
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>	<u>Method of Appeal</u>	<u>Committee/ Delegated</u>
3372929 23/0036	Enforcement notice appeal - The creation of an area of hardstanding and the widening of a means of access to a highway comprising the removal of a section of drystone wall and the erection of gates and gate posts Greenfields Christmas Trees Ltd, Land adjacent A621 Owler Bar, Holmesfield	Written Representation	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 APPEALS WITHDRAWN

There have been no appeals withdrawn during this month.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.

<u>Reference</u>	<u>Details</u>	<u>Method of Appeal</u>	<u>Decision</u>	<u>Committee/ Delegated</u>
3369095 NP/DDD/1024/1145	Proposed garage and store building for purposes incidental to a dwelling The Barn, South Church Street, Bakewell	Householder	Dismissed	Committee

The main issue considered by the Inspector was the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, with particular reference to outlook, sunlight and daylight.

The proposed development was considered to have a neutral effect upon, and therefore preserve, the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would not cause harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset. This was because the building would be sited in an enclosed garden area, and the design would be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the area.

The proposed development would not unreasonably overshadow the neighbouring properties windows or gardens however it was considered the development would have an overbearing impact on Erica Cottage and Barnes Cottage. Thus, the proposed development would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, with particular reference to outlook.

On this basis the Inspector found the proposal would conflict with adopted policies and it would also conflict with the Detailed Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document: alterations and extensions. This states where an extension would interfere with the outlook from a habitable room in a neighbouring property to the extent that alone or cumulatively with others, it is unduly intrusive and oppressive then it is reasonable to resist the proposal.

As such the appeal was dismissed.

3366274 NP/GDO/1124/1175	Proposed is described as 'agricultural building for the storage of fodder and implements Land West of Alstonefield Road, Hulme End	Written representation	Dismissed	Delegated
-----------------------------	--	------------------------	-----------	-----------

The main issue was whether prior approval should be granted having regard to the proposed development's siting, design and external appearance.

The Inspector agreed that due to its overall scale, including its height, the proposed building would be visually prominent within the surrounding area, including from public viewpoints from the nearby footpaths, and out of keeping with the low-lying, open qualities of the fields, particularly in the context of the nearest buildings, opposite the access track, which appear to be sited at a lower level than the proposal.

Also, given the topography of the area, the siting of the proposed building in relation to the nearby buildings, and the cluster of trees which separates Paddock House Farm from the proposed building, the Inspector found that the proposal would not relate to this group of buildings and would dominate the immediate landscape and erode the sense of openness that characterises the site.

In conclusion the Inspector found that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, prior approval regarding the proposed development's siting, design and external appearance should not be granted.

4. **RECOMMENDATION:**

To note the report.