

---

### 13. **AUTHORITY SOLICITOR REPORT - PLANNING APPEALS REPORT (A.1536/AE)**

#### 1. **APPEALS LODGED**

The following appeals have been lodged during this month.

<b><u>Reference</u></b>	<b><u>Details</u></b>	<b><u>Method of Appeal</u></b>	<b><u>Committee/ Delegated</u></b>
NP/DDD/1023/1269 3347367	Erection of new low energy house to replace existing garage at land to the side of Spire View, Monyash Road, Bakewell	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 **APPEALS WITHDRAWN**

There have been no appeals withdrawn during this month.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.

<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/DDD/1121/1299 3336610	Change of use from domestic garden to camping pod site at Top Riley, Riley Lane, Eyam	Written Representations	Allowed	Committee

The Inspector found that the proposal would be compatible in this location when assessed against the relevant policies, particularly in view of the lack of harm to the surrounding landscape and therefore the proposal does not conflict with the Policy RT3 of the PDCS, p\policy DMR1 of the DMP or the provisions found within the National Planning Policy Framework. The Inspector considered that the proposal would not conflict with Policy DMT5 of the DMP as it would not increase vehicular traffic along Riley Lane which would be to the detriment of the enjoyment of walkers and riders. The proposal complies with the development plan as a whole and there are no considerations which suggest that a decision should be taken other than in accordance with it. The appeal was allowed.

NP/SM/0623/0673 3332843	Conversion and alteration of former kennels and cattery to form two 3 bedroom holiday lets with amenity space, access and parking at White Shaw Farm, Heaton	Written Representations	Allowed	Delegated
----------------------------	--	-------------------------	---------	-----------

The Inspector considered the proposed development would be sympathetic and complementary to the existing buildings and the rural surrounds and would not harm the character and appearance of the area, and would also preserve the setting of the heritage asset. The Inspector also felt that the proposal was in accord with Development Management policies DMC3, DMC5, DMC7 and DMC10. The appeal was therefore allowed.

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

**To note the report.**