



MINUTES

Meeting: **Planning Committee**

Date: Friday 17 July 2026 at 10.00 am

Venue: Aldern House, Baslow Road, Bakewell

Chair: M Chaplin

Present: P Brady, T Arnold, M Beer, R Bennett, Prof J Dugdale, J Garvey, B Hanley, L Hartshorne, I Huddleston, A Nash, K Potter, V Priestley and J Wharmby

Apologies for absence: M Smith.

70/26 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON FRIDAY 12 JUNE 2026

The minutes of the last meeting of the Planning Committee held on 12 June 2026 were approved as a correct record.

71/26 URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business.

72/26 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

73/26 MEMBERS DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Item 11 – Monitoring & Enforcement Quarterly Review

P Brady declared having a family connection on the enforcement report.

74/26 FULL APPLICATION - DEMOLITION OF 3 PRECAST CONCRETE GARAGES AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF TWO AFFORDABLE LOCAL NEED DWELLINGS AT LAND AT SHERWOOD ROAD AND HARDY LANE, TIDESWELL (NP/DDD/0126/0134) JK

The North Area Manager presented the report and outlined the reasons for refusal of the proposal. There had been a previous refusal for the development of two affordable dwellings in 2021 which was dismissed on appeal. Six trees on site are covered by a tree preservation order and the proposal would require the removal of three of these. The Officer recognised there is a wider need for more affordable housing, and the

development would meet some of that need however this would not outweigh the harm identified to the streetscene, Conservation Area, local biodiversity and the setting of the nearby listed building.

The following spoke under the public participation at meetings scheme:

- Robert Hopkins – Applicant

Some Members had visited the site the previous day.

Members discussed the following points:

- A site had been identified by the Local Housing Authority to provide 20 houses over two phases, which would provide for the needs of the local community.
- The trees on site were discussed and Members felt the preservation of these trees was important. Replacing these with saplings would be too much of a loss.
- Members acknowledged the need for affordable housing but felt the proposed site was not the place for this development.
- Alternative areas within the proposed site were questioned. From previous applications, development away from the trees had been proposed to help retain the majority of the mature trees but were refused and dismissed at appeal. It was concluded the site could not be developed on without having an impact on the trees.

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

RESOLVED:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

- 1. The felling of three TPO protected trees along with likely pressure from future residents for the removal or lopping of remaining protected trees would result in immediate and likely longer term significant harm to the character and appearance of the street scene, local biodiversity and the significance of the Conservation Area contrary to Policies GSP1-3, DMC13 and L1.**
- 2. The layout and the design of the development does not adequately reflect the established built form in the locality especially with regard to the parking area and wide gable massing. The proposal would therefore harm the valued character, appearance and significance of the Conservation Area, the street scene and the setting of the adjacent listed Hardy House contrary to Policies GSP1-3 & DMC3, DMC5 and DMC7.**
- 3. The substantial harm to local biodiversity contrary to Policy GSP1-3 and DMC11 from the loss of semi natural green space and the three protected mature trees which provides habitat for birds, bats and other species. The compensatory planting elsewhere in the village will not mitigate the losses from this site**
- 4. Inaccurate BNG assessment which also does not follow appropriate mitigation hierarchy in achieving net gain.**
- 5. Inadequate information to demonstrate that off-site nutrient credits are available or have been secured to demonstrate nutrient neutrality.**

6. **The development does not demonstrate that adequate vehicle and pedestrian visibility splays can be provided within land in ownership to ensure a safe access. Furthermore, no bin storage/dwell areas are proposed or secure cycle storage.**
7. **The less than substantial harm caused to the setting of Hardy House and to the significance of the Conservation Area from the loss and damage to the protected trees and the poor layout/design of the scheme is not outweighed by the public benefit arising from the limited provision of affordable housing contrary to Policies DMC5, 7, 8 and the NPPF.**
8. **Harm to the archaeological interest within the site in the absence of pre determination archaeological investigation works, alongside the harm which in itself (e.g. trenching) would likely cause harm to the root protection areas of the protected trees.**

75/26 FULL APPLICATION - CHANGE OF USE OF AGRICULTURAL BARN TO SINGLE (C3) 3-BEDROOM DWELLING WITH ASSOCIATED WORKS INCLUDING ACCESS AT LAMB HILL BARN OFF TROUBLEWOOD LANE, LOW BRADFELD (NP/S/0326/0286) HF

The North Area Senior Planner presented the report and outlined the reasons for refusal of the proposal. At present there is an enforcement case which opened in November 2025 regarding the creation of an unauthorised track leading up to the barn. The Officer clarified that the applicant did not consider the track to be unauthorised as there had previously been a track present. It was noted there is a proposal to create an amenity area which was not outlined within the submitted plan at the time of application. This area would be East of the barn. Within the report there had not been a reference to the two king post trusses within the barn. Indication had been made within the structural report submitted that these would be retained.

The barn has been identified as a non-designated heritage.

Since the report was published, a response had been received from the planning agent, however due to timings, this had not been considered prior to committee.

The following spoke under the public participation at meetings scheme:

- Charlotte Williamson – Applicant
- Mark Bowen – Supporter
- Caroline McIntyre – Supporter

The following points were noted:

- The Officer confirmed in some cases tracks can be permitted development either for agricultural use or maintenance and alteration of private ways., however neither was considered to apply in this case.
- Funding of up to 80% from Farming in Protected Landscapes (FiPL) could support the restoration of the barn to retain an agricultural and low-intensity use.
- Reference to scheme for 20 homes in Low Bradfield and the impact of this on addressing local housing needs.

Some Members had visited the site and stopped to view the Water Treatment Works at Low Bradfield the previous day

Members discussed the following points:

- Some Members sympathised with the applicant and what they were trying to achieve. The preservation of the landscape was discussed and concerns were voiced over the impact both the access road and dwelling would have on the landscape.
- Comments on the open enforcement case against the track were made, Officers stated that a decision would be made whether or not that this would be pursued if the application was to be refused.
- Members felt a number of the concerns raised in the Officer's report could be addressed by conditions. Screening around the track and amenity area were suggested.
- The materials used on the track were discussed, it was mentioned plastic and metal had been used to fill the track and Members felt damage to the surrounding ecology had already occurred.
- Some Members had visited the site the day before and concluded the barn and track were very prominent from numerous viewpoints and it would be difficult to screen in an appropriate way. In addition, it was mentioned, there would be considerable land movement to create the proposed plans which would be highly visible.
- Members felt from the report it was unclear as to why the barn was a non-designated heritage asset and if refused, what the future of the barn would be.
- With there being an open enforcement case on the site with regards to the track, Members felt an application could not be accepted especially as suitable access was not possible at the time of the application.
- Members made a point of the barn being in a condition that may require considerable work which would result in a near new build rather than a barn conversion.

A motion was made by the Members to defer the application to allow for further discussions.

A motion to defer the application was moved, seconded, put to the vote and lost.

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

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 result in unacceptable harm to the setting of a non-designated heritage asset and to the character and appearance of the landscape, and that harm is not outweighed as part of the planning balance. The development is contrary to Core Strategy Policies GSP1, GSP3, L1 and L3; Development Management Policies DMC3, DMC5, DMT3 and DMT8; the Conversions SPD and NPPF.**

G Priestly declared they had received an email from a Joel Williamson on 15 July, which was not previously mentioned.

11:34am the meeting was adjourned and recommenced at 11:44am

11:40am – A Nash left the meeting

Item 9 was moved ahead of item 8.

76/26 S.73 APPLICATION FOR THE REMOVAL OF CONDITION 3 ON NP/DDD/0723/0788 AT SPITTLEHOUSE BRIDGE (BRIDGE MAS/25) NORTH OF A6187 HATHERSAGE ROAD, HATHERSAGE (NP/DDD/0326/0323) JK

The North Area Manager presented the report and outlined the reasons for approval of the proposal. Minimum clearance of 4,012mm was set in 2023, upon completion and from a survey carried out on site, the actual clearance is 3,870mm. It was noted the existing bridge clearance is lower than the new bridge clearance however there is an incline which may have an impact on longer vehicles. An amended drawing was requested to demonstrate the impact on the clearance of longer vehicles and the neighbour's effluent tanker. Due to the late submission of the plan, the public consultation period had not ended at the time of committee.

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 subject to the following conditions and provided no new representations contrary to the recommendation are received before the end of the re-consultation period; And that any which are received are delegated to the Head of Conservation and Planning to consider in consultation with Chair/Vice Chair of Planning Committee before issue of the decision.

- 1. The development hereby approved shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the following approved plans; the 'Visualisation of Proposed Structure' drawing No 136126-2885-BAM-0000-DRG-T-LP-040004-P01, the 'General Arrangement Drawing' No 136126-2885-BAM-0000-DRG-T-LP 040002 Rev P01, as amended by the drawing titled MAS 25 - TOPOGRAPHICAL AS BUILT SURVEY & BRIDGE SOFFIT CLEARANCES TO A 25M CHORD (received on the 6/7/26) and the 'Outline drawing – wing wall sheet 2 drawing no 136 126-2885-BAM-0000-DRG-C-ST-043024 Rev P04.1 subject to the following modifications and/or conditions;**
- 2. The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the existing construction management plans and ecological management plans approved under discharge applications ref NP/DIS/0721/0831, NP/DIS/0821/0918 and NP/DIS/0921/1041.**

B Hanley stated one of the parish councillors involved was from Hathersage Parish Council where they sit as a councillor and so abstained from voting.

77/26 FULL APPLICATION - CHANGE OF USE OF THE FIELD TO PROVIDE A SMALL-SCALE, SEASONAL TOURING CARAVAN AND CAMPING SITE AT YEW TREE FARM, WETTON (NP/SM/0526/0467) MN

The South Area Principal Planner presented the report and outlined the reasons for refusal of the proposal. The site is currently used as a campsite under permitted development rights for 60 days a year. There had been an erection of a building in support of the 60-day campsite but this has not been removed from the site when not in use as is required under the provisions of the GPDO and does not otherwise benefit from planning permission. Due to the openness of the site and lack of tree planting, the campsite would be highly visible from public rights of way and screening through tree planting would be inappropriate for the landscape. Concerns were made around noise pollution and the impact this would have on neighbouring properties, no assessment or measures were submitted as part of the application. The application was made by the applicant under the impression it would be exempt from Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) regulations, however, following consultation this is not the case.

The following spoke under the public participation at meetings scheme:

- Graham Stubbs – Applicant

Members discussed the following points:

- The openness and lack of screening was mentioned and having a more permanent campsite would intrude on the landscape. Suggestions of there being more appropriate and less prominent sites were made.
- Members voiced support for the rural economy and small businesses and the proposal would make farming more economically sustainable within the area. Support from the local community was highlighted.
- Suggestion of concerns raised in the officer's report, particularly around the lack of screening, could be addressed through amendment.
- Members discussed the enforcement enquiry of the erection of the building as well as the lack of BNG report and felt these would need to be resolved before making a decision.
- Members queried whether other sites had been looked at which would have less landscape impact. It was noted other land had not been explored as part of the pre-application process.

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

RESOLVED:

That the application be DEFERRED and delegated power to the Head of Planning, Development and Enforcement Manager and South Area Manager to approve the application on a reduced seasonal basis, in consultation with chair and vice chair, subject to achieving a satisfactory amenity building, landscaping and submission and acceptance of the required Biodiversity Net Gain information.

78/26 HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION - TWO-STOREY EXTENSION BUILT TO THE REAR OF EXISTING HOUSE, AND CREATION OF PARKING SPACE AT HUNSTONE HOUSE, WINSTER (NP/DDD/0526/0482) MN

The South Area Principal Planner presented the report and outlined the reasons for approval of the proposal. The title of the report was incorrect and should state Householder Application - A single-storey rear extension built into the higher rear level of the garden, Hunstone House East Bank Winster (NP/DDD/0526/0482)". In addition to this change, the report author should state Charlotte Clarke. It was noted that on the elevation plans the chimney is missing, and clarified that a chimney is present on the property and will be retained. The proposal to reduce the size of the first-floor window is more in-keeping with the characteristic of the property. The design had been amended by the applicant from discussions with Officers following refusal of the previous application for extension, and the updated proposal is more sympathetic to the wider environment. There had been a response to the submitted report in relation to an error on one of the measurements within paragraph 58. The report should state a 7.5m gap between the proposed extension and the neighbour's rear amenity space.

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 subject to the to the following conditions:

- 1. 3-year implementation period**
- 2. Adopt amended plans**
- 3. The new window in the eastern elevation of the extension shall be obscure glazed.**
- 4. The rainwater goods shall be of black cast metal.**
- 5. Materials and pointing to match the existing in appearance.**
- 6. The new and replacement windows proposed shall be of timber construction, with central glazing bar (set external to the glazing) to first floor window.**
- 7. Detailed design of new back door to be approved.**
- 8. All new retaining walls shall be faced with natural limestone rubble to all external faces.**

12:23pm – L Hartshorne left the meeting

79/26 MONITORING & ENFORCEMENT QUARTERLY REVIEW - JULY 2026 (A.1533/AM)

The Committee considered the Quarterly Enforcement report covering the quarter April – June 2026.

Members discussed the following points:

- Members were pleased to see the continued progress and complimented everyone on the enforcement team.
- Members noted the increase in enquiries, there was no definitive answer as to why there was an increase, it was suggested more development may be carried

out at that time of year and the team would look into this and report back to Members.

RESOLVED:

1. That the report be noted.

80/26 PLANNING APPEALS MONTHLY REPORT (A.1536/BT)

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

Members were advised to forward any emails in relation to appeals to the Legal Team.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the report be noted.

81/26 PLANNING APPEALS ANNUAL REPORT (A.1536/BT)

The committee considered the annual report on planning appeals lodged, withdrawn and decided.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the report be noted.

The meeting ended at 12:39