# 9. <u>AUTHORITY SOLICITOR REPORT - PLANNING APPEALS REPORT (A.1536/AE)</u>

### 1. APPEALS LODGED

The following appeals have been lodged during this month.

Reference	<u>Details</u>	Method of Appeal	Committee/ Delegated
NP/HPK/0723/0869 3340823	Conversion and refurbishment of disused stable block to form self-contained holiday accommodation at Round Meadow Barn, Parsons lane, Hope	Written Representations	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 APPEALS WITHDRAWN

There have been no appeals withdrawn during this month.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.

Reference	<u>Details</u>	Method of Appeal	<u>Decision</u>	Committee/ Delegated
NP/SM/1222/1535 3332348	Conversion of redundant barn to one bed residential dwelling at barn south west of Crowdecote	Written Representations	Dismissed	Delegated

The Inspector considered that the barn would be observed in the wide-open views, and the likely proliferation of domestic paraphernalia would have an adverse effect on the local landscape character, which could not be adequately mitigated. The proposed development would also be contrary to policies DS1 and HC1 of the Core Strategy as well as DMC10 of the Development Management Policies. The appeal was dismissed.

NP/DDD/0623/0731 3333489	Erection of rear extension and alterations to existing dormer roof/window with associated internal and external works at Brookfield Grove, The Dukes Drive, Ashford	Householder	Dismissed	Delegated

The Inspector considered that the proposal would have a visually harmful impact on the host property and character and appearance of the area. The Inspector also found that insufficient evidence had been provided to demonstrate that the proposal would not harm protected bat species that had been identified on the site. The appeal was dismissed.

NP/GDO/0322/0431 3325925	New building for mixed agricultural use at Land	Written Representations	Allowed	Committee
3325925	agricultural use at Land at Middle Hay, Long Lane, Cressbrook Dale	Representations	Allowed	Committee

The Inspector considered that the design and appearance of the proposal would not harm the landscape character of the area and would conserve the valued characteristics of the National Park as well as assisting with the appellant's management of the DDNNR. The Inspector also concluded that the siting, design and appearance of the proposal would comply with GSP1, GSP2, GSP3 and L1 of the Core Strategy as well as DMC1, DMC3 and DME1 of the Development Management Policies. The appeal was allowed.

The Inspector considered that the proposal would not preserve the special interest of the Grade II listed building, nor satisfy the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework. The appeal was dismissed.

#### 4. **RECOMMENDATION:**

To note the report.