
MINUTES

Meeting: **Planning Committee**

Date: Friday 12 March 2021 at 10.00 am

Venue: Webex - Virtual Meeting

Chair: Mr R Helliwell

Present: Mr K Smith, Cllr W Armitage, Cllr P Brady, Cllr M Chaplin, Cllr D Chapman, Cllr A Gregory, Ms A Harling, Cllr I Huddleston, Cllr A McCloy, Cllr Mrs K Potter, Cllr K Richardson, Miss L Slack and Cllr G D Wharmby

17/21 ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS PRESENT, APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND MEMBERS DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

It was noted that all Members had received two emails. One on Item 5 from Caroline McIntyre and one on Item 8 from Caroline Payne

Mr Helliwell declared a prejudicial interest in Item 5 and confirmed that he would leave the meeting and handover to the Vice Chair for that item.

Cllr Armitage declared an interest in Item 8 as he had received a letter.

Cllr Brady declared that he was slightly acquainted with the applicant in Item 8

Cllr Chaplin stated that Item 6 was within in the boundary of Sheffield City Council, however he had not been consulted and would approach the matter with an open mind.

Cllr McCloy declared a personal interest for Item 8, he had met the applicant with Officers previously and had subsequent email correspondence but he would approach the matter with an open mind.

Ms Slack declared a prejudicial interest in Item 5 as she knows the applicant well and would leave the meeting when this item was discussed.

Ms Slack declared regarding Item 8 that she knew the Agent well and so leave the meeting when this item was discussed.

18/21 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING OF 12 FEBRUARY 2021

The minutes of the last meeting of Planning Committee held on 12 February 2021 were approved as a correct record.

19/21 URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business.

20/21 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Six members of the public had given notice to make representations to the Committee.

21/21 FULL APPLICATION - ERECTION OF AN AFFORDABLE LOCAL NEEDS DWELLING, WORKS OF HARD AND SOFT LANDSCAPING AND OTHER WORKS INCIDENTAL TO THE PROPOSALS AT LITTON DALE, LITTON (NP/DDD/1220/1217, AM)

Mr Helliwell and Ms Slack left the meeting while this item was discussed and Mr Smith took the Chair.

The Vice Chair of the Committee had visited the site the previous day.

The Planning Officer introduced the report outlining the reasons for refusal as set out in the report.

The following addressed the Committee under the Public Participation at meetings scheme:

Mr Richard Baker, Applicant – via video presentation.

Members discussed the potential impact to the landscape of the proposed development being on the very edge of the village boundary, and the issues around local need housing, and noted that approval of the application would be contrary to policy.

A motion to refuse the item in accordance with Officer recommendation was moved and seconded and a vote was taken and carried.

RESOLVED

To REFUSE the application for the following reasons

- 1. The application does not demonstrate that the development would meet eligible local needs for affordable housing. The application therefore fails to demonstrate exceptional circumstances to allow new build housing within the National Park contrary to Core Strategy policy HC1, Development Management policies DMH1 and DMH2 and the National Planning Policy Framework.**
- 2. The proposed site is not well related to the built form of Litton and would introduce development into Litton Dale in a manner that would harm the character of the area and valued landscape character contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP3 and L1 Development Management policies DMC3 and DMC4 and the National Planning Policy Framework.**

Mr Helliwell and Ms Slack re-joined the meeting.

22/21 FULL APPLICATION - SITING OF A MOBILE COFFEE UNIT TO BE SITUATED AT THE TOP OF THE CAR PARK AT LADY CANNINGS PLANTATION, SHEEPHILL ROAD, SHEFFIELD (NP/S/1220/1197, AM)

The Planning Officer introduced the report setting out the reasons for refusal as set out in the report.

The Officer was asked to advise whether a temporary permission would be appropriate and confirmed that it would not be, as the reasons for refusal would still be applicable.

Issues around litter and visitor behaviour were discussed by Members.

Sheffield City Council had proposed an alternative site for the unit, beyond the carpark. The Planning Officer advised that this would not be an acceptable alternative as it would be located in the Natural Zone where there is a strong presumption against any development. In any event the alternative site was not part of the application and could not therefore be voted on.

A motion to refuse the application in accordance with Officer recommendation was proposed and seconded and a vote was taken and carried.

RESOLVED:

To REFUSE the application for the following reasons

- 1. The development would not be directly related to or ancillary to a recreation or tourist facility and therefore in principle is contrary to policies DS1 and HC5 that seek to direct development to named settlements and other appropriate locations detailed within the Development Plan.**
- 2. The development would harm the landscape character and biodiversity of the National Park contrary to policies GSP1, GSP3, L1, L2, DMC3, DMC11 and litter from the development could not be satisfactorily controlled contrary to policy DMC14.**
- 3. The development would reduce available off-street parking spaces in the car park and exacerbate existing on-street parking issues in the local area, particularly at weekends and harm highway safety and the amenity of the local area contrary to policies GSP3 and DMC3.**

The meeting adjourned for a short break at 10.58am and reconvened at 11.10am.

23/21 FULL APPLICATION - RENOVATION OF HOUSE AND CONVERSION OF AGRICULTURAL DWELLINGS FOR RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL USE (CAFE) AT TOWN END COTTAGE, GRINDON (NP/SM/1020/0979 MN)

The Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee had visited the site the previous day.

The Planning Officer introduced the report setting out the reasons for approval as set out in the report.

The following addressed the Committee under the Public Participation at meetings scheme:

Mr Rob Webb, Objector – statement read out by Democratic & Legal Support Team (DLST)

Mr Andrew Gagie, Objector – statement read out by Democratic & Legal Support Team (DLST)

Dr Alex Forrester, Applicant – video presentation

The Planning Officer was asked to clarify the advice which had been given by the Highways Authority and confirmed that the original application proposed a larger café space and it had been considered by the Highways Authority that there was not adequate parking provision for a café of the proposed size. Following discussion with the Applicant the proposed size of the café was reduced and the parking provision was subsequently considered to be adequate in accordance with the relevant standards.

Additionally queries had been raised by Natural England in relation to the Package Treatment Plant regarding potential phosphorus output, but the Applicant had been able to answer these queries to Natural England's satisfaction. The proposed location of the package Treatment Plant had been confirmed as acceptable to building control officers of the relevant council.

Members noted that the café and house renovation were part of the same application and queried whether it was possible to consider the two matters separately. The Planning Officer confirmed that it was not possible to issue a split decision on the application.

Members discussed the potential number of customers that would be attracted by the proposed café and the likelihood of them dispersing to other parts of the village.

A motion to approve the item in accordance with Officer recommendation was proposed and seconded

The Chair asked if a condition could be added to regulate any external lighting and the Officer confirmed that it could.

A vote was taken on approving the application in accordance with Officer recommendation with an additional condition regarding external lighting, and was carried.

RESOLVED

To approve the application subject to the following conditions, and an extra condition relating to regulation of external lighting to be delegated to the Planning Officer

- 1. 3 year time limit**
- 2. In accordance with the amended plans**

3. **Hard and soft landscaping of the site, including parking spaces and surfacing to be reserved and subsequently approved parking to be set out prior to the use of the café commencing**
4. **Dwelling and café to be maintained as a single planning unit**
5. **Cafe opening hours limited to 9am to 6pm daily**
6. **Extent of café use limited to that identified on the approved floor plans**
7. **No external extraction, refrigeration, ventilation or other plant or machinery associated with the café use to be installed without the Authority's prior written approval**
8. **No business use other than the café use to be granted by the permission**
9. **Scheme of archaeological monitoring and recording to be approved prior to commencement**
10. **Recommendations of the protected species report to be complied with**
11. **Proposed climate change mitigation measures to be incorporated**
12. **Effluent purification measures for package treatment plant to be implemented at time of installation and maintained thereafter**
13. **Conditions to secure detailed design matters**
14. **External lighting to be agreed**

24/21 FULL APPLICATION - CONVERSION AND REINSTATEMENT OF BUILDING TO FORM ONE DWELLING AT BIRCH CROFT, BARROWSTONES LANE, THE RAKE, MONYASH (NP/DDD/1120/1063 TS)

Ms Slack left the meeting.

The Planning Officer introduced the report outlining the reasons for refusal as set out in the report.

The following addressed the meeting under the Public Participation at meetings scheme:

- Mrs R Tarr, Monyash Parish Council – Supporter – statement read out by Democratic and Legal Support Team (DSLTT)
- Jordan Hotchin, Applicant – audio recording

Members discussed the importance of the retention of traditional field barns in the National Park due to their historic importance in the landscape, but noted that this had to be considered alongside the recommended reasons for refusal in this instance which were similar to those in the two previous applications for the conversion of the site which had been refused by the Committee. These included the distance of the proposed site

from the village of Monyash, the advanced deterioration of the original building, the access to the site via a Green "Drovers" Lane and the impact on the landscape.

The Parish Council's support for the application was noted.

A motion to refuse the application in accordance with Officer recommendation was moved and seconded.

Officers were asked to clarify what the policy roadmap is for the preservation of historic field barns and confirmed that conversion for residential use is not the only option and that some have been restored for agricultural use. All applications are assessed on their own merits and there will be a variety of relevant factors.

A vote to refuse the application in accordance with Officer recommendation was taken and carried.

RESOLVED

To REFUSE the application for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed development would create an isolated new build dwelling in the open countryside that would not deliver conservation or enhancement of a valued vernacular building. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy HC1 of the Core Strategy and paragraph 79 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to avoid isolated homes in the countryside.**
- 2. The proposed development would not conserve or enhance the existing field barn which is a non-designated heritage asset, and would harm the character of the agricultural strip field system in which the barn is set and which is also a non-designated heritage asset. There are no public benefits that outweigh the harm to the non-designated heritage assets. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L1, L3, DMC3, DMC5, DMC10 and the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.**
- 3. The creation of a new dwelling in this isolated location within the open countryside and the domestication of the site would result in significant harm to the landscape character and scenic beauty of the National Park. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L1, L3 and DMC3 and paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework.**

25/21 HEAD OF LAW REPORT - PLANNING APPEALS (A.1536/AMC)

The Head of Planning explained that summaries of the cases decided had been forwarded to all Members.

Members noted concerns over the appeal allowed at The Lodge, Hollow Meadows. The Head of Planning indicated that he was inclined to write to the Planning Inspectorate to stress the need to apply greater weight in cases involving new development in the open countryside in order to uphold National Park purposes and protect the character of wilder landscapes.

Members endorsed the suggestion.

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

The meeting ended at 12.52 pm