE45 1SR	Written Representations	Dismissed	Delegated
-----------------------------	--	----------------------------	-----------	-----------

The Inspector dismissed the appeal as she felt that the proposal would have been visibly prominent from the road and would appear intrusive within the natural landscape. Although landscaping was proposed, it was felt that it would not have been sufficient to screen the development. The site would have also been prominent from other vantage points within the landscape, and although the site was some distance from the village, it would have adversely impacted on views from nearby roads, and would not have been in keeping with the open character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal would have also conflicted with Core Strategy GSP1, GSP3 and L1 as well as conflicting with Local Plan LC4, LC13 and LR7 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the report be received.