

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 4 NOVEMBER 2025**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Lee Hartshorne (Chair) (in the Chair)  
Councillor Tony Lacey (Vice-Chair)

Councillor David Cheetham  
Councillor Peter Elliott  
Councillor Fran Petersen

Councillor Andrew Cooper  
Councillor Christine Gare  
Councillor Kathy Rouse

#### **Also Present:**

D Thompson	Assistant Director of Planning
A Smith	Legal Services Manager and Deputy Monitoring Officer
G Cooper	Team Leader (Development Management)
S Wigglesworth	Senior Planning Officer
A Bryan	Governance Manager
T Fuller	Senior Governance Officer

#### **PLA/ Apologies for Absence and Substitutions**

**37/2**

**5-26** Apologies for absence were received from Councillors M Foster, W Jones and H Liggett.

Councillor N Baker attended as a substitute for Councillor M Foster. Councillor S Clough attended as a substitute for Councillor W Jones.

#### **PLA/ Declarations of Interest**

**38/2**

**5-26** There were no declarations of interest.

#### **PLA/ Declaration of Predetermination**

**39/2**

**5-26** There were no declarations of predetermination.

#### **PLA/ Minutes of Last Meeting**

**40/2**

**5-26** RESOLVED – That the Minutes of the meeting held on 30 September 2025 were approved as a true record.

#### **PLA/ NED/25/00707/FL - SHIRLAND**

**41/2**

**5-26** The Committee considered an application that had been submitted for the retention and completion of an existing structure to form a hay, feed and implement store at land approximately 100m west of Yew Tree Farm, Quarry Lane, Woolley Moor. The application had been referred to Committee by Local Ward Member, Councillor C Cupit, on the basis of the complex history of the site. An update report had been circulated which set out late representations regarding the application.

The recommendation by officers was to refuse the application. The report to Committee explained the reasons for this.

The report contended that the proposal was not designed for the purposes of modern agriculture and insufficient evidence had put forward to indicate that the building was required to ensure the viability of an existing agricultural business. The report also contended that the proposal would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape, which was within a primary Area of Multiple Environmental Sensitivity (AMES) and sensitive to such change.

Officers concluded that the proposal was contrary to the policies of the development plan. They recommended, therefore, that the application be refused.

Before the Committee considered the application it heard from supporter, Raymond Barlow, and the Agent, Jon Millhouse.

Committee considered the application. It took into account the relevant Local and National Planning Policies. These included Local Plan policy SS9, concerning development in the countryside, and Local Plan policy SDC 12, concerning High Quality Design and Place Making.

Committee discussed the application. Some Members suggested that the form of the building was not consistent with modern agriculture usage. In this context, it was considered that the proposal did not accord with the policies of the Local Plan.

At the conclusion of the discussion Councillor L Hartshorne and Councillor T Lacey moved and seconded a Motion to refuse the application, in line with officer recommendation. The Motion was put to a vote and approved.

#### RESOLVED –

That planning permission be **refused** for the following reasons.

1. The applicant has no significant agricultural land holding in the locality from which to generate the need for an agricultural building in this location and the proposed building is not considered to be suitable for modern agricultural purposes, this is because of its design, its size, its openings and its traditional stone construction. It is also noted that the site is in an isolated location away from any groups of existing agricultural building. The agricultural justification provided is not accepted because it proposes the building for use by neighbouring farmsteads rather than for the applicant and therefore the building by virtue of its design, siting, and the submitted justification has not been proven to be necessary for the efficient or viable operation of agriculture and is therefore contrary to Local Plan Policies SS2 and SS9 and the NPPF particularly paras 135, 139 and 187.

2. The proposed building is located away from any group of existing agricultural buildings and open to public view, located next to a public right of way and at a site which skylines when viewed from Quarry Lane. By virtue of the buildings design and siting the proposal would result in harm to the character and

appearance of the area including the landscape (primary AMES) and is therefore contrary to Local Plan Policies SS9, SDC3, SDC12 and Brackenfield Neighbourhood Plan Policy CH1 and the NPPF particularly paras 135, 139 and 187.

**PLA/ Planning Appeals - Lodged and Determined**

**42/2**

**5-26**

The Committee considered a report which set out planning appeals that had been lodged and determined. The report set out that no appeals had been lodged, no appeals had been allowed, four appeals had been dismissed, and no appeals had been withdrawn. The relevant applications the appeals were in respect of was set out in the report.

**PLA/ Matters of Urgency**

**43/2**

**5-26**

None.