
MINUTES

Meeting: **Planning Committee**

Date: Friday 12 June 2026 at 10.00 am

Venue: Aldern House, Baslow Road, Bakewell

Chair: P Brady

Present: V Priestley, M Beer, M Buckler, M Chaplin, B Hanley, L Hartshorne,
I Huddleston, K Potter, K Smith, M Smith and J Wharmby

Apologies for absence: R Bennett.

61/26 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 15 MAY 2026

The minutes of the last meeting of the Planning Committee held on 15 May 2026 were approved as a correct record.

62/26 URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business.

63/26 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

One member of the public was present to make representations to the Committee.

64/26 MEMBERS DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Items 6 and 7 – Hope Works, Pindale Road, Hope
M Smith declared a personal interest in these items and therefore would be absent for the discussion and vote.

65/26 HOPE LIMESTONE REVIEW OF MINERALS PERMISSIONS - FIRST PERIODIC REVIEW AT BREEDON CEMENT, HOPE WORKS, PINDALE ROAD, HOPE, HOPE VALLEY (NP/DDD/1223/1527) TE

10:04 M Smith left the meeting

The Senior Minerals Planner presented the report of the Review of Minerals Permission (ROMP) for Hope Limestone works for Members to authorise the delegation to officers to agree a final Schedule of Conditions. An enhanced restoration scheme had been submitted with the application for the first periodic review of the scheme of conditions.

The scheme was subject to 51 conditions which allowed mineral extraction to take place until 21 February 2042, with restoration to be completed no later than 21 February 2047, or from five years following the completion of the extraction.

Some Members had visited the site the previous day.

Members discussed the following points:

- There was a statutory aftercare period that applied to mineral extraction sites. Once the Authority agreed that restoration was completed, a 5-year aftercare period would commence, after which the site could be subject to development proposals in accordance with the Development Plan.
- Clarification was sought on ownership of the land once the aftercare period ended.
- The operator had a positive attitude to nature recovery.
- The schedule of conditions was comprehensive, with cooperative work having been done between the PDNPA and the operators at Hope.
- The surrounding area had natural features which echoed areas of the Minerals site that were no longer being worked. Quarries were important for nature recovery in the Peak District.
- Conditions set down in the extant 2006 planning permission had stood the test of time and enabled the business to continue requiring only minor changes to the schedule of conditions in the first ROMP due to the positive work between the Authority and the site operators.

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

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the Scheme of Conditions set out in Appendix A are agreed in principle, and that delegated authority is granted to the Head of Planning and Conservation to determine the final wording of the Scheme of Conditions following discussions with the Applicant**

66/26 HOPE SHALE REVIEW OF MINERALS PERMISSIONS - FIRST PERIODIC REVIEW AT BREEDON CEMENT, HOPE WORKS, PINDALE ROAD, HOPE, HOPE VALLEY (NP/HPK/1223/1521) TE

The Principal Minerals Planner presented the report of the Review of Minerals Permission (ROMP) for Hope Shale works for Members to authorise the delegation to officers to agree a final Schedule of Conditions. The scheme was subject to 36 conditions which allowed mineral extraction to take place until 21 February 2042, with restoration to be completed five years later. A final restoration plan would be submitted in ten years' time when it would be clearer how much shale was left on site.

Some Members had visited the site the previous day.

Members discussed the following points:

- Being overly prescriptive on the Restoration Plan could impact on operator costs and reduce outcomes.
- Parts of the site no longer being worked had shown signs of recovery without restoration measures.
- If solar panels were a consideration at the aftercare stage, a planning application would be required.

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

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the Scheme of Conditions set out in Appendix A are agreed in principle, and that delegated authority is granted to the Head of Planning and Conservation to determine the final wording of the Scheme of Conditions following discussions with the Applicant.**

10:30 M Smith returned to the meeting

67/26 MAJOR APPLICATION - PROPOSED 2010SQM INDUSTRIAL UNIT EXTENSION TO EXISTING INDUSTRIAL BUILDING FOR STORAGE OF PRODUCTS PRIOR TO DISTRIBUTION AT BELLE ENGINEERING, THE BRUND, SHEEN (NP/SM/0325/0240) ALN

The South Area Senior Planner presented the report which represented major development and outlined the reasons for approval of the proposal. The main industrial buildings were split into two areas, the main yard to the south of the site and another yard at a slightly lower elevation to the north. This application related to the buildings in the main yard to the south.

The proposal paragraph was missing from the officer report. The officer detailed the proposals in their presentation to committee, which was for the erection of a 2010m² new building as an extension over an existing yard to be used for the storage of products and components to the south west of the main building group. It would be subservient to the existing large group of buildings and wouldn't be prominent in the landscape. The portacabin offices would be removed and there would be no adverse impact on trees. Items currently stored offsite could be brought back on site and remove approximately 125 HGV journeys.

The applicant had requested for one of the portacabins to be retained as a construction site office during the works, to be removed prior to first occupation, which officers accepted as reasonable. The final conditions would be precise and include the triggers to ensure condition requirements were met in a timely way.

Members discussed the following points:

- During the day when the site is operational it had little noise and visual impact on the landscape.

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

RESOLVED:

That the application be APPROVED in accordance with officer recommendation with amended conditions subject to a S106 agreement to rescind planning permission ref NP/SM/0593/057 and subject to the to the following conditions:

- 1. 3-year implementation period**
- 2. Adopt amended plans**

3. Before work commences, one of the existing redundant portable cabins to be completely removed from the site. The second to be removed prior to the building being first brought into use.
4. Before the building is first brought into use, the four existing blue van/HGV bodies on the south western boundary of the site to be completely removed from the site.
5. The development shall be implemented in full accordance with the stated requirements of the Arboricultural Report THL-R25-42 prepared by Tree Heritage Ltd and dated 11th April 2025.
6. Unless prior permission has been obtained in writing from the National Park Authority, all noisy construction activities shall be restricted to the following times of operations.

08:00 - 18:00 hours (Monday to Friday);

08:00 - 13:00 hours (Saturday)

No working is permitted on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

In this instance a noisy construction activity is defined as any activity (for instance, but not restricted to, building construction/demolition operations, refurbishing and landscaping) which generates noise that is audible at the site boundary.

7. Construction Impacts

- During construction/demolition phases amplified music and/or radios shall not be audible beyond the site boundary;
 - Any waste material associated with the demolition or construction shall not be burnt on site but shall be kept securely for removal to prevent escape into the environment. All waste transfer records should be retained for inspection by officers of the National Park Authority;
 - No activity hereby permitted shall cause dust to be emitted beyond the site boundary so as to adversely affect adjacent residential properties and/or other sensitive uses and/or the local environment. In the event dust is caused to escape the site boundary the activity shall be stopped until sufficient dust suppression has been undertaken to prevent further escape. There shall always be the appropriate means and sufficient water resources on site for dust suppression. These should be made available for inspection when required by officers of the National Park Authority.
8. Any artificial lighting incorporated into the site in connection with the approved development shall not increase the pre-existing illuminance or glare at the adjoining light sensitive locations when the light (s) is (are) in operation. Details of all artificial lighting to be installed under this permission shall be submitted to and approved by the National Park Authority prior to the installation of any lighting.
 9. The building shall be constructed so as to provide sound insulation against internally generated noise of not less than 35dB(A), with windows shut and other means of ventilation provided. The building shall not be brought into use or occupied until the required sound attenuation works have been permanently carried out. Such works shall be maintained thereafter for the life of the approved development.

- 10. No phase of the development hereby permitted shall take place, except for works of site clearance and demolition until a risk assessment has been undertaken to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, in accordance with a scheme to be agreed with the National Park Authority. Once completed, a written report of the findings and recommendations shall be submitted and approved in writing by the National Park Authority.**
 - a. If the site risk assessment (a) indicates that potential risks exist, development shall not commence, until a detailed remediation strategy to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use has been prepared, and is subject to the approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**
 - b. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme (b) and prior to bringing the development into first use, a verification report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be produced, and is subject to the approval in writing of the National Park Authority.**
 - c. If, during the course of development, any contamination is found which has not been identified in the site investigation, additional measures for the remediation of this source of contamination shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The remediation of the site shall incorporate the approved additional measures.**
- 11. Before the building is first brought into use, the surface water drainage system shall be installed in accordance with the design detailed contained within the following document: Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy (Doc Ref: 17379 Drainage Strategy MD-01, P02, 15th April 2026).**
- 12. The sheeting for the sides and the roof shall be pre-coated in dark green to match the colour of the adjacent building.**
- 13. The solar pv panels shall be matt black and non-reflective. The approved solar panels shall be installed and operational before the building is first brought into use.**
- 14. Approved car parking layout and manoeuvring space to be provided and retained in its approved use for the life of the development.**

68/26 FULL APPLICATION - CHANGE OF USE AND ALTERATIONS AND EXTENSION OF EXISTING BARN TO FORM DWELLING AT BARN, CHURCH LANE, TIDESWELL, BUXTON (NP/DDD/0326/0281) HF

The North Area Senior Planner presented the report and outlined the reasons for the refusal of the application. Planning permission had been granted in 2015 for the conversion. Works had started which did not comply with that planning permission and were unauthorised in the officer's view. The current application was part retrospective to cover some works already carried out, and to seek further extension and alterations. Some of the proposed works had already been carried out, but have now been stopped. The roof was higher and steeper than the original structure.

The officer report concluded the proposal to be acceptable subject to conditions in respect of residential amenity, ecology, nutrient neutrality and highways. The officer report however went on to recommend refusal as the conversion works to achieve a residential use resulted in harm to heritage and landscape. The original building was reflective of a typical field barn, in a Conservation Area and a non-designated heritage asset. The scheme did not achieve conservation or enhancement of the site. The

Parish Council had supported the proposal as providing a dwelling for a local family however the proposal wasn't for a local needs affordable dwelling and limited weight afforded to provision of new market dwelling due to conflict identified with Authority's policies for new housing provision.

The following spoke under the public participation at meetings scheme:

- Mr Danny Hopkins – Applicant

John Scott, a former employee of the Authority, had acted as the agent for this application.

Members discussed the following points:

- Clarity sought on highways position given previous recommendation for refusal. Officers clarified that although Highways continued to require additional information to conclude on highway safety, previous planning decisions had accepted the scheme on highway grounds therefore based on material considerations, highways was not a recommended reason for refusal.
- Was the Authority trying to impose affordability and were the applied policies fit for purpose. An inflexible approach may result in the loss of field barns by not allowing practical conversions.
- The increase in floorspace was much larger than the criteria set out for affordable housing, and was larger than for the permission granted in 2015.
- The 2015 application was in line with the National Park's policies to retain the character of the building as a field barn, and allowed for sympathetic conversion of the building. The current proposal resulted in loss of character.
- The barn was worth conserving within development and conservation limits set out in the Authority's policies and guidelines.

RESOLVED:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed dwelling does not achieve the conservation and / or enhancement of a non-designated heritage asset, and it does not meet any other exception for new housing in the National Park, contrary to Core Strategy Policy HC1 and Development Management Policy DMC10.**
- 2. The proposed development would have an unacceptable design and would result in harm to the character and appearance of the non-designated barn and Tideswell Conservation Area. The harm to the Conservation Area would be less than substantial but would not be outweighed by any public benefits, and harm to the non-designated barn is not outweighed as part of the planning balance. The development is therefore contrary to Core Strategy Policies GSP1, GSP3, L1 and L3, Development Management Policies DMC3, DMC5 and DMC8 and the NPPF.**

69/26 PLANNING APPEALS MONTHLY REPORT (A.1536/BT)

The Committee considered the monthly report on planning appeals lodged, withdrawn and decided. One appeal had been lodged, one appeals had been withdrawn and six appeals had been decided, and dismissed, within the last month.

Officers were thanked for the work they had put in to get the Authority's position across and the appeals dismissed.

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

RESOLVED:

To note the report.

Time meeting ended: 11:31am