12. PLANNING APPEALS MONTHLY REPORT (A.1536/BT)

1. APPEALS LODGED

The following appeals have been lodged during this month.

| <u>Reference</u> | <u>Details</u> | Method of Appeal | Committee/ Delegated |
|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| NP/DDD/0124/0111 3663131 | Replacement of windows to the front elevation of the public house The Moon Inn, Stoney Middleton | Written Representations | Delegated |
| NP/DDD/1224/1362 3363039 | Conversion of agricultural barn to open market dwelling at Barn and Croft to the east of Robin Hey, Main Road, Wardlow | Written Representations | Delegated |
| NP/SM/0924/1017 3364097 | Two storey extension of northwest gable and erection of a balcony/patio area including minor internal revisions at Ye Olde Rock Inn, Upper Hulme | Written Representations | Delegated |
| NP/DDD/0924/0916 3364693 | Listed Building consent - The provision of two parking bays with hipped roof canopy. Proposed removal of a disused oil tank, excavation of hillside alongside driveway, and the felling of 4 low quality trees in woodland. To include associated landscaping and hard-standing provision. | 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 APPEALS WITHDRAWN

There have been no appeals withdrawn during this month.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.

| NP/DDD/0624/0624 3354957 | Proposed alteration and extension at The Gables, Greaves Lane, Ashford in the Water | Householder | Dismissed | Delegated |
|-----------------------------|---|-------------|-----------|-----------|
| | vvater | | | |

The Inspector considered that the main issues were a) whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ashford in the Water Conservation Area, b) the effect of the appeal scheme on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties with specific regard to outlook and light and c) the suitability of the proposal with specific regard to climate change mitigation and flood resilience.

The Inspector states that the scale of the extension would create a bulky mass to the rear that

would be unreflective of and thus an unacceptably jar against the quaintness of the original dwelling. It would have a dominating presence that would also erode the sense of spaciousness. The proposal would also include bi-fold doors that would be an alien feature against the more traditional and prevailing smaller proportioned openings of the existing house.

The proposal would be set an adequate distance away from neighbouring properties and it was considered that the scale would not cause harm to the living conditions of these occupants, however a lack of flood risk assessment also meant that this other material issue could not be adequately addressed.

Overall there were no material considerations which would outweigh the significant harms set out to the character and appearance of the original dwelling and as such the appeal was dismissed.

| NP/DDD/0524/0534 3352304 | Change of use to dwelling The Old School, Main Street, | Written Representations | Dismissed | Delegated |
|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| | Great Longstone | | | |

The Inspector set out the main issues as: whether the proposed development would result in an unacceptable loss of a community facility; the effect of the proposal on protected species; and the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including the wider National Park landscape, and the extent to which it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Great Longstone Conservation Area and the effect on a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA).

While the Inspector found that the wider impacts on the Conservation Area were not considered significant and could have been mitigated, the Inspector concluded that the proposal would result in the unacceptable loss of a community facility. It would therefore conflict with CS Policy HC4 and DMP Policy DMS2 which together seek, among other things, to protect community facilities unless it is demonstrated and evidenced that reasonable attempts have been made to sell or let the building for an alternative community facility for a period of at least 12-months; and that the community facility is no longer needed; is available elsewhere; or is no longer viable.

Furthermore, there was insufficient information to adequately demonstrate the proposed development would not cause harm to protected species.

On this basis the appeal was dismissed.

| NP/DDD/0324/0306 3351162 | Proposed heightening of stone wall between garden and road from 1m to 1.82m at Lathkill | Householder | Dismissed | Delegated |
|-----------------------------|---|-------------|-----------|-----------|
| | View, Church Street, Monyash | | | |
| | | | | |

The Inspector considered that the main issue was the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and the setting of the Monyash Conservation Area (CA).

The Inspector found that the development would provide improved security and privacy for the appellant and future occupants of Lathkill View. However, set against this the altered wall would be a discordant feature in this particular location. Its height would be very apparent in views into the CA and it would be visually prominent due to its proximity to the road. As a consequence, the wall would detrimentally affect the manner in which the CA is experienced and harm the significance of the heritage asset through development in its setting.

The Inspector concluded that the proposal conflicted with the development plan and the material considerations did not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.

The appeal was therefore dismissed.

4. **RECOMMENDATION:**

To note the report.