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

### 1. APPEALS LODGED

The following appeals have been lodged since the last report.

| Reference                   | <u>Details</u>   | Method of Appeal           | <u>Committee/</u><br><u>Delegated</u> |
|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| NP/DDD/0724/0684<br>3356834 | Proposed re-use of garage/store as a mixed use building with flexible space that can be purposed for residential and business use at Land to the Rear of the former RBS, Main Road, Hathersage | Written<br>Representations | Committee                             |
| NP/DDD/0424/0460<br>3357258 | Proposed retention of forestry storage shed at Oaks Wood, Highlow  | Written<br>Representations | Delegated                             |
| NP/DDD/1024/1047<br>3358361 | S.73 application for the variation of condition No 2 on NP/DDD/0522/0669 at 15 The Beeches, Baslow   | Householder                | Delegated                             |

### 2. APPEALS WITHDRAWN

The following appeal has been withdrawn during this month.

| Reference              | <u>Details</u>   | Method of<br>Appeal        | <u>Decision</u> | Committee/<br>Delegated |
|------------------------|--|----------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| ENF 21/0054<br>3358331 | Two unauthorised<br>buildings and track at<br>Hallfield Farm,<br>Strawberry Lee Lane,<br>Sheffield | Written<br>Representations | Withdrawn       | Delegated               |

## 3. APPEALS DECIDED

The following appeals have been decided during this month.

| Reference                   | <u>Details</u>  | Method of<br>Appeal        | <u>Decision</u> | Committee/<br>Delegated |
|-----------------------------|---|----------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| NP/HPK/0923/1117<br>3345822 | Retrospective planning permission for change of use of land to allow siting of three small scale units to be used as holiday accommodation at Booth Farm, Hollinsclough | Written<br>Representations | Allowed         | Delegated               |

The Inspector considered that the structures "formed only a small part of an expansive view and the buildings were small and patently subservient to the larger agricultural ones". In the view of the Inspector their simple design and use of natural materials addressed any incongruity. As a result, the Inspector felt that the scheme did not harm the character and appearance of the area and states that the scheme complied with Policies GSP1, GSP3, RT3 and L1 of the CS and Policies DMC3 and DMR1 of the Peak District National Park Development Management Policies 2019. Officers disagree with this assessment as policy DMR1 limits camping pods to wooded locations in order to conserve and enhance the wider landscape and special qualities of the National Park. An allowance is made in policy for a single shepherd's hut on a farm as this works more comfortably with the characteristics of the area and reduces the "clutter" effect of additional modern structures in the context of historic farmsteads. Nevertheless the appeal was allowed.

| NP/S/0523/0530 | Retrospective         | Written        | Dismissed | Delegated |
|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------|-----------|
| 3335166        | planning application  | Representation |           |           |
|                | for a timber, open    |                |           |           |
|                | fronted implements    |                |           |           |
|                | store, and a circular |                |           |           |
|                | horse training centre |                |           |           |
|                | at Hallfield Farm,    |                |           |           |
|                | Strawberry Lee Lane,  |                |           |           |
|                | Sheffield             |                |           |           |

The Inspector considered the main issues were the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, and whether the proposal would be in a suitable location within the Natural Zone and concluded that the proposal would result in demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the area, where the Framework required great weight to be applied to the conservation and enhancement of the landscape and the scenic beauty of a National Park. Accordingly, the proposal would not accord with the development plan, when taken as a whole, and there were no material considerations of sufficient magnitude to indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Consequently, the appeal was dismissed.

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

To note the report.