

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 29 JULY 2025

Present:

Councillor Tony Lacey (Vice Chair) (in the Chair)

Councillor Tony Lacey
Councillor Andrew Cooper
Councillor Christine Gare
Councillor Heather Liggett
Councillor Kathy Rouse

Councillor David Cheetham
Councillor Mark Foster
Councillor William Jones
Councillor Fran Petersen

Also Present:

A Kirkham	Planning Manager - Development Management
A Bryan	Governance Manager
P Slater	Principal Planning Officer
C Wilson	Senior Planning Officer
T Fuller	Governance Officer
M E Derbyshire	Members ICT & Training Officer

PLA/ Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

20/2

5-26 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors L Hartshorne and P Elliott.

Councillor M Durrant attended as a substitute for Councillor L Hartshorne.
Councillor N Baker attended as a substitute for Councillor P Elliott.

PLA/ Declarations of Interest

21/2

5-26 There were no declarations of interest.

PLA/ Declaration of Predetermination

22/2

5-26 There were no declarations of predetermination.

PLA/ Minutes of Last Meeting

23/2

5-26 RESOLVED – That the Minutes of the meeting held on 24 June 2025 were approved as a true record.

PLA/ NED/25/00479/FL - Tupton

24/2

5-26 The Committee considered an application that had been submitted for a two-year temporary permission for a waste refuse vehicle hub, conversion of storeroom to welfare facility and new access ramp, at Pioneer House, Mill Lane, Wingerworth. The application had been referred to Committee as it had been submitted on behalf of North East Derbyshire District Council and objections had been received.

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

The report contended that the 2-year temporary permission for a refuse hub at the Pioneer House car park would be an appropriate form of development within the Avenue Strategic site. Officers accepted that there would be an impact on residential amenity as a result of the scheme, however this impact was deemed acceptable and short term.

Officers concluded that the proposal was acceptable as there were no matters that outweighed its compliance with the Development Plan. They recommended, therefore, that the application be approved subject to conditions.

Before the Committee considered the application it heard from Joy Redfern who was speaking as the applicant.

Committee considered the application. It took into account the relevant Local and National Planning Policies. This included Local Plan Policy ID3, concerning sustainable travel.

Committee discussed the application. Some Members suggested that the proposal would have an adverse impact on traffic as a result of refuse vehicles using the smaller roads that surround the site as cut throughs. In this context it was suggested that a routing agreement be put in place via condition to prevent refuse vehicles over a certain weight using particular roads, except when on duty or in exceptional circumstances. Committee agreed that this would be an appropriate condition.

At the conclusion of the discussion Councillor N Baker and Councillor M Foster moved and seconded a Motion to approve the application, in line with officer recommendation, subject to a routing agreement condition. The Motion was put to a vote and approved.

RESOLVED – That planning permission be **conditionally approved** subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report, along with an additional condition regarding a routing agreement, with the final wording of the conditions delegated to the Planning Manager (Development Manager).

PLA/ NED/25/00415/FL - Tupton

25/2

5-26

The Committee considered a retrospective application that had been submitted for siting an InPost Parcel Locker at Unit 5, Ankerbold Road, Old Tupton, Chesterfield. The application had been referred to Committee by Local Ward Member, Councillor D Hancock, on the basis of highway safety concerns. An update report had been circulated which set out late representations regarding the application.

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

The report contended the parcel locker would represent an acceptable visual

addition to the area. Officers accepted that the proposed development would result in increased levels of activity within the vicinity of the site, such activity would not result in any significant harm to the existing residential amenity levels of properties in the locality. Officers also suggested that development would not result in any unacceptable impact on highway safety in the vicinity, in line with the consultation response from DCC Highways Officers.

Officers concluded that the proposal represented an acceptable form of development within the defined Settlement Development Limits of Tupton. They recommended, therefore, that the application be approved subject to conditions.

Before the Committee considered the application it heard from Local Ward Member, Councillor David Hancock, and objectors Jeffrey Fagan and Norman Hill.

Committee considered the application. It took into account the relevant Local and National Planning Policies. These included Local Plan Policy ID3, concerning sustainable travel, and National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 116, concerning impact on highway safety.

Committee discussed the application. Some Members suggested that a need for a parcel locker in this location was lacking, and that it was having an unacceptable impact on local amenity. Some Members felt that more evidence was needed on the impact on highway safety in order to consider the application properly. In this context, it was suggested that the application be deferred in order for more evidence to be collected and a Traffic Impact assessment to be conducted. Committee discussed the likelihood of the parcel locker being the root cause of highway safety concerns in the vicinity. It was suggested that this uncertainty supported the proposition of allowing more time to gather evidence.

At the conclusion of the discussion Councillor M Foster and Councillor H Liggett moved and seconded a Motion to defer the application until a traffic impact assessment had been completed by the applicant. The Motion was put to a vote and approved.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred and the applicant be requested to complete and submit a traffic impact assessment.

PLA/ Planning Appeals - Lodged and Determined

26/2

5-26

The Committee considered a report which set out planning appeals that had been lodged and determined. The report set out that one appeal had been lodged, one appeal had been allowed, three 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

27/2

5-26

None.