
MINUTES

Meeting: **Planning Committee**

Date: Friday 13 September 2024 at 10.00 am

Venue: Aldern House, Baslow Road, Bakewell

Chair: Cllr P Brady

Present: Cllr V Priestley, Cllr M Beer, Ms R Bennett, Cllr M Chaplin, Cllr B Hanley, Cllr A Hart, Cllr I Huddleston, Cllr Mrs K Potter, Cllr K Richardson, Mr K Smith and Cllr J Wharmby

Apologies for absence: Cllr M Buckler, Cllr L Hartshorne and Cllr D Murphy.

100/24 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 9TH AUGUST 2024

The minutes of the last meeting of the Planning Committee held on 9 August 2024 were approved as a correct record.

101/24 URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business.

102/24 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

103/24 MEMBERS DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Item 6

The speaker was a former employee of the Peak District National Park Authority and known to some of the Members.

Ms Bennett declared a personal interest as she knew the applicant professionally, but had not discussed the application and was not conflicted.

Item 7

Cllr Beer declared a prejudicial interest as he had been involved in discussions with the applicant and with the Parish Council in his role of Parish Councillor, so would leave the room when this item was discussed.

Item 8

Both speakers were known to the Members as employees of the Peak District National Park Authority.

All Members declared an interest as the application related to a property owned by the Peak District National Park Authority.

Item 9

All Members declared an interest as the application related to a property owned by the Peak District National Park Authority.

104/24 FULL APPLICATION - PROPOSED RE-USE OF GARAGE / STORE AS A MIXED USE BUILDING WITH FLEXIBLE SPACE THAT CAN BE PURPOSED FOR RESIDENTIAL AND BUSINESS USE AT LAND TO THE REAR OF THE FORMER RBS, MAIN ROAD, HATHERSAGE (NP/DDD/0724/0684, HF)

Some Members had visited the site the previous day.

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

The following spoke under the public participation at meetings scheme:

- Jane Newman, Agent

Although some Members were supportive of the application, there was some concern over the loss of car parking that was currently available to local residents. Members also considered that this was a missed opportunity for the site to be used for affordable housing in the centre of the village.

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

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed development would have an unacceptable design and would result in harm to the character and appearance of the site and the Hathersage Conservation Area. The harm identified would be less than substantial but would not be outweighed by any public benefits. The development is therefore contrary to Core Strategy Policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3 and L3, Development Management Policies DMC3, DMC5, DMC8 and DME8 and the National Planning Policy Framework.**
- 2. The proposed development would not be required to achieve the conservation or enhancement of the settlement and therefore the proposed development is not acceptable in principle and contrary to Core Strategy Policies DS1 and HC1 and Development Management Policy DMH6. The development proposes a business use on previously developed land and does not take up opportunities for enhancement contrary to Core Strategy Policy E1.**

105/24 FULL APPLICATION - PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF REDUNDANT BUILDING AND REDEVELOPMENT TO FORM A SINGLE DWELLING AT ROSE FARM COTTAGE, GRINDLOW, GREAT HUCKLOW (NP/DDD/0624/0641, WE)

Cllr Beer had declared a prejudicial interest so left the room while this item was discussed.

Some Members had visited the site the previous day.

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

The following spoke under the public participation at meetings scheme:

- Carol Bradshaw, Little Hucklow Parish Council - Supporter
- Lee Ollerenshaw – Applicant
- Nick Marriott, Agent

Members considered that the cost of preserving what was already there was not an option, as there would have to be a re-build of the barn to make it properly habitable, and if there was no intervention, then the barn could well collapse. The proposed development would result in enhancement to the site.

A motion to approve the application contrary to the Officer recommendation was proposed and seconded, put to the vote and carried.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. **Statutory 3-year time period for commencement of development.**
2. **Adoption of approved plans covering the minor design clarifications**
3. **Agree details of windows and doors.**
4. **Agree sample panel of stonework and sample blue slate roof material.**
5. **Archaeological WSI for Level 2/3 building recording and a structural watching brief to be submitted for approval in writing before work commences. Thereafter, carry out in accordance with agreed scheme with no occupation until site investigating and post investigation reporting and archiving has been secured.**
6. **Submit and agree details of package treatment plant and outlet to ground.**
7. **Provision of parking and turning space before occupation.**
8. **Carry out in accordance with bat survey report recommendations.**

The meeting was adjourned for a short break at 11:15 and reconvened at 11:30

106/24 LISTED BUILDING CONSENT - ALTERATIONS TO LISTED BARN COMPRISING: ROOF COVERING RENEWAL, REPAIRS TO TIMBER ROOF STRUCTURE, AND MINOR REPOINTING TO INTERNAL STONE WORK. THE PROPOSED ROOF COVERING RENEWAL INCLUDES REPLACING SECTIONS OF CONCRETE HARDROW TILES WITH NATURAL STONE SLATES, RELAYING OF EXISTING STONE SLATES, LEAD WORK RENEWAL, AND REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING BITUMEN FELT WITH A BREATHABLE MEMBRANE AT NORTH LEES BARN, BIRLEY LANE, HATHERSAGE (NP/DDD/0824/0806, JK)

Some Members had visited the site the previous day.

Members were advised that this application was solely for the listed building consent for roof repair and renovation works; it was not accompanied by another application regarding use of the building. Consequently, Members could only consider the planning merits of the proposals within the confines of the application before them, and must substantiate any decision with sound planning reasons only to those proposals.

The Planning Officer informed Members that since the report was published, a further objection had been received from the Authority's Ecologist regarding the impact the works would have on the known bat roost. Further discussions with the Ecologist had taken place and they agreed that works could go ahead subject to planning conditions if consent were granted. The Officer then went on to present the report and outlined the reasons for refusal as detailed in the report.

The following spoke under the public participation at meetings scheme:

- Beth Fenna, PDNPA Building Surveyor – Applicant
- Hannah Turner – PDNPA Head of Assets and Enterprise – Applicant

Members acknowledged that the cruck barn and hayloft at North Lees were the most important buildings the Authority had within the National Park with the highest conservation objectives, and that the roof timbers were in a bad state of disrepair so it was important that the works were done to preserve the buildings. However, there was concern as to the appropriateness of using a modern membrane rather than a traditional method such as "torching".

Members noted that the Conservation Officer strongly supported the re-roofing and repairs to the barn, however, they had raised serious concerns to the provision of a modern membrane, which they felt would have a negative impact and be visually intrusive on the listed building's special architectural and historic interest.

Members expressed concern about the conflicting information presented to them regarding the effects and lifespan of both methods. Members did not consider they could proceed to make a sound decision without further information to clarify these issues.

A motion to refuse the application was moved but not seconded.

A motion to defer the application to allow the applicants to engage further with officers and consider bringing forward a joint application with development proposals for future use noting that in the meantime this would require urgent mitigation works to protect the historic fabric of the roof structure, was moved, seconded, put to the vote and carried.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be DEFERRED to enable the applicant to engage further with officers and consider bringing forward a joint application with development proposal for potential futures use(s), but in the meantime make provision for urgent works to protect the historic roof structure form further damage.

107/24 FULL APPLICATION - PROPOSED EXTENSIONS AND CONVERSION OF ATTACHED BARN TO FORM ADDITIONAL LIVING ACCOMMODATION AT 1 TEARSALL VIEW, THE SQUARE, WENSLEY (NP/DDD/0624/0656, GG)

This item was brought forward on the agenda due to the speakers having arrived.

Some Members had visited the site the previous day.

A motion to continue the meeting past 1pm, was moved, seconded, voted on and carried.

The Planning Officer informed Members of an update to the Officer recommendation in that following a response from the Authority's Ecologist that the barn did have bat roost potential, a preliminary bat survey had not been submitted as yet. The Officer then presented the report and outlined the reasons for refusal as detailed in the report.

The following spoke under the public participation at meetings scheme:

- Stephanie Roberts, Applicant
- Clare Lang, Agent

Members were minded to approve the application as it would make good use of the barn, and it was not readily visible from public places, however there was some concern over the materials and details to be used as they were out of keeping with the conservation area.

A recommendation to defer the application and grant the Head of Planning, Development and Enforcement manager or Area Team Manager delegated powers to approve the application subject to design amendments and submission of a protected species survey which demonstrated that the development would not harm protected species was proposed and seconded, put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED:

That the application be DEFERRED and to grant the Head of Planning, Development and Enforcement manager or Area Team Manager delegated powers to approve the application subject to design amendments and submission of a protected species survey which demonstrated that the development would not harm protected species.

The meeting was adjourned for a short break at 1:10 during which Cllr Chaplin, Cllr Potter and Cllr Hart left the meeting. The meeting reconvened at 1:15.

108/24 FULL APPLICATION - ERECTION OF A SLURRY STORE AT STONEY CLIFFE FARM, BUXTON ROAD, UPPER HULME (NP/SM/1223/1473, LB)

This item was brought forward on the agenda due to the speaker having arrived.

Some Members had visited the site the previous day.

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

The following spoke under the public participation at meetings scheme:

- Ed Groves, Agent

Members considered that the proposal was an essential part of farming operations and that the existing tree cover, allied with the screening proposed, would in time mask the development.

Members asked whether the development was subject to biodiversity net gain (BNG). The Officer reported that the application had come in before the regulations became mandatory, but it would be subject to BNG, if the application had come in now.

A motion to approve the application, contrary to Officer recommendation was proposed, seconded, put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED:

That the application be APPROVED, subject to the following conditions:

1. **Statutory 3-year time period for commencement of development.**
2. **Adopt submitted plans**
3. **Secure finish of the store to make its dark and recessive including any lid.**
4. **Secure levels and grading of the land including reseeding after excavations have taken place.**
5. **Secure a scheme of spoil removal.**
6. **Building to be removed, when it was no longer needed for agriculture.**

109/24 FULL APPLICATION - DEVELOPMENT OF A CHANGING PLACES TOILET FACILITY ON AN EXISTING GRASS VERGE AREA AT PARSLEY HAY CYCLE HIRE, UNNAMED SECTION OF C138 FROM A515 TO TISSINGTON TRAIL BRIDGE, PARSLEY HAY (NP/DDD/0724/0697, CC)

Some Members had visited the site the previous day.

The Planning Officer presented the report and outlined the reasons for approval as detailed in the report.

Members requested whether the orientation of the unit could be looked at so that it ran parallel to the track? The Planning Officer confirmed that this would be reviewed.

The Officer recommendation to approve the application in principle, subject to Officers looking at the orientation of the unit was moved, seconded, put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED:

That the application be APPROVED subject to Officers liaising with the applicant to determine whether the orientation of the unit could be changed and to the following conditions (regardless of the outcome of discussion regarding orientation):

1. **Statutory time limit for implementation.**
2. **Development not to be carried out otherwise than in accordance with specified approved plans.**
3. **Conditions to specify architectural and design details for the building, including stonework, roof materials and joinery details / finish.**
4. **Prior to the commencement of the development a scheme for the protection of the retained trees, in accordance with BS 5837:2012, including a Tree Protection Plan(s) (TPP) and an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) to be submitted and approved, and thereafter implemented.**
5. **Scheme of archaeological monitoring to be submitted, approved, and carried out, including appropriate analysis, publication, dissemination and archiving.**

110/24 PROPOSED REFORMS TO THE NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK AND OTHER CHANGES TO THE PLANNING SYSTEM

The Policy Planner introduced the report and informed Members that the Government consultation process on the changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which started on the 30th July was due to close on the 24th September, so any changes could happen relatively quickly after that. National Parks England are submitting a joint response to the consultation on behalf of all national parks and the Broads Authority, and each national park are also submitting their own consultation response on how the proposed changes would affect them, which Officers are currently drafting, and that the final response would be delegated to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of Planning, before being submitted. The Officer informed Members that the consultation process would not affect our own Local Plan Review, Issues and Options consultation which is due to start on the 7th October.

Members considered that one of the issues that would be coming out of the consultation for the Authority was the pressures that would be put on two of our partner authorities in particular High Peak Borough Council and Derbyshire Dales District Council in terms of housing provision, and this is something the authority need to keep pressing and drawing to the attention of Government and to ensure that they consider National Park Purposes when looking at policies.

Members would also like Government to look again at permitted development right changes, in particular with regard to camping and caravanning, and asked if the Authority had the ability to ask whether the Government was open to suggestions as part of the consultation process? The Officer confirmed that one of the questions in the consultation process there was an "open question" regarding rural housing so there may be an opportunity to feed into that.

Members noted the report.

RESOLVED:

1. **The contents of the report and Appendix 1 are noted; and**
2. **Final response is delegated to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of Planning Committee**

111/24 AUTHORITY SOLICITOR REPORT - PLANNING APPEALS (A.1536/AE)

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

The Head of Planning gave an update on the Planning Inspectorates appeal decision regarding Top Riley Lane where the application was refused by Members on the basis that the pods were large and went beyond the perimeters of the Authority's policies for smaller simple pods. The application was resubmitted and approved for smaller simple pods, but this appeal was against the first application for the larger more chalet like pods in that location. The Head of Planning reported that the Authority were content that there was minimal landscape concerns but it did raise issues on policy going forward and how we frame our approach to these different products.

RESOLVED:

To note the report.

The meeting ended at 2.00 pm