

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 9 DECEMBER 2025**

#### **Present:**

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

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

Councillor Peter Elliott  
Councillor William Jones  
Councillor Fran Petersen  
Councillor Richard Welton

#### **Also Present:**

|                |                                                      |
|----------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| D Thompson     | Assistant Director of Planning                       |
| A Kirkham      | Planning Manager - Development Management            |
| A Smith        | Legal Services Manager and Deputy Monitoring Officer |
| C Wilson       | Senior Planning Officer                              |
| T Fuller       | Senior Governance Officer                            |
| M E Derbyshire | Members ICT & Training Officer                       |

#### **PLA/ Apologies for Absence and Substitutions** **44/2**

**5-26** Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors D Cheetham and M Foster.

Councillor R Welton attended as a substitute for Councillor M Foster.

#### **PLA/ Declarations of Interest** **45/2**

**5-26** Regarding item **NED/25/00703/FL – Pilsley & Morton**, as the application was within Pilsley and Morton Ward, which Councillor A Cooper represented, Councillor Cooper would speak as Ward Councillor then leave the room and would not participate in the Committee's consideration or determination of the application.

#### **PLA/ Declaration of Predetermination** **46/2**

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

#### **PLA/ Minutes of Last Meeting** **47/2**

**5-26** RESOLVED – That the Minutes of the meeting held on 4 November 2025 were approved as a true record.

#### **PLA/ NED/25/00703/MFL - PILSLEY & MORTON** **48/2**

**5-26** The Committee considered an application that had been submitted for a Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) with an import/export capacity of up to 50MW and including associated infrastructure, engineering works, drainage, cabling,

landscaping and access (Major Development/Affecting Public Rights of Way) (Amended Title) at Hallgate Farm, Hallgate Lane, Pilsley, Chesterfield, S45 8HN. The application had been referred to Committee by Local Ward Member, Councillor K Gillott, who had raised some 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 highlighted that the proposal was supported in principle by both local and national planning policy. It was stressed that the public benefits of the proposal, in helping to manage energy supply and demand, supported the transition to net zero, and reduced reliance on fossil fuels should be attributed significant weight. Additionally, the scheme served to protect and enhance the District's natural environment and increase both the quantity and quality of biodiversity and geodiversity.

Whilst it was accepted that the scheme would have a localised impact on public rights of way and visual amenity, it was suggested that these would be mitigated against and, therefore, there was no significant adverse impact. It was also accepted that the proposal represented limited harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset and provision of agricultural land. However, officers suggested that the benefits in terms of energy security and progress toward Net Zero outweighed the harm. The report also highlighted that the development would not have a significant adverse effect on the amenity or safety of local residents.

Officers concluded that the benefits of the proposal clearly outweigh the harm. They recommended, therefore, that the application be approved subject to conditions.

Before the Committee considered the application it heard from local Ward Member, Councillor Andrew Cooper, and supporters, Martin Blunden and Claire Davies. Committee also heard from Stuart Hammond who spoke on behalf of the applicant.

Committee considered the application. It took into account the relevant Local and National Planning Policies. This included Local Plan Policy SDC 10, concerning renewable and low carbon energy generation, and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 8(c), concerning adapting to climate change.

Committee discussed the application. Some Members raised concerns regarding the recycling of batteries across the 40-year lifetime of the scheme. However, it was felt that for the proposal the benefits outweighed the harm. Some Members suggested that the benefits extended to positives for the rural economy. Some Members suggested that it would be good to see further community engagement and as much biodiversity net gain (BNG) as possible but overall supported the proposal.

At the conclusion of the discussion Councillor F Petersen and Councillor W Jones moved and seconded a Motion to approve the application, in line with officer recommendation, subject to conditions. 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 with the final wording of the conditions delegated to the Planning Manager (Development Manager).

**PLA/ NED/25/00039/FL - TUPTON**

**49/2**

**5-26**

The Committee considered an application that had been submitted for the demolition of the existing dwelling and construction of two new dwellings, and creation of a new vehicular access (Amended Plans/ Amended Title) at Holmfield, Ankerbold Road, Old Tupton, Chesterfield, S42 6BX. The application had been referred to Committee by Local Ward Member, Councillor D Hancock, who had raised some concerns.

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

Officers highlighted that the proposal represented an acceptable form of development within the defined Settlement Development Limits (SDL) of Tupton. The report suggested that the proposed development would represent an acceptable visual addition to the surroundings, would satisfactorily protect the residential amenity and would not result in any unacceptable highway safety harm.

Officers concluded that the proposal would represent a form of development that accords with the relevant Policies contained in the North East Derbyshire Local Plan and the NPPF. 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, Richard Moore, Katherine Moore and Pamela Moody.

Committee considered the application. It took into account the relevant Local and National Planning Policies. This included Local Plan Policy SDC12, concerning high quality design and place making, and Local Plan Policy SS7, concerning development on unallocated land within settlement with defined settlement development limits.

Committee discussed the application. Some Members suggested that the amenity of neighbouring properties would be significantly impacted. Some Members suggested that whilst there was an impact on amenity, it was not significant or material enough to refuse the application. Some Members supported the proposal as it contributed to housing need and lay within the SDL of Tupton.

At the conclusion of the discussion Councillor K Rouse and Councillor T Lacey moved and seconded a Motion to approve the application, in line with officer recommendation, subject to conditions. 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 with the final wording of the conditions delegated to the Planning Manager (Development Manager).

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

**50/2**

**5-26**

The Committee considered a report which set out planning appeals that had been lodged and determined. The report set out that five appeals had been lodged, no appeals had been allowed, two 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**

**51/2**

**5-26**

None.