



MINUTES

Meeting: **Planning Committee**

Date: Friday 14 March 2025 at 10.00 am

Venue: Aldern House, Baslow Road, Bakewell

Chair: P Brady

Present: V Priestley, M Beer, R Bennett, M Buckler, M Chaplin, L Hartshorne, D Murphy, K Potter, K Richardson and K Smith

Apologies for absence: B Hanley, A Hart, I Huddleston and J Wharmby.

25/25 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 14 FEBRUARY 2025

The minutes of the last meeting of the Planning Committee held on 14 February 2025 were approved as a correct record.

26/25 URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business.

27/25 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

28/25 MEMBERS DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Item 6

All Members had received an email from the applicant.

G Priestley declared a personal interest as a member of Bamford Parish Council, so would leave the room when this item was discussed.

Item 8

M Buckler declared an interest as he was the Ward District Councillor for Elton.

Item 9

P Brady declared a personal interest as a member of Taddington Parish Council, but was not present at the parish council meeting when this item was discussed.

Item 10

P Brady declared a personal interest as he was acquainted with one of the objectors, but confirmed that he had not discussed the item with them.

Some of the Members knew Cllr D Chapman, who had made a representation on the application, as he was a former Member of the Authority.

29/25 FULL APPLICATION - DEMOLITION OF DERELICT OUTBUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION OF TWO-BEDROOMED DETACHED DWELLING WITH FRONT GARDEN TO STREET AND SMALLER PRIVATE AMENITY SPACE TO REAR AT SITE OF FORMER NATWEST BANK, BAMFORD (NP/HPK/0125/0061 WE)

G Priestley left the room while this item was discussed.

Some Members had visited the site the previous day.

The Planning Officer presented the report and informed Members that since the report was written, a further seven representations had been received, four of which were objections and three that were in support, bringing the total number of representations to 17.

The Officer then went onto outline the reasons for refusal as set out in the report.

The following spoke under the public participation at meetings scheme:

- Kathryn Sather, Supporter – Statement read out by Democratic Services
- Ben McIntyre, Objector
- Daniel Hale, Applicant
- Chris Barnes, Architect

Members agreed that although the site was an eyesore at present they were concerned that the current proposal appeared over-development on what was a small site and would have a harmful impact on the amenity of the neighbouring property, and that a better solution and design could be found.

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

RESOLVED:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:-

- 1. The design, scale, form, and massing of the proposed development would erode the setting of The Green and Fidlers Well and harm the significance of the Bamford Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP2, GSP3, L3 and HC1 and Development Management policies DMC3, DMC5, DMC8 and DMH6. The harm identified would be less than substantial but would not be outweighed by public benefits and therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework.**
- 2. The proposed development would be overbearing and have an unacceptable harmful impact upon the residential amenity of occupants of neighbouring properties contrary to Core Strategy policy GPS3 and Development Management policy DMC3.**

30/25 FULL APPLICATION - PROPOSED SITING OF 24 STATIC HOLIDAY CARAVANS WITH ADDITIONAL LANDSCAPING IN LIEU OF 28 TOURING CARAVANS AND TWO TENTED CAMPING AREAS - NEWHAVEN HOLIDAY PARK, NEWHAVEN (NP/DDD/1024/1137)/MN

G Priestley returned to the meeting.

Some Members had visited the site the previous day.

The Planning Officer informed Members of a correction to the report at paragraph 39, which suggested there was a seasonal restriction on the touring caravans within this area of the holiday park, which was not the case as the pitches could be used year round for up to 28 days per calendar year by any one person.

The Officer then went onto present the report and outlined the reasons for approval as set out in the report. The Officer informed Members that the application, which was for the siting of static caravans, represented a departure from policy RT3, which says that static caravans would not be permitted, with the supporting text only allowing them in exceptional circumstances, which would be sites where they would have a very low impact in the landscape, so if Members were minded to approve the application, then a referral back to a future Planning Committee would be needed to consider the impact on the adopted policy.

The following spoke under the public participation at meetings scheme:

- David Middleton, Agent

Members considered that the site was extremely well hidden in the landscape, and that it could be regarded as a positive move in this specific location. Members also asked if an additional condition could be added regarding electric vehicle charging points? The Agent agreed that this was something that they could look at providing near the reception building or sales office as it would not be practical for each static unit to have one.

Members were minded to approve subject to referral to the next Planning Committee in accordance with standing order 1.48 in order to consider impact to adopted policy, as an approval in this case would represent a departure from strategic policies, and subject to an additional condition regarding an electric vehicle charging unit being installed.

RESOLVED:

That subject to referral of the application under Standing Order 1.48, Members are minded to APPROVE the application subject to the following conditions:-

- 1. Statutory 3 year time limit for implementation**
- 2. In accordance with submitted and amended plans**
- 3. 28-day holiday occupancy restriction**
- 4. Colour range of units to be approved and implemented**
- 5. Biodiversity Net Gain plan to be implemented**

6. **Habitat creation and management plan to be approved and implemented**
7. **In accordance with the recommendations of the protected species report**
8. **In accordance with the recommendations of the tree report**
9. **Programme of monitoring and site supervision of arboricultural measures to be approved**
10. **Final Tree Protection Plan (TPP) and Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) to be approved and implemented**
11. **Planting to be carried out as approved**
12. **Woodland management plan to be approved and implemented**
13. **Parking plan to be approved**
14. **Travel Plan to be approved if approved parking plan includes provision of more than 28 spaces**
15. **A scheme of EV charging points to be approved.**

31/25 AUTHORITY SOLICITOR REPORT - PLANNING APPEALS (A.1536/AE)

This item was brought forward on the agenda, as the speakers had not arrived for the next item.

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

A discussion took place regarding one of the appeals that had been allowed at Booth Farm, Hollinsclough, where it was felt that the Planning Inspector had not referred to the Development Management Policy which sets out the exceptions for pods and shepherds huts etc, but had made a view that they were acceptable in that location, which is contrary to our exceptions. It was agreed that greater clarity in this area was needed when the Local Plan is rewritten.

RESOLVED

To note the report.

The meeting was adjourned from 11:10 until 11:25 following consideration of this item

32/25 FULL APPLICATION - FOR THE PROPOSED CHANGE OF USE OF FORMER CHAPEL TO CREATE ANCILLARY LIVING ACCOMMODATION FOR LAWSON COTTAGE AND SHORT STAY HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION USE AT ELTON METHODIST CHURCH, WEST END, ELTON (NP/DDD/0125/0071/GG)

The Planning Officer informed Members that the previous application in 2015 to convert the chapel into holiday accommodation was refused as it had not been demonstrated that there was no longer a need for the chapel as a community service or facility and the development would have impacted on the neighbouring property. Since then, the chapel

had been purchased by the owners of the neighbouring property, who now wish to convert it to ancillary accommodation. The Officer then presented the report and outlined the reasons for refusal.

The following spoke under the public participation at meetings scheme:

- Michele Cartwright, Supporter
- Nick Marriott, Agent

Members considered that if the Chapel was put to a community use then it could have a considerable impact on the applicants own property. The Planning Officer responded that the applicants would have bought their property in the knowledge that it was adjacent to a church which is its lawful use so the situation was existing.

Members agreed that there was a need to protect a community asset, however, the chapel hadn't been used as a community asset for some time and the Parish Council were clear that they didn't need another community facility.

Members were minded to approve subject to referral to the next Planning Committee in accordance with standing order 1.48 in order to consider impact to adopted policy, as an approval in this case would represent a departure from strategic policies.

RESOLVED:

That subject to a referral of the application under Standing Order 1.48, Members are minded to APPROVE the application subject to the following conditions:-

- **Standard Time Limit**
- **In accordance with plans submitted**
- **To agree the type, colour and position of the solar panels**
- **Detail of replacement windows and doors to be submitted**
- **Replacement colour of render to be agreed**
- **Car parking space to be removed**
- **Building to remain ancillary accommodation to Lawson Cottage**
- **Occupancy condition of 28 days**
- **Archaeology requirement**
- **Removal of PD Rights**

33/25

FULL APPLICATION - CONVERSION OF THE STONE FIELD BARN TO CREATE A FIVE BEDROOM PROPERTY WITH INTEGRATED 1 BEDROOMED ANNEXE OFF BROADWAY LANE, NR PRIESTCLIFFE, TADDINGTON (NP/DDD/1224/1324, MN)

The Planning Officer informed Members of a correction to paragraph 10 of the report, which stated that the application was for a 3 bedroomed open market dwelling, when it should have said a 5 bedroomed open market dwelling. The Officer informed Members that an application for conversion of the barn to a dwelling was considered by the Planning Committee approximately 12 months ago, but the Officers still had similar concerns to last time. The Officer then went on to present the report and outline the reasons for refusal.

The following spoke under the public participation at meetings scheme:

- Ellie Hensby, Applicant

Members were concerned that there were not enough changes to the previous refused application, and there was good policy reason for not allowing the application.

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

RESOLVED:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed conversion would harm the heritage significance of the barn by virtue of domestication of its character and setting, with no material planning considerations outweighing that harm, contrary to policies L3, DMC3, DMC5, and DMC10, and to the heritage provisions of the NPPF.**
- 2. The proposed conversion would harm the special landscape character of the locality by virtue of domestication of the barn and its rural agricultural setting, with no material planning considerations outweighing that harm, contrary to policies L1, DMC3, and DMC10, and to the provisions of the NPPF insofar as they relate to landscape protection within National Parks.**

34/25 FULL APPLICATION - ALTERATIONS, EXTENSION AND DETACHED GARAGE AT JOLLY FIELD FARM, CHELMORTON (NP/DDD/1024/1161 PM)

Some Members had visited the site the previous day.

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

The following spoke under the public participation at meetings scheme:

- Robert Dearman, Objector
- Jade Collins, Objector
- Richard Mundy, Agent
- Julie Collins, Objector

Members noted that there was an insufficient heritage assessment provided, which didn't provide the information required to make an informed decision. Although there were elements of the proposal that were acceptable, there was some concern by Members on the size of the garage, impact upon the conservation area and the potential impact on the tree.

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

RESOLVED:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

- 1. The application includes insufficient heritage assessment of the site, or of the impacts of the proposed development on its significance, character and appearance, and setting, contrary to Development Management policy DMC5 and paragraph 207 of the NPPF. Due to the lack of sufficient heritage assessment it is not possible to conclude that the heritage significance of the site would be conserved by the development, contrary to Core Strategy policy L3 and Development Management policies DMC3 and DMC5.**

- 2. By reason of its proposed design and materials, the proposed 'glazed link' extension would detract from the character and appearance of the existing building and its setting as a former agricultural barn contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP3 and L3 and Development Management policies DMC3, DMC5 and DMH7.**
- 3. By reason of its siting and scale the proposed garage does not conserve or enhance the setting of the former barn (a non-designated heritage asset) or the valued characteristics of the Chelmorton Conservation Area contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP3 and L3 and Development Management policies DMC3, DMC5 and DMH8.**
- 4. The proposed garage would fall within the Root Protection Area (RPA) of T1 (lime tree). This tree makes a significant positive contribution to the character of the Chelmorton Conservation Area by reason of its prominence and good condition and life expectancy. Further built development within the RPA of T1 would harm its long-term life expectancy resulting ultimately in its loss. As such the proposal is contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP3 and L3 and Development Management policies DMC3, DMC5, DMC8 and DMC13.**

The meeting ended at 12.45 pm