
MINUTES

Meeting:	Planning Committee
Date:	Friday 9 December 2022 at 10.00 am
Venue:	Aldern House
Chair:	Cllr P Brady
Present:	Mr K Smith, Cllr W Armitage, Cllr A McCloy, Cllr D Murphy and Cllr V Priestley
Apologies for absence:	Cllr M Chaplin, Cllr A Hart, Cllr I Huddleston, Cllr Mrs K Potter and Cllr K Richardson.

113/22 ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS PRESENT, APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND MEMBERS DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Items 7 & 8

The Chair advised that he had received an email from the Applicant around 4 weeks prior to the meeting but it had addressed the process of the application only. He had then received a further email on behalf of the Applicant 2 days prior, which he had forwarded to all Members on the Planning Committee which was subsequently referred to by Committee Members during the declaration of interests.

114/22 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS HELD ON 30 SEPTEMBER AND 7 OCTOBER 2022

The minutes of the previous meetings of the Planning Committee held on 30th September and 7th October were approved as correct records.

115/22 URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business.

116/22 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Two members of the public were present to make representations to the Committee.

117/22 FULL APPLICATION - APPLICATION FOR THE REMOVAL OR VARIATION OF CONDITION 5 OF NP/SM/0904/0974 - LONGNOR WOOD HOLIDAY PARK, LONGNOR (NP/SM/0922/1125) MN

The report was presented by the Area Team Manager who outlined the reasons for approval, as set out in the report. He also requested that condition 4 be amended as follows:

“Any touring or static caravans within the application site area shall be occupied only as short-term holiday accommodation, and shall not be occupied as permanent dwellings. The owner shall maintain a register of occupants noting their permanent residential address upon which Council Tax is paid for each calendar year, which shall be made available for inspection by the National Park Authority on request.”

He also confirmed that a further application had subsequently been submitted regarding the occupation of other sections of the site.

A motion to approve the application in accordance with the Officer recommendation and subject to amending condition 4 as set out above, was moved, seconded, put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED

That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the submitted plan numbered 14.503/HLDL2B and dated June 2005, subject to the following conditions or modifications.**
- 2. This consent relates to the layout of the caravans under Phase 1 (as amended by the annotation on the plan) as shown on the approved drawing numbered 14.503/HLDL2B and dated June 2005.**
- 3. The number of touring caravans on site as part of ‘Phase 1’ shown on the approved plan shall not exceed 33 touring caravans, 14 static caravans and 1 warden’s caravan at any one time.**
- 4. Any touring or static caravans within the application site area shall be occupied only as short-term holiday accommodation, and shall not be occupied as permanent dwellings. The owner shall maintain a register of occupants noting their permanent residential address upon which Council Tax is paid for each calendar year, which shall be made available for inspection by the National Park Authority on request**
- 5. Details of the type and colour of all new caravans and their subsequent replacements shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the National Park Authority before siting.**
- 6. The site warden’s caravan shall not be occupied other than by a site warden working at Longnor Wood Holiday Park and their dependents, and shall be maintained as a single planning unit with the holiday park.**

118/22 FULL APPLICATION - CHANGE OF USE FROM EXISTING STONE BARN TO A LOCAL NEEDS DWELLING, HOLLY BANK BARN, BUTTERTON (NP/SM/0922/1144) MN

The report was introduced by the Planning Area Manager who outlined the reasons for approval as set out in the report. He advised that in paragraph 5, the sentence stating that “no garden space is proposed” should be deleted.

The following spoke under the public participation at meetings scheme:

- Mr Tom Meakin, Applicant

Members requested clarification as to whether a more favourable recommendation might be reached if an application were made for an agricultural workers dwelling, and were advised that no conclusive comment could be provided on that without the further information on agricultural need which would form part of such an application. However based on the information already provided about the farming operation, it was unlikely that an agricultural workers dwelling would be justified.

Members stated the following concerns:

- The lack information regarding any Climate Change provision
- The lack of an up to date protected species report
- Insufficient information to demonstrate that the Applicant was in housing need
- The impact of inappropriate development in open countryside
- The likelihood of the proposed one bedroom conversion requiring extension in the future.

Members expressed sympathy with the situation of the Applicant and his desire to live in the local area and noted that the barn was considered to be an important heritage asset. They stated that they felt that there was potential for many of the above issues to be addressed by the Applicant. After these matters had been resolved, the effect of the conversion and domestication on the landscape could then be assessed at a future meeting. In the meantime it could also be considered if there was a more appropriate solution or site to address the Applicant’s housing need.

Officers advised that if the application was deferred, any further bat survey work would have to be carried out in the Spring, due to the hibernation period.

A motion to defer the application was proposed, seconded, voted on and carried

RESOLVED

That the application be DEFERRED for further information to be provided by the Applicant and for further discussions to take place.

119/22 FULL APPLICATION - CHANGE OF USE OF OUTBUILDINGS TO DWELLING AND FORMATION OF RESIDENTIAL CURTILAGE AND USE OF EXISTING FARMHOUSE. REPLACEMENT OF PORCH WITH GLAZED LINK FROM THE FARMHOUSE TO THE OUTBUILDINGS, EXTENSION AND ALTERATION OF THE OUTBUILDINGS INCLUDING REPLACEMENT OF THE NISSEN HUT TO FORM A FAMILY HOME. REPLACEMENT OF THE STABLES AT WRIGHTS FARM, CLAYHOLES ROAD, KETTLESHULME (NP/CEC/0522/0645 SPW)

Some Members of the Committee had visited the site the previous day.

The report was introduced by the Area Team Manager who advised that there were some amendments to the reasons for refusal as follows:

- After the first sentence of reason 1, add “it would also lose the rank, role and historic significance of the farmhouse as the principal listed building on the site”
- In the final sentence of reason, 1 add policy GSP1
- Reason 2 could then be deleted and 3 and 4 renumbered accordingly.

The Area Tea Manger also confirmed that extra information which had been submitted on behalf of the Applicant had been shared with Members. This largely consisted of clarification on submissions already made and did not necessitate any changes to the report.

The following spoke under the public participation at meetings scheme:

- Mr Mark Heyes, Applicant

The Head of Planning advised that pre-application advice had been provided by both Planning and Heritage Officers. Various concerns had been raised about the scheme at an early stage and advice had been offered accordingly. Officers continued to engage with the Applicant after the listed building application was submitted but the issues of scale which had been raised by Officers, had not been addressed by the Applicant. The Area Team Manager confirmed that there would be various alternative ways to extend the property which would be more acceptable.

In response to the points raised by the Head of Planning the Applicant stated that the size of the scheme was in accordance with guidance from Historic England, and the view of his agent was that after conversion, the outbuildings section would remain subservient to the existing farm house. He also stated that there had been significant delays in obtaining advice from the Authority.

Members discussed the following:

- The viability of the existing house had not been assessed to the extent that they would expect in a listed building application, so there was insufficient evidence to show that the property was not viable as dwelling or that a large extension was necessary.
- A difference of opinion had arisen between the Authority and the Applicant as to whether the proposal constituted one dwelling or two due to the extension having all the characteristics of a separate dwelling- i.e. its own kitchen, bathroom, 3 bedrooms and living room.

- There were concerns over the detrimental impact of the conversion on the character of the outbuildings and on the farm house. The farm house would become subservient to the extended outbuildings
- A new driveway had been created which was unacceptable due to its impact on the setting of the listed building
- The extension was too large and too long, and constituted a replacement building rather than an extension and would be uncharacteristic of buildings in the open countryside.
- The proposed glazing was too extensive and would cause visible domestication which would impact views from the wider landscape
- The impact on the landscape had not been analysed in the heritage statement.
- The impact on the listed barn, which was on adjacent property and not in the ownership of the Applicant, had not been considered
- Undue weight had been given to Historic England guidance and insufficient consideration had been given to the policies of the Authority

However, Members welcomed the principle of conversion, and were impressed by the proposals for the main farm house. They stated that they would like to see the Applicant being helped to arrive at an acceptable solution, but for this to be achieved, advice from Officers would have to be acted upon.

A motion to refuse the application in accordance with the Officer recommendation as amended was moved, seconded, put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED

To REFUSE the application for the following reasons:

- 1. The scale, massing and detailed design of the proposal is unacceptable and does not follow the advice of the SPD Design Guide or Conversion of Historic Buildings SPD. It significantly extends and alters the outbuildings, harming their form and character and would lose the positive contribution these buildings have as part of the group of listed buildings. It would also lose the rank, role and historic significance of the farmhouse as the principle listed building on the site. The proposal is therefore not achieving the conservation or enhancement requirements of GSP1, GSP2, HC1 or DMC10 to allow for market housing. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of these buildings and their immediate setting and therefore harm the significance of these heritage assets and the valued characteristics of the local landscape. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Strategy Policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, HC1, L1, L3 and Development Management Policies DMC3, DMC5, DMC7 and DMC10 and the NPPF.**
- 2. Given the scale and nature of the proposed residential annexe (the existing farmhouse) and its relationship and arrangements with/ to the proposed new dwelling it would actually form a separate planning unit with a lawful use as an independent dwelling house. The proposal is therefore contrary to Development Management Policy DMH5 and the Authority's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Annexes'.**

- 3. Inadequate and inaccurate plans have been submitted to be certain of the extent of the proposal or be able to fully ascertain the impact on the listed buildings. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Strategy Policy L3, and Development Management Policies DMC5, DMC7 and the NPPF.**

120/22 LISTED BUILDING CONSENT APPLICATION - RENOVATION OF THE FARMHOUSE LINKING TO CHANGE OF USE OF THE OUTBUILDINGS AND REPLACEMENT OF THE NISSEN HUT TO ENSURE PROTECTION OF THE HERITAGE AND THE FARM'S LONG TERM VIABILITY. REBUILDING OF THE STABLES IN KEEPING MATERIALS AT A STANDARD SIZE TO BETTER SUPPORT THE VIABILITY OF THE LAND AT WRIGHTS FARM, CLAYHOLES LANE, KETTLESHULME (NP/CEC/1221/1304 SPW)

This item was debated at the same time as Item 7.

The Area Team Manager advised that an amendment was necessary to the reasons for refusal.

- From reason 1 delete “and the proposed alterations at the top of the track and widening of the access”

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

RESOLVED

To REFUSE the application for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposal by virtue of its design would harm the character, appearance and significance of the heritage assets and their setting, this is because the works required to create the new residential accommodation significantly extend and alter the outbuildings, harming their form and character and would lose the positive contribution these buildings have as part of the group of listed buildings, and would represent an unfortunate domestic intrusion into the landscape as would the new domestic curtilage to the west of the outbuildings. It would also reduce the rank, role and historic function of the existing dwelling to a residential annexe ancillary to the proposed new dwelling. The glazed link would also fail to enhance the significance of the site and would have a negative impact on the character and appearance and significance of the dwelling and outbuildings. The proposed stables will also detract from the setting of the listed buildings, and would represent an unfortunate and unnecessary domestic intrusion into the landscape as would the new domestic curtilage to the west of the outbuildings. The proposal would also potentially harm the butter churning wheel by obscuring it from view due to the position of the relocated cupboards and the proposal would also cut through a historic stone flag, part of a fireplace, unnecessarily harming this historic feature. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Strategy Policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3,**

L1, L3 and Development Management Policies DMC3, DMC5, DMC7, DMC10 and the NPPF.

- 2. Inadequate and inaccurate plans and justifications have been submitted to be able to fully ascertain the impact on the listed buildings and to be able to be certain of the extent and details of the proposal. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Strategy Policy L3, and Development Management Policies DMC5, DMC7 and the NPPF.**

121/22 HEAD OF LAW REPORT - PLANNING APPEALS (A.1536/AMC)

The Head of Law presented the report which set out the planning appeals lodged and decided in the last month.

RESOVED

The report was noted.

The meeting ended at 11.42 am