



---

## MINUTES

Meeting: **Planning Committee**

Date: Friday 5 December 2025 at 10.00 am

Venue: Aldern House, Baslow Road, Bakewell

Chair: P Brady

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

Apologies for absence: R Bennett, B Hanley, A Hart, K Potter and M Smith.

### 117/25 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 7 NOVEMBER 2025

Minute number 115/25 was amended to read "A motion to defer the application to allow **further consideration of a revised proposal and amended plans** was proposed, seconded, put to the vote and carried".

The minutes of the last meeting of the Planning Committee held on 7 November 2025, with the above amendment, were approved as a correct record.

### 118/25 URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business.

### 119/25 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

### 120/25 MEMBERS DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

The following declarations of interest were made:

#### Item 6 – Conksbury Lane, Youlgrave

K Smith declared that one of the public speakers is known to him but no discussion had taken place regarding the application.

#### Item 7 – Church Farm, Parwich

The Chair of the Planning Committee declared that he had received an email from the applicant regarding progressing the application to the Planning Committee but the application itself and details were not discussed.

Item 10 – Holmesfield, Castleton

K Smith declared that one of the public speakers is known to him but no discussion has taken place regarding the application.

Item 12 – Post Office, Eyam

All Members of the Planning Committee had received an email from Eyam Parish Council.

Item 14 – Hurst Waterworks, Glossop

J Wharmby declared an interest as she attends the Parish Council meetings at Charlesworth but does not stay for the items which involve the Peak Park and this application falls within her DCC division.

Item 15 – Dennis Knoll Car Park

- All Members of the Planning Committee declared an interest in the application as this was an application submitted by the Authority itself.
- One of the public speakers is known to some of the Members of the Planning Committee.
- Additionally one of the speakers is known to K Smith but no discussion has taken place regarding the application.

**121/25 FULL APPLICATION - ERECTION OF NINE DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, PARKING AND GARDENS, ALONG WITH ALLOTMENTS, AND SOFT LANDSCAPING INCLUDING A MIXTURE OF GRASSLAND AND TREE PLANTING AT LAND ACCESSIBLE FROM HANNAH BOWMAN WAY OFF CONKSURRY LANE YOULGRAVE (NP/DDD/0425/0354) JS**

The Planning Officer presented the report and outlined the reasons for approval as detailed in the report. Since the publication of the report the Highways Authority has responded to the consultation and has no objections to the development.

The following spoke under the public participation at meetings scheme:

- Karen Shelly-Jones - Objector
- Peter Masheder - Objector
- Laura Mellstrom – Supporter – DDDC member for Youlgrave Ward
- Andrew McCloy - Supporter
- Anna Croasdell – Supporter – Community Land Trust (CLT)

Some Members had visited the site the previous day.

The following points were discussed:

- Concerns were raised that this development is just one phase of a larger development. Currently there are 21 empty properties in Youlgrave and a high number of holiday lets.
- It was noted that since the council tax has doubled on second homes the number of them within Youlgrave has decreased by 10% in the last 6 months.
- The vacant properties in the village do not provide the necessary affordable housing.
- The current scheme has 8 units occupied by local young families. There are core services in the village e.g. Doctors Surgery, school and nursery.
- Concerns about overlooking of current properties were discussed. Plots 1-5 have sufficient space so not to be over-bearing. Plots 6-9 do not have windows in

the end gable and there is a landscaping buffer which is 4m wide which would be planted with wild-flowers and small shallow root trees.

- It is considered that 17 parking spaces for 9 homes is sufficient parking. To provide additional parking would be to sacrifice the landscaping which softens the impact of the car-parking.
- The benefits of the solar panels were discussed.
- There would be a continuous hedge along the parking spaces with no gap.
- Bin storage was considered and bin stores have been incorporated in the conditions and collection points discussed.
- Members felt there was insufficient information provided regarding surveys and the impact on wildlife.
- There was concern expressed regarding creeping development and future infill in neighbouring land.

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

**RESOLVED:**

**That the application be APPROVED subject to prior entry into a S.106 planning obligation to secure affordable housing, the maintenance and management of open space and subject to the following conditions:**

**In accordance with specified approved amended plans:**

- 1. Statutory time limit for implementation**
- 2. In accordance with specified approved amended plans**
- 3. Submission, approval and implementation of Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation**
- 4. Submission, approval and implementation of scheme to deal with ground contamination**
- 5. Stability assessment to be submitted and any necessary remedial measures to be agreed before the development commences.**
- 6. Submission, approval and implementation of surface and foul water drainage scheme**
- 7. Submission, approval and implementation of Construction Management Plan (to include details of noise/dust management and hours of operation)**
- 8. Submission, approval and implementation of method statement for amphibians and reptiles**
- 9. Submission, approval and implementation of site parking plan**
- 10. Submission, approval and implementation of a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP)**
- 11. Submission, approval and implementation of finished ground and floor levels**

12. Submission, approval and implementation of scheme of enhancement measures for bats, birds and hedgehogs
13. Submission, approval and implementation of scheme of measures to mitigate the effects of and adapt to climate change
14. Submission, approval and implementation of detailed hard and soft landscaping scheme
15. Submission, approval and implementation of secure bicycle parking and bin storage areas.
16. Implementation of biodiversity gain plan. The biodiversity gain plan shall include additional enhancements to compensate for the loss of terrestrial habitat for GCN, other amphibians (such as common toad) and reptiles.
17. Implementation of mitigation measures detailed in Section 6.2 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal
18. Implementation of access, parking and turning facilities
19. Approve samples of external materials
20. Approve sample panels of limestone walling
21. Approve details of windows and doors
22. Approve details of any external meter boxes
23. Approve details of solar panels
24. Rainwater goods and verge details
25. If Great Crested Newts or Reptiles are encountered at any time during the works operations shall cease and a suitably qualified ecologist and/or Natural England to be consulted for further advice as to whether a license is required for the works to proceed
26. Prior to the erection of any external lighting on the site, a lighting plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority
27. Remove permitted development rights for alterations, extensions, hard surfaces, ancillary buildings, means of enclosure and solar panels.

**122/25 FULL APPLICATION - CONSERVATION REPAIRS AND ALTERATIONS TO CHURCH FARM. NEW ATTACHED GREENHOUSE ON THE EAST ELEVATION TO REPLACE MODERN OUTBUILDINGS. INTEGRATION OF SOLAR PANELS AND AIR SOURCE HEAT PUMP. NEW OUTBUILDINGS AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING SEPARATE GARAGE (NP/DDD/1124/1291) SC**

Item 7 was presented and discussed at the same time as Item 8 but the votes were taken separately with the vote for Item 7 being taken first.

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:

- Tom Crooks - Agent

Some Members had visited the site in November 2025.

The following areas were discussed:

- The re-instatement of the internal wall and relocation of the kitchen.
- The greenhouse and how appropriate the design is for an 18<sup>th</sup> century farmhouse.
- It was felt that it would be an enhancement to the property to remove all of the existing outhouses.
- There was clarification provided as to why an oil tank and air-source heat pump was necessary.
- Potential conditions were discussed should the committee be minded to approve this application.

A motion to approve the application, contrary to officer recommendation, with the conditions detailed below, was proposed, seconded, put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED:**

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

- 1. Statutory time limit for implementation**
- 2. In accordance with specified approved/amended plans**
- 3. Stonework shall be natural limestone to match the existing dwelling**
- 4. Details of repointing to be submitted, approved and implemented**
- 5. New rooflights to be conservation type**
- 6. All pipework other than rainwater goods to be internal**
- 7. Method of fixing and mounting of the Solar panels to be submitted, approved and implemented**
- 8. Full details of the joint work and fixing method of the glasshouse to the gable elevation of the dwelling to be submitted, approved and implemented**
- 9. Methodology of the re-roof of the garage to be submitted, approved and implemented**
- 10. Written Scheme of Investigation to be submitted, approved and implemented**
- 11. Mitigation and enhancement measures identified in Section 6.2 of the submitted Nocturnal Bat Survey Report (2024) and Appendix 4 of the submitted Preliminary Bat Survey Report shall be followed and implemented.**

**12. The submitted climate change mitigation measures shall be fully implemented before the extensions and alterations are first brought into use and then retained.**

**123/25 LISTED BUILDING CONSENT - CONSERVATION REPAIRS AND ALTERATIONS TO CHURCH FARM. NEW ATTACHED GREENHOUSE ON THE EAST ELEVATION TO REPLACE MODERN OUTBUILDINGS. INTEGRATION OF SOLAR PANELS AND AIR SOURCE HEAT PUMP. NEW OUTBUILDINGS AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING SEPARATE GARAGE (NP/DDD/1124/1292) SC**

Item 8 was presented and discussed at the same time as Item 7 but the votes were taken separately with the vote for Item 7 being taken first. See minute number 122/25 for details of the discussion.

- Members requested that should this application be approved then an additional condition be included to cover the removal and re-instatement of the thrawl and sink.

A motion to approve the application, contrary to officer recommendation, with the conditions detailed below was proposed, seconded, put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED:**

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

- 1. Statutory time limit for implementation**
- 2. In accordance with specified approved/amended plans**
- 3. Stonework shall be natural limestone to match the existing dwelling**
- 4. Details of repointing to be submitted, approved and implemented**
- 5. New rooflights to be conservation type**
- 6. All pipework other than rainwater goods to be internal**
- 7. Method of fixing and mounting of the Solar panels to be submitted, approved and implemented**
- 8. Full details of the joint work and fixing method of the glasshouse to the gable elevation of the dwelling to be submitted, approved and implemented**
- 9. Methodology of the re-roof of the garage to be submitted, approved and implemented**
- 10. Methodology for the removal and reinstatement of the historic salting trough and thrawls to be submitted, approved and implemented**

*11:40am the meeting adjourned for a short break and reconvened at 11:50am*

**124/25 FULL APPLICATION - PROPOSED CONVERSION OF DISUSED BUILDING TO ONE BEDROOMED DWELLING WITH CREATION OF OFF-ROAD PARKING SPACE AT THE WASH HOUSE, GAULEGE LANE LONGNOR (NP/SM/0925/0958) GG**

The Planning Officer presented the report and outlined the reasons for approval as detailed in the report. It was noted that following further review with the Authority Conservation Officer an extra condition has been recommended to add to the list of conditions, the condition would require the applicants to record the building to Level 2 of Historic England's Guidance on understanding historic buildings prior to commencing works.

- 4 letters of rejection received so this has been referred to committee as contrary to officer recommendation.
- The Highways Authority have not raised any objection and support the principal of a designated parking space to serve the dwelling.
- The building is a non-designated heritage asset within the Longnor conservation area
- It was noted that correct notice has been served regarding the ownership of the land, paragraphs 105-107 of the officers report detail this.
- Members recognised that this is a useful way of conserving the building and bringing it back into use.

A motion to approve the application with the conditions outlined below with an additional condition requiring the applicants to record the building, was moved, seconded, put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED:**

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

- 1. Statutory time limit for implementation**
- 2. In accordance with specified approved/amended plans**
- 3. Conversion and not rebuild and conversion works to be in full accordance with the recommendations in Section 5 of the Structural Condition Report R3391-001 Rev. A (Peak Engineers) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the LPA.**
- 4. A full method statement setting out how the front wall will be repaired and made sound is required, including how the existing structure will be supported while the work is undertaken.**
- 5. Details of the new support to the first floor external landing**
- 6. Details of any replacement materials**
- 7. Precise drawn details of the new roof structure**
- 8. Details of the mortar mix to be used for repointing**
- 9. Window and door details**

10. The external door to the lower ground floor shall open inwards only
11. Details of obscured north facing, first floor window shall be submitted, approved and implemented
12. A sample of replacement stone for window surrounds and stone walls
13. Details of rainwater goods and external pipework
14. Details of highway edge restraint to be submitted, approved and implemented
15. Details of car park provision and surfacing to be submitted and approved prior to the development being first brought into use
16. Details of a boundary treatment above the retaining wall
17. Handrail details to serve external steps on north elevation
18. Hard and soft landscaping
19. Details of bin storage to be submitted, approved and implemented. Any door to the bin store shall open inwards
20. Adhere to all mitigation measures detailed in Section 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 of the Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment & Bat Emergence Surveys
21. Nesting birds
22. In accordance with the details contained in the supporting document with respect to addressing climate change and sustainable development
23. PD rights removed for alterations, extensions, ancillary building, satellite dishes and means of enclosure.
24. Prior to commencement of works, the building shall be recorded to level 2 of the Historic England's guidance 'Understanding Historic Buildings'

**125/25 FULL APPLICATION - PROPOSED CREATION OF 35 MOTORHOME PITCHES AT HOLMESFIELD, MILL BRIDGE, CASTLETON (NP/HPK/0625/0541) WE**

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

Since the publication of the report a revised landscape assessment and strategy has been received which, due to time constraints, has not yet been consulted on. An updated response has also been received from the Environment Agency who have removed their objections to this application. The Applicant has also confirmed that the main business of the farm would remain as agriculture and therefore this application is an enhancement/diversification to farms primary business.

The following spoke under the public participation at meetings scheme:



- Kate Stanyon – Objector
- Ed Proctor – Objector
- Angela Darlington – Castleton Parish Council - Objector
- Joe Oldfield – Agent

Some Members had visited the site the previous day.

The following points were discussed:

- The site is outside of the Castleton conservation area.
- Over 200 representations have been received regarding this application which mainly cover the principal of the development and the impact on the conservation area.
- Regarding the flood risk the area of the site is in Zone 3b, which is a functional flood plain.
- The area covered by the application is slightly larger than the guidance which is up to a maximum of 41 pitches, this application is for 20-30 pitches.
- The BNG of this development is 17.23% which is in excess of the guidelines.
- It was noted that the local community is overwhelmingly opposed to this development and has set out clear reasoning why.
- It was acknowledged that the village of Castleton is experiencing a number of visitor pressures.
- The Agent requested that this application be deferred to a future meeting to allow for new information to be included and digested. This information is almost ready and covers landscaping, addressing planning policy and farm diversification and the economic benefits and this information has not been considered by the Planning Officer.
- Currently the campsite is operating on 60 days permissive development.
- There were concerns that Members were asking to approve an application which was beyond the Castleton boundary and into the open land.
- Members felt that the size and scale of the vehicles provide a visual and landscape intrusion and the current landscaping proposal is not sufficient to mask the development. The current situation contains the camping to 60 days across the summer months when the trees are in leaf.

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

**RESOLVED:**

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

- 1. The proposed development would result in a form of development that would be visually prominent and harmful to the valued landscape character and scenic beauty of the National Park. The development would fail to conserve or enhance the valued characteristics of the landscape, contrary to policies GSP1, L1, RT3, and DMR1 and Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.**
- 2. The proposed development would harm the significance and setting of the setting of the Castleton Conservation Area, contrary to policies L3, DMC3, DMC8 Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.**

3. **The application has not been supported by a sequential test to demonstrate that the development cannot be located in an area of low flood risk. The proposed development would be classified as more vulnerable to flood risk and would not be a compatible use within Flood Zone 3b. The proposed development is therefore in conflict with policy CC1, paragraphs 170 and 173 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.**
4. **The application has failed to demonstrate that the site access is safe for its intended use. The proposed development is therefore in conflict with policy DMT3.**

*12:45pm the meeting adjourned for a short break and reconvened at 13:15pm*

**126/25 OUTLINE APPLICATION - SITING OF 3 CABINS AT NEW HOUSE FARM, BEET LANE, THE WASH, CHAPEL-EN-LE-FRITH (NP/HPK/0725/0672) WE**

The Planning Officer presented the report and outlined the reasons for refusal as detailed in the report. This is an Outline Application to consider the principal and layout and the scale of the development and not the detail of the structures at this stage.

The following spoke under the public participation at meetings scheme:

- Erica Leigh - Applicant

Some Members had visited the site the previous day.

The following points were noted:

- It was clarified that the cabins will be buildings and not caravans but would be easily removable.
- The application is set in open landscape and can be viewed by neighbours.
- A statement from the landowner was tabled at the meeting and passed to the Chair but not read out.
- The application includes a 35 year planting agreement of which requires 80% of the trees to be established by year 5, the average height of the trees to be 5 metres.
- Members felt that currently they do not have enough information on the size and type of chalets proposed for this site.
- The applicant was commended for looking at ways of achieving farm diversification but Members felt this was the wrong location for this development.

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

**RESOLVED:**

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

1. **The development of new building holiday accommodation, chalet or lodges on this site is not acceptable in principle and contrary to policies DS1, RT2, RT3 and DMR1.**
2. **The development would result in a significant adverse visual impact and harm the**

scenic beauty and landscape of the National Park contrary to policies GSP1, GSP3, L1, DM1 and DMC1 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The development would result in less than substantial harm to the setting of New House farmhouse (Grade II listed) and Beet Farm (a non-designated heritage asset of local significance). The harm would not be outweighed by public benefits and therefore the development is contrary to policies L3, DMC5, DMC7 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
4. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the development would result in enhancement to biodiversity or that the development could be carried out without harm to protected species or their habitat contrary to policies L2, DMC11, DMC12 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
5. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that foul drainage would be dealt with in a satisfactory manner without harm to the environment contrary to policies CC5 and DMC14.

**127/25 FULL APPLICATION - PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF EXISTING COMMERCIAL BUILDING AND PROPOSED NEW 2 STOREY DOMESTIC 2 BEDROOM DWELLING AND ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING AT POST OFFICE, MAIN ROAD, EYAM (NP/DDD/0625/0591) WE**

The Planning Officer presented the report and outlined the reasons for approval as detailed in the report. The loss of the community facility is acceptable in principle if it can be demonstrated to provide enhancement. This application was marketed for over 12 months. The application has been supported by several viability appraisals demonstrating that the building is not suitable for alternative use. There have been 19 representations overall of which 11 are objections. A condition has been included requiring the building to be constructed in gritstone to better blend in with neighbouring properties. It is acknowledged that there would be some impact on the amenity of the existing properties. Although there is no parking included in this application no objection has been received from the Highway Authority based on safety.

The following spoke under the public participation at meetings scheme:

- Hugh Wright – Objector
- Ian Smith – Objector
- Will Thomas – Objector – Statement read out by Democratic Services Staff

Some Members had visited the site the previous day.

The following points were made and discussed:

- The road is narrow outside of this development and there is pavement only on one side. This development will result in additional permanent parking.
- Locals had not been made aware that the building was up for sale and therefore have not had the opportunity to retain the building for community use. This building was marketed for over 16 months with a commercial building company and this has been confirmed by the Planning Officer.
- The space between the downstairs windows and those of the house opposite is 10 metres, this would breach the approved standards however this occurs with other existing properties on this street, which is a public street.

- There was a discussion about the bin storage and electricity meter as there would only be a very narrow gap between the buildings.
- There are concerns that this will be a holiday let and not purchased by local people that need housing on a permanent basis. The principal of open market dwelling is acceptable for this application and there is no requirement to make it affordable housing.
- Members felt it appeared to be a positive approach to remove the current building and replace it with a more attractive building.
- The ownership of the wall and the boundary were discussed. Members would like clarification on who owns the land and the wall and the boundary line.
- There was concern expressed as to how this would be built and maintained given the constraints of space and access. There will be a construction management plan which dictates how the build would progress.
- Members felt there would be too much massing on such a small site and questioned if it would be possible to reduce the size of the building. The footprint of the building on the application is not allowing for the servicing of the building.

A motion to defer the application to allow further discussion regarding the boundary of this site and ownership, along with the size of the building, was moved, seconded, put to the vote and carried. If the issues can be resolved then the decision to be delegated to officers, if not then the application to be brought back to the committee for a decision.

**RESOLVED:**

**That the application be DEFERRED to allow for further discussions between the Applicant and the Planning Officer regarding:**

- 1. How the boundary between this site and The Rookery next door shall be treated along with clarification on who owns the land, wall and boundary line.**
- 2. The massing of the proposed building on a small site and if the size of the proposed building could be reduced as the current footprint does not allow for servicing of the building.**

**128/25 FULL APPLICATION - ERECTION OF LOCAL NEEDS DWELLING (SELF-BUILD) AT LAND ADJACENT 25 HERNSTONE LANE, PEAK FOREST (NP/HPK/1025/1040) HF**

The Planning Officer presented the report and outlined the reasons for refusal as detailed in the report. The location is acceptable in terms of the policies, local needs housing and local connection for the applicant. The housing needs to remain affordable. The need that has been demonstrated is for a single person property therefore policy dictates the size of the property, this application exceeds the size dictated by the policies. It was noted that the dwelling should be 97m<sup>2</sup> but is in fact 100m<sup>2</sup> (although a 97m<sup>2</sup> dwelling would still exceed the size thresholds for the identified need).

The following spoke under the public participation at meetings scheme.

- Andrew Rouke – Applicant

Some Members had visited the site the previous day.

The following points were discussed:

- It was logical and practical to allow a larger sized building.
- The Applicant is happy to reduce the size from 100m<sup>2</sup> to 97m<sup>2</sup>.
- The application can only be considered on the grounds of the information presented, cannot approve a dwelling that is the size of a five person dwelling for one person. Members felt it was unrealistic to expect the applicant to build a 39m<sup>2</sup> house.
- The policy is responding to the local needs in the area. There is a requirement to be consistent in how the policy is applied and need to look at the characteristics of the area.
- This property would not be part of a housing association or the council.
- Members felt it was not practical to build such a small home as the Applicants circumstance may change in the future, should be more flexible and make reasonable provision for the future.
- There was a suggestion that the application be deferred to gain more information and compromise on the size of the house, perhaps reducing it to the size of a four person house.
- Members were requested to provide material reasons for departing from policy and also to respond to the harm the development would cause to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

A motion to approve the application with conditions was proposed and seconded but not voted on. This motion was then amended to defer the application to allow the applicant to amend the plans to alter the design of the dwelling and to bring it within 97m<sup>2</sup>. This motion was proposed and seconded, put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED:**

**That the application be DEFERRED for the following reasons:**

- 1. To allow the applicant to amend the plans to alter the design of the scheme and to bring it within 97m<sup>2</sup>**

**129/25 FULL APPLICATION - CHANGE OF USE OF LAND TO GARDEN AND SITING OF TIMBER GAZEBO, TIMBER CABIN, CAT PEN, SUMMERHOUSE AND LOG STORE AND ASSOCIATED WORKS. SITING OF HEN HOUSE ON AGRICULTURE LAND AND ASSOCIATED WORKS AT 3 HURST WATERWORKS, DERBYSHIRE LEVEL, GLOSSOP (NP/HPK/1224/1334) HF**

The Planning Officer presented the report and outlined the reasons for approval as detailed in the report. A further response has been received from the Environmental Health Officer regarding a condition they had recommended and a need to have a site investigation to establish potential contamination risk – this is a time controlled condition. This application is to regularise work and changes that have already taken place. There have been some changes to the application during the application process.

Some Members had visited the site the previous day.

A motion to approve the application with the amended condition and an additional condition from the Environmental Health Officer controlling imported soil on the site, was moved, seconded, put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED:**

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

1. **Accordance with approved plans subject to conditions / modifications.**
2. **External finish of cabin to be provided prior to re-siting of cabin.**
3. **Cabin to remain ancillary to 3 Hurst Waterworks and within the same planning unit.**
4. **Hard and soft landscaping including boundary treatments to be implemented in first planting and seeding season following approval and thereafter to be permanently so maintained.**
5. **Condition to specify extent of residential curtilage of no 3 Hurst Waterworks.**
6. **Condition requiring site investigation to be carried out in accordance with approved scheme, and for a remediation strategy as necessary, to be secured within specified timescale.**
7. **Condition controlling imported soils.**

**130/25 FULL APPLICATION - EXTENSION TO THE CAR PARK AT DENNIS KNOLL CAR PARK, HOLLIN BANK ROAD, HATHERSAGE (NP/DDD/0925/0951) WE**

The Planning Officer presented the report and outlined the reasons for approval as detailed in the report. The application has been supported by data and monitoring information which showed under capacity of the site, for every car parked in the car park 2-3 cars were parked on the verge. Currently there is no mitigation for verge parking so there is an impact on the land. Verge parking could be limited by using byelaws to better enforce verge parking and to act as a deterrent along with increased liaison and education on site to encourage parking in the car park.

The tree protection plan has been viewed by the Conservation Officer and there has been a Landscape Visual Appraisal (LVA). The site would be visible throughout the year.

Some Members had visited the site the previous day.

The following points were discussed:

- There is a mature oak tree on the proposed site which would need chopping down, it was felt that to remove an oak tree to accommodate parking was not acceptable.
- Members agreed that there is currently a massive problem with road parking.
- The timeline for the Traffic Regulation Order was discussed. There is a reluctance to have a TRO due to the yellow lines however this is an effective way

of keeping cars off the verges. We own the verges around Dennis Knoll and therefore can use byelaws to enforce the parking.

- A section 101 agreement allows local authorities to transfer powers to each other; discussions are currently ongoing with DCC with a view to implementing an effective enforcement plan for the verges.
- The site is on elevated land so would be visible but this needs to be weighed against the current non-restricted parking which has no screening at all.
- Alternative layouts for the car park have been considered. The current layout does manage to protect some of the trees but it is not possible to save all of the trees so this needs to be properly mitigated.
- There was a request to see if it is possible to blur the back line of the car park so that it is not so linear.
- Members felt a management plan for the screening and planting at the Eastern End of the car park is required.
- Members felt the plans should be looked at to protect some of the larger trees on the site.

*15:30pm K Richardson left the room and returned at 15:34pm*

*15:33pm L Hartshorne left the room and returned at 15:35pm*

Members were minded to approve the application however new plans were requested to incorporate more landscaping at the eastern end of the car park along with plans to protect more of the larger trees on site.

A motion to defer the application to allow for amendments to the landscaping at the eastern end of the car park along with amendments to protect some of the larger trees on site, was moved, seconded, put to the vote and carried. The decision on the new proposals to be delegated to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Planning Committee.

**RESOLVED:**

**That the application be DEFERRED for the following reasons:**

- 1. To allow for amendments to the landscaping at the eastern end of the car-park.**
- 2. To agree amendments to protect some of the larger trees on site.**

**131/25 SADDLEWORTH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (EF)**

The Community Policy Planner presented the report. In paragraphs 4 and 23 of the report it should read Oldham Council and not Sheffield City Council.

The recommendations as set out in the report were proposed, seconded, voted on and carried.

**RESOLVED:**

- 1. To determine that Saddleworth Neighbourhood Plan (Regulation 15 submission draft) meets statutory requirements and can be subject to Regulation 16 Consultation and Examination.**

**2. Working with Oldham Council as lead authority to approve publication of and consultation on Saddleworth Neighbourhood Plan and following this to submit for Examination in accordance with The Neighbourhood Planning Regulations (2012).**

**132/25 PLANNING APPEALS MONTHLY REPORT (A.1536/BT)**

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

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

**RESOLVED:**

**To note the report.**

The meeting ended at 3.41 pm