

---

## MINUTES

Meeting: **Planning Committee**

Date: Friday 15 May 2026 at 10.00 am

Venue: Aldern House, Baslow Road, Bakewell

Chair: P Brady

Present: V Priestley, R Bennett, M Chaplin, B Hanley, L Hartshorne,  
I Huddleston, K Potter, K Smith and M Smith

Prof J Dugdale - attended to observe and speak but not vote.

Apologies for absence: M Beer, M Buckler and J Wharmby.

### **53/26 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 10 APRIL 2026**

It was noted that following the recent Local Council Elections, K Richardson was not re-elected and is therefore no longer able to continue as a Member of the Peak District National Park Authority. K Richardson was thanked for his contribution to the committee and his dedication as a Councillor.

The minutes of the last meeting of the Planning Committee held on 10 April 2026, were approved as a correct record.

### **54/26 URGENT BUSINESS**

There was no urgent business.

### **55/26 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

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

### **56/26 MEMBERS DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **57/26 NP/DDD/0126/0079: CONVERSION AND EXTENSION OF EXISTING BUILDING TO A TWO BEDROOM (INTERMEDIATE) DWELLING, INCLUDING REMODELLED ACCESS, HARD AND SOFT LANDSCAPING, AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE AT PADLEY MILL COTTAGE, GRINDLEFORD - (POLICY PAPER FOLLOWING DEFERRAL FROM APRIL MEETING)**

This application was originally considered at the meeting of the Authority's Planning Committee on 10 April 2026. At this meeting the application was recommended for refusal but Members were minded to approve. The Authority's Standing Orders (Section 1.48) state that where a

Committee is proposing to make a decision which would be a departure from policy and/or the Officer recommendation, final determination shall be referred until the next meeting. The Development and Enforcement Manager authorised such a referral in order that the Planning Committee can consider a further paper to explore the policy implications and risks.

The Senior Policy Planner presented the report which set out the implications and risks and gave a recap of the application and the reasons for the application.

The following spoke under the public participation at meetings scheme:

- Mr David Jenner – Applicant

*Janet Dugdale arrived at 10:12am*

Some Members had visited the site in April 2026.

Members discussed the following points:

The Authority Solicitor asked that all those Members absent from the previous Planning Committee meeting in April 2026 confirm that they had read all the documents associated with this application prior to taking part in the discussion. If Members had read all the documents, then they would be able to participate in the vote. The Head of Planning also re-presented the slides from the first meeting in order to familiarize all members with the nature of the site and the physical proposals.

- Clarification was provided regarding the definition of “affordable housing” and how it has been assessed. The main basis for the argument against approving the application is that the applicant does not have a local need for affordable housing.
- The medical need element to the policy was discussed.
- The size of the proposed development was discussed.
- Whether the benefits of providing an affordable house in perpetuity outweigh the breaches of policy.
- The provision of local housing stock and the suitability of the houses for down-sizing in the local area.
- It was noted that the planning policies are set out to enable fairness and equity across society.
- There was concern about the policy implications if this application was approved. The property is not a non-designated heritage asset but is a modern barn.
- It was clarified that the applicant is not in affordable housing need, every occupant afterwards would require a local connection in accordance with policy.
- There was concern that should this application be approved, that other applicants would use a similar method in the future. It was agreed that there is a need to think through longer term implications of any decisions made.

A motion to refuse the application was moved, seconded, put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED:**

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

- 1. The proposed dwelling would not address a proven need for affordable housing and is therefore contrary to Core Strategy Policy HC1.A and Development Management Policy DMH1.**

58/26

**FULL APPLICATION - HOLIDAY RETREAT WITH HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION INCLUDING 2 STATIC CARAVANS, 1 YURT, 9 TOURING CARAVAN PITCHES, 17 CAMPING PODS, 5 CAMPING PITCHES AND ANCILLARY FACILITIES INCLUDING TOILET BLOCK, CONVERSION OF POLE BARN TO FLEXIBLE SPACE FOR EVENTS, CONVERSION OF DUTCH BARN TO CATERING AREA, CONVERSION OF**

**OLD MILKING PARLOUR TO 4 HOLIDAY LETS, REPLACEMENT OF 2 STOREY STORAGE BARN WITH 2 UNDERGROUND SINGLE STOREY HOLIDAY LET STUDIOS, A POLYTUNNEL AND ASSOCIATED ACCESS AND ACCESS TRACKS, PARKING AND LANDSCAPE AT HOME FARM, MAIN STREET, SHELDON (NP/DDD/0326/0247) JS**

The Development and Enforcement Manager presented the report and outlined the reasons to decline to determine the application where under current standing orders the use of such a power is not delegated. Therefore, the report is seeking authority from the Planning Committee to formally decline to determine this application. The history of the application was outlined to members, there has been no change in circumstances to the policies or the application.

The following spoke under the public participation at meetings scheme.

- Ammir Kohanzad – Applicant

It was noted that some Members had visited the site within the last couple of years.

Members discussed the following points:

- The site visit revealed a substantial level of unauthorised development.
- It was noted that the Applicant has made no attempt to work with the local community.

A motion to decline to determine the application for the reason set out below was proposed and seconded, put the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED:**

**That authority to DECLINE TO DETERMINE the retrospective planning application under S70C of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) for the following reason is approved.**

- 1. The application relates to development of land to which an existing enforcement notice relates and seeks permission for the retention of the matters specified in the enforcement notice as constituting a breach of planning control and there has been no material change in circumstances to warrant consideration of the application.**

**59/26 REPORT ON OBJECTION TO TPO 107/2025 FLATS 1-11 LONDON HOUSE, MATLOCK STREET, BAKEWELL, DE45 1EE - AND PROPOSAL TO CONFIRM**

The Tree Officer presented the report and outlined the reasons to confirm the Tree Protection Order 107/2025 without modification as set out in the report.

No speakers that had registered to speak under the public participation at meeting scheme.

Some Members had visited the site in April 2026.

Members made the following point:

- Members commended the Tree Officer and Platform Housing for requesting the Tree Protection Order

A motion to confirm Tree Protection Order 107/2025 without modification was moved, seconded, put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED:**

**That the Tree Protection Order 107/2025 be CONFIRMED without modification.**

**60/26 PLANNING APPEALS MONTHLY REPORT (A.1536/BT)**

The Committee considered the monthly report on planning appeals lodged, withdrawn and decided. There have been three appeals lodged, no appeals have been withdrawn and one appeal decided within the last month.

The recommendation to note the report was moved, seconded, put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED:**

**To note the report.**

The meeting ended at 11.04am