
MINUTES

Meeting:	Planning Committee
Date:	Friday 11 October 2024 at 10.00 am
Venue:	Aldern House, Baslow Road, Bakewell
Chair:	P Brady
Present:	V Priestley, M Beer, Ms R Bennett, M Buckler, M Chaplin, B Hanley, L Hartshorne, I Huddleston, D Murphy, K Potter and K Richardson
Apologies for absence:	A Hart, K Smith and J Wharmby.

112/24 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 13 SEPTEMBER 2024

The minutes of the last meeting of the Planning Committee held on 13 September 2024 were approved as a correct record, subject to the following amendments:

Minute 106/24

Listed Building Consent – North Lees Barn, Birley Lane, Hathersage

To amend the wording to “consider bringing forward a joint application with development proposals for future use noting that in the meantime”

Minute 108/24

Full Application – Stoney Cliffe Farm, Buxton Road, Upper Hulme

To amend the wording of Condition 3 to read “ Secure finish of the store to make it dark and recessive including any lid”.

Minute 111/24

Cllr Hanley asked that his concern on the Planning Inspectors decision regarding Top Riley Lane be added to the minute, as the Planning Inspector had considered that there was no vehicle movement issues, which was surprising as the lane is used by visitors to Eyam and to the historic Riley graves, which has to be done on foot as there is no other way of getting there.

113/24 URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business.

114/24 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

One member of the public was present to make a representation to the Committee.

115/24 MEMBERS DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Item 6

An email received from the agent to Cllr Priestley was circulated to Members of the Planning Committee and to Planning Officers.

Cllr Potter declared a personal interest as she relied on the bees for making jams for charity.

Item 7

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

116/24 FULL APPLICATION - PROPOSED CREATION OF AN AGRICULTURAL BARN FOR BEE KEEPING REQUIREMENTS AT SWALLOWS NEST BARN, THE EDGE, EYAM (NP/DDD/0724/0738/CB)

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 Officer reported that since the report was drafted, correspondence from the agent had been received clarifying the status of both the existing shed and the proposed use of the building, and it was also confirmed on the site visit how the building would be used, so it was clear that the vast majority of the building would be for agricultural purposes. Officers were therefore satisfied that there was a need for an agricultural building and any business use would be ancillary to the main agricultural use.

The Officer reported that following the clarification of the use of the building from the applicant, recommendation 1 of the report should now be amended

The following spoke under the public participation at meetings scheme:

- James Darwent – Agent

Although Members supported the business, it was asked whether the building could be moved further to allow for better screening? It was also noted that it was a sensitive site and that more work needed to be done on screening, location and materials.

A motion to defer the application was moved and seconded.

A recommendation to defer the application and grant delegated authority to the Head of Planning to approve the application subject to further discussions with the applicant to agree amendments to screening, location and materials was proposed, and seconded, put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED:

That the application be DEFERRED and delegated authority granted to the Head of Planning to approve the application subject to further discussions with the applicant to agree amendments to screening, location and materials

117/24 FULL APPLICATION - ALTERATION TO EXTERNAL APPEARANCE OF EXISTING LIVESTOCK BUILDING AT KNOWLE HOUSE FARM, MOOR ROAD, REAPSMOOR, LONGNOR (NP/SM/0824/0829/RD)

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

Members queried why cement was being used for part of the proposal as opposed to Yorkshire Boarding, as cement was a carbon emitting material? The Officer reported that using cement was more robust and was a common material used in agricultural buildings.

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

RESOLVED:

That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Statutory time limit**
- 2. In accordance with approved plans**
- 3. Design and materials**

118/24 MONITORING & ENFORCEMENT QUARTERLY REVIEW - OCTOBER 2024 (A.1533/AJC)

The Principal Enforcement Planner presented the report which provided a summary of the work carried out over the last quarter (July - September 2024). The Officer also reported of an amendment to the report regarding Orchard Farm, Parwich (case ref 22/0003) which should say it was for the "erection of a fence" and not "erection of a yurt" and that the fence had now been removed.

The Officer informed Members that following an internal process mapping and discussions with the Chair and Vice Chair of Planning Committee, it was agreed that Officers would provide relevant information in the Annual Monitoring and Enforcement Report on the number of cases that remained unresolved, and those where an enforcement notice had not been complied with and where it appeared that timely action was not being taken to ensure compliance.

It was agreed that, in the annual review which is reported to the April Planning Committee Meeting, Members will now receive information about outstanding cases and how long they have been outstanding for. Once an enforcement notice is in place and

has not been complied with within 3 months of the compliance period, this would come before Planning Committee as a priority case each quarter along with an explanation of where the case was at.

The Officer then shared before and after photographs of some of the cases that had been resolved in the latest quarter.

Members thanked the Officer for his report, but asked what “expedient” meant. The Officer reported that expediency must be considered when the Authority has to decide whether to take enforcement action or not. In reaching this decision, Officers must consider whether there is harm to the amenity of the area or the special qualities of the National Park and if the development is in conflict with policies. Members asked whether by not taking any action does that mean that they have planning permission by default? The Officer reported that the developments still remained unauthorised, and the applicant has the right to apply for retrospective planning permission to regularise it as it could lead to issues for them if they wished to sell the property in the future. Unauthorised development (excluding listed buildings) will normally become immune from enforcement action after 10 years.

The Officer responded to a request for an update on case ref: 15:0057, Mickleden Edge. Members also asked for an update on case ref: 19/0037, Cauldwells Mill. The Officer reported that he would look into them and report back.

The Officer was thanked for the report and particularly for the before and after photos which proved helpful and gave a quick snapshot into what is happening.

RESOLVED:

That officers begin a process of gathering data in relation to those matters set out in paragraph 6, and report to the Planning Committee on all outstanding cases and the length of time they have been outstanding at least once per year, and each quarter on cases where compliance with an enforcement notice is outstanding for longer than three months.

119/24 AUTHORITY SOLICITORS 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 10.55 am