

---

## MINUTES

Meeting: **Planning Committee**

Date: Friday 14 June 2024 at 10.00 am

Venue: Aldern House, Baslow Road, Bakewell

Chair: Cllr P Brady

Present: Cllr V Priestley, Ms R Bennett, Cllr M Beer, Cllr M Buckler,  
Cllr M Chaplin, Cllr B Hanley, Cllr A Hart, Cllr L Hartshorne,  
Cllr I Huddleston, Cllr D Murphy, Cllr Mrs K Potter and Mr K Smith

Apologies for absence: Cllr K Richardson and Cllr J Wharmby.

### **66/24 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 10 MAY 2024**

The minutes of the last meeting of the Planning Committee held on the 10<sup>th</sup> May 2024 were approved as a correct record.

### **67/24 URGENT BUSINESS**

There was no urgent business.

### **68/24 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

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

### **69/24 MEMBERS DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

There were no Declarations of Interests

### **70/24 FULL APPLICATION - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING HOUSE AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW, THREE-BEDROOM DWELLING, INCLUDING NEW RETAINING WALL STRUCTURE AT THE BUNGALOW, MACCLESFIELD ROAD, KETTLESHULME (NP/CEC/1023/1278, WE)**

The Planning Officer presented the report and outlined the reasons for refusal as set out in the report.

The proposal is for the demolition of the existing house and for the construction of a larger new three bedroom dwelling, including the repair of the retaining wall structure to the rear of the house. Previous planning approval had been granted in 2021 pertaining to alterations and extensions of the existing property.

The Planning Officer made an amendment to the wording of the Recommendation in the report in order for it to better reflect the wording of the policy.

The paragraph on page 18, Recommendation 1 was amended to the following wording:

1. The design of the proposed replacement dwelling does not enhance the valued character of the site itself and the surrounding built environment and landscape, reflecting guidance provided in adopted guidance and therefore does not meet the high design standards necessary to justify the demolition and replacement of the existing dwelling. It is therefore contrary to policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DMC3, DMH9 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The following spoke under the public participation at meetings scheme:

- Mr Matt Hurst – Agent

It was noted that the retaining wall at the rear of the house is failing and is why the building needed to be moved by 2metres. It was noted that it may be more cost effective and appropriate to demolish the existing building rather than undergo major engineering and structural works.

This is a completely different type of development as it is a replacement dwelling and therefore requires a different set of policies to be applied which require significant enhancement is achieved to the landscape and the built environment. It does comply to CC1 as did the original extension. This application was submitted prior to the new BNG regulations.

There was a question as to why the fenestration was not acceptable on this design however it had been acceptable on the previous application and this was clarified by the Planning Officer.

The Officer amended recommendation to refuse the application was moved, seconded, put to the vote and lost.

The Planning Officer outlined some suggested conditions which would be imposed on the application if Members were minded to approve it.

A motion for approval subject to conditions was moved, seconded, put to the vote and carried.

#### **RESOLVED:**

**That the application be APPROVED subject to the following planning conditions:**

1. **Standard time for commencement**
2. **Define approved plans**
3. **Prior to works taken place, submit for agreement a demolition and construction management plan**
4. **Prior to works taking place, submit for written agreement precise levels of the dwelling**
5. **Sample panel for external walling including retaining wall**
6. **Agree details of windows and doors**
7. **recess of windows and doors**
8. **Agree sample of blue-slate**
9. **Agree details of air source/ground source heat pump**

10. **Agree details of packaged sewage treatment plant**
11. **Written verification that the development has been carried out in strict compliance with the Sustainability Statement**
12. **Omission of glass balustrade and replacement with metal railings**
13. **No external lighting unless in agreement with approved scheme including design, location and candela**
14. **Prior to occupation, at least one single Mode 3 compliant electric vehicle charging point**
15. **Black rain water guts attached to stone work, no fascia/projecting or exposed rafters**
16. **Roof verge to be flush cement pointed**
17. **Remove PD rights**

Also see United Utilities informative note

**71/24 FULL APPLICATION - FOR THE REPLACEMENT OF AN EXISTING AGRICULTURAL BUILDING WITH A NEW DWELLING AT HOPE FARM, ALSTONEFIELD (NP/SM/1123/1405, GG)**

The Planning Officer presented the report and outlined the reasons for refusal.

Members were reminded that this application was deferred at the March 2024 meeting to allow for a discussion between the Applicant and Officers regarding design which could result in enhancement.

The Planning Officer made an amendment to the wording of the recommendation in the report in order for it to better reflect the wording of the policy.

Paragraph 11 on page 28, recommendation 2 was amended to the following wording:

2. In this instance, there are no exceptional circumstances as required by HC1 and would not provide significant enhancement as required by GSP2 nor any other material planning consideration that would justify a departure from the Authority's adopted housing policies.

It was noted that a late committee statement had been received from the Agent on behalf of the Applicant which is a re-statement of the case and this is available to view on-line.

The following spoke under the public participation at meetings scheme.

- Mr Hambling - Applicant

Members understand and have some sympathy with what the Applicant is trying to achieve but there was concern over the character of the development. Local housing policy covers very significant enhancement to the valued characteristics of the local area which does not appear to be happening here. What is needed is an innovative design of high architectural standing that reflects the local vernacular and it is felt that the design here does not meet the standards required to be treated as an outstanding design.

Members enquired as to what attempts have been made to work with the Applicant and Agent to submit an acceptable design. The Planning Officer confirmed that contact had been made with the Agent however the amended plans still do not meet the required

standard by a significant amount. Members requested that Officers further work with the Agent to find an acceptable design for this site.

The Officer recommendation to refuse the application was moved, seconded, put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED:**

**That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:**

- 1. The Applicant does not have an eligible local need for new housing within the National Park and the current application is therefore contrary to policy HC1(A) of the Core Strategy.**
- 2. In this instance, there are no exceptional circumstances as required by HC1 and would not provide significant enhancement as required by GSP2 nor any other material planning consideration that would justify a departure from the Authority's adopted housing policies.**

**72/24 ANNUAL REPORT ON PLANNING APPEALS 2023/2024 (A.1536/BT/KH)**

The Head of Planning introduced the report which summarised the work carried out on Planning Appeals over the period 2023/2024.

Members asked if it was possible to receive an annual report on the number of applications received in the year, the number of applications approved and the number of applications refused. The Head of Planning agreed that it would be possible to produce such a report.

**RESOLVED**

**To note the report.**

**73/24 AUTHORITY SOLICITOR REPORT - PLANNING APPEALS (A.1536/AE)**

The Committee considered the monthly report on planning appeals lodged, withdrawn and decided.

**RESOLVED:**

**To note the report.**

The meeting ended at 11.05 am