
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>
6007476 NP/S/1025/1079	S73 application for the variation of conditions 2 and 3 on NP/S/1024/1107 at Low Flatt Farm, Heads Lane, Bolsterstone	Written Representation	Delegated
6007791 NP/DDD/0725/0715	Against condition 2 of planning application for alterations to Listed Building 16 The Square, Middleton by Youlgrave	Written Representation	Delegated
6008552 NP/CEC/0126/0107	Listed Building consent - Internal alterations to Grade II listed property including the replacement of a modern stair and removal of modern brick wall at Tower Hill Fold, Rainow	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 APPEALS WITHDRAWN

There have been no appeals withdrawn during this month.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>
6001731 NP/DDD/0925/0885	Side extension and pool house at Underlowe, Lydgate, Eyam	Householder	Allowed	Delegated

The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area, including Eyam Conservation Area.

The Inspector found that Underlowe has different characteristics to the groupings of closely-knit historic dwellings within the vicinity. It is a substantial dwelling, set within its own large grounds, with a formal driveway entrance. It is largely concealed from views within the village itself, due to its well-established tree groups, and raised ground in the rear garden. Its main, front elevation, faces away from the village, and looks out over open fields.

The Inspector acknowledged that the building had been extended previously. The development would include further extensions to one side of the dwelling, within a spacious part of the garden. Although the plant room / store would be built on to an existing side

extension and would be the element most visible from Mill Lane, it would be significantly stepped down and also set back. It would have a simple form and appearance, with a roof shape mirroring that of the existing dwelling. As such, the Inspector found that the proposal would not compete with the existing building range or have a complicated form. It would also allow the original part of the dwelling to continue to be appreciated as the principal feature.

The Inspector also found the following in respect of other elements:

“The pool building would be set low down within the side garden, with a low profile roof form, a contemporary design to its frontage, and stone walling to the side and rear. It would also be accessed via a simple and deeply set back, glazed link. Its form, scale, height and design would be such that it would appear as a separate garden building. It would be set forward of the existing building range, with different proportions and design details. However, it would not compete with the original dwelling or diminish its quality or integrity. It would appear as a visually distinct and subservient building, partially set within a dip in the contours of the garden.

Whilst the roof would have a utilitarian appearance with solar panels and rooflights, views towards the roof would be contained to the terrace within the site itself, and it would not be conspicuous when viewed from outside of the site. As such it would not detract from the character and quality of the wider extent of garden to the front and rear of the dwelling.

The proposed rear, two-storey extension and flat-roofed element, would be contained within a small area on an elevation that already has variety, both in its detailing and form of projecting elements. It would also be largely concealed from views from outside of the site.”

So overall, even though the development would have a large footprint, the Inspector found that it would not result in a confusing massing or complicated form. Nor would it dominate or diminish the character and quality of the original dwelling. It would sit comfortably within the spacious garden, making use of the different levels within the site.

Therefore, while the development is large views are only partial and in the context of a significant building. Therefore, the Inspector considered that the development would still preserve the character and appearance of the CA and would not harm the landscape setting of the village.

As such the Inspector felt the proposal would comply with the development plan and there were no other material considerations that indicate a decision should be taken other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore the Inspector concluded that the appeal should be allowed.

4. **RECOMMENDATION:**

To note the report.