



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2025

by N Duff BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/W/25/3371429

Land off Old Coach Road, Low Bradfield, Sheffield S6 6HX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr G Rhodes against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref is NP/S/0325/0256.
 - The development proposed is replacement store building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. After final comments were received on the appeal, the Council commented regarding the history of the building on site. The appellant has had the opportunity to comment on these and I have taken both sets of comments into account in my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area with particular regard to the site's location within the Peak District National Park.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a large area of land located off Old Coach Road a narrow single-track lane. The lane is on a hillslope with the appeal site situated on the slope with the slope continuing across Old Coach Road and down the hill. The landscape is undulating and is fairly open with an agrarian character, with a group of trees near to the site further along Old Coach Road.
5. The proposal is for a replacement store building and a timber frame is in situ. The proposed building would be a steel container, clad in timber with sedum/grass roof for the secure storage of camping equipment. The proposed building would be of a similar size to that it replaces.
6. The appeal site is within the Peak District National Park, therefore, I have a duty¹ to seek to further the statutory purposes of a National Park which are: Conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of National Parks; and Promoting opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special

¹ The National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 s5(1)

qualities of National Parks by the public: section 5(1)(b). This means² that, amongst other factors, as far as is reasonably practical, relevant authorities should seek to avoid harm and contribute to, the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty, special qualities and key characteristics of Protected Landscapes.

7. The Framework says that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, which have the highest status of protection. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks.
8. The Peak National Park Building Design Guide (BDG) states that the Peak District has a strong tradition of consistently simple and robust buildings, using mostly local materials to suit conditions. The result is buildings which fit into their setting. Based on the photographs within the appellant's evidence, the building that was removed was a simple building, used for storage, with timber frame, and corrugated metal roof. The building was open fronted, weathered and appeared to be assimilated well into the landscape. Therefore, it was consistent with the description in the BDG.
9. The proposal for a metal storage container, would appear to be a stark contrast to the building it replaces. The industrial shape and precision of the storage container would appear incongruous within the agrarian landscape. Whilst timber and a grass/sedum roof would be appropriate materials in a location such as this, timber cladded onto a shipping container would appear unnaturally engineered and at odds with the character and scenic beauty of the landscape in which it would sit, and would not conserve or enhance it.
10. Whilst the building would be contained, to a degree, within the hillslope from views from the south, due to its position on the hillslope and the openness of the location, it would, be prominent from views further down the hill.
11. The building would have a side door, for safety reasons, due to the distance from the road, this element of the proposal would be acceptable.
12. Nevertheless, due to the design of the proposed building, the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the Peak District National Park. The proposal would therefore, fail to accord with Policies GSP1, GSP3, L1 of the Peak District National Park Local Development Framework Core Strategy (CS), which in combination seek to ensure that development is consistent with the National Park's legal purposes and duty, respects conserves and enhances the character of the area and valued landscape with particular attention paid to building materials and design. The proposal would also fail to accord with Policy DMC3 of the Development Management Policies Part 2 of the Local Plan for the Peak District National Park (DMP) which seeks to ensure that a development's detailed treatment including design, details, materials and finishes reflects or complements the style and traditions of the locality.
13. I have considered the proposal with regard to the Framework. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would not accord with the Framework, in particular Paragraph 189, as it would fail to conserve and enhance the landscape and scenic

² Guidance for relevant authorities on seeking to further the purposes of Protected Landscapes, December 2024

beauty of the Peak District National Park, which is given the highest status of protection, to which it indicates that great weight should be given. More significantly, it would conflict with the duty to seek to further the statutory purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of a National Park.

14. Reference has been made to Policy DME8 of the DMP in the Council's reason for refusal, this policy relates specifically to employment sites. Whilst the building would be used for storage and the site would include a campsite for a temporary period under permitted development, I have limited substantive evidence to suggest that this is an employment site. Therefore, I do not consider this policy to be directly relevant to the proposal before me.

Other Matters

15. The appellant has stated that there were no objections to the proposals from interested parties, however, the absence of objections is a neutral factor in the determination of the appeal.
16. Policy E2 of the CS relates to businesses in the countryside, whilst the proposal would be linked to a campsite use, the appeal does not seek to determine the acceptability of a business in this location. Furthermore, the appellant has expressed in the statement of case that the proposal is not business related. Therefore, this Policy is of limited relevance regarding this appeal.
17. The appellant has stated that since the dereliction of an outdoor pursuit centre there are fewer places accessible for use in the local area. Therefore, whilst the proposal would provide benefits with regard to outdoor recreation and support that function, due to the small scale of the development, these benefits carry modest weight and do not outweigh the harm identified in the main issue.
18. The appeal site is located some distance from Foxholes Farm a Grade II Listed Building, which is located near to the entrance of Old Coach Road. Given the distance between the appeal site and the Listed Building, together with intervening vegetation, drystone walls and undulating topography, I am satisfied that the development preserves its significance as a heritage asset, insofar as it relates to its setting.
19. The appellant has stated that some of the proposed building materials, such as timber could be sustainably sourced and that the sedum/grass roof would provide natural insulation. Whilst these would be benefits of the scheme and the proposal would accord with Policy CC1 of the CS in that specific regard, given the small scale of the proposed development it would only attract modest weight in the overall planning balance.
20. The proposal would provide a secure place to store camping equipment which is a material consideration in this case, however, given the limited substantial evidence before me that the appeal site would likely be a target of vandalism or theft, this benefit would attract modest weight and would not outweigh the harm identified in the main issue.
21. The appellant's appeal statement has highlighted the credentials of the appellant, which are commendable. The proposal would provide storage for camping equipment which would assist in the providing outdoor recreation in the National Park and health and wellbeing benefits, as supported in the Framework, to those

who use the site including children and young adults, and therefore could affect persons with a protected characteristic.

22. I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, which sets out the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it. Therefore, the negative effect of dismissing the appeal is that the recreational opportunity for those with a protected characteristic may not be provided.
23. Nevertheless, having regard to my duty, I have concluded that the decision to dismiss the appeal is proportionate in view of the reasons discussed in the main issue and having considered the benefits of the proposal above.

Conclusion

24. The proposal would provide benefits as set out above, however, due to the design of the proposed building there would be harm as set out in the main issue. This adverse element of the proposal would be such that the harm would not be outweighed by the benefits.
25. As a consequence, the proposal would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole and material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

N Duff

INSPECTOR