

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 17TH MAY 2012
REGARDING PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT BETWEEN MOOR LAND AND LOW STREET.

Present : Parish Councillors B. Packham (Chairman), Mrs B. Thwaite (Vice Chairman), C. Lake, M. Hobson, K. Devers, A. Parmenter, M. Redhead, S. Haskell & P. Doherty.

Also present 10 members of the public and County Councillor Jordan.

Apologies were received from Councillors Mrs J. Brown and Mrs A. Traska.

Chairman opened the meeting and reported that this is to consider the three applications which have been received one for 498 houses, one for 100 houses and another for extension plans for Athelstan School.

The main issues this council have with these proposals are highways/services/Police/Education and also "pot of gold" possible from the developers.

The 498 housing development is basically the same as the last one.

The 100 houses do not state whether a link road will be built or even when it is felt a link road would be proposed.

The Athelstan School is for development of two storey extension on present playing fields and new playing field provision.

Chairman also stated that the Core Strategy and the Site allocation SADPD have not yet been finalised so we will be consulted before these are finalised. We need to be clear on what we want to comment on these projects.

Chairman asked that we make it clear to the planning officers and NY Education dept that they have assessed that this proposal is "future proof" and will hold all the children on this housing proposal, we do not want our children to be "bussed out" to other schools because there is not enough provision for them in the present proposals, as is happening at present at South Milford children.

Agreed that we stick by our objections and ask County to be more specific about what they see as the future for South Milford and Sherburn Schools with all the proposed developments.

He then opened the meeting for Councillors/public comments.

Councillor Devers states that if (as proposed) only 60 houses per year are built then obviously the S106 money will come in small amounts which have to be spent in the year, which would not help with any large projects. Chairman states that we have up to 5 years to spend this fund, and this could be changed by the District Council putting a specific clause in the S106 agreement. The money would be allocated first for Education and then proposals for upgrading High School facilities for open usage for the village.. Then it would be allocated for Parish projects.

Resident felt we should get a project scheme up and costed so we are ready for when monies become available.

Highways Issues

Chairman asked Councillor Doherty to report on this area, as he had done the most work on this. Councillor Doherty reports that there are 3 main problems with this proposal the traffic lights, their survey states that all traffic to Leeds will go via South Milford and also the impact of extra Trading Estate traffic. The developers survey has managed to convince NYCC that all traffic heading for Leeds will go via South Milford whereas we all know it comes to the Traffic lights, or worse still through Eversley Estate. Councillor Doherty reports that NYCC have done their own survey and it more or less agrees with builders, he had contacted NYCC asking if they check the figures match the actual traffic flow, but they state they do not have to. The survey we have done shows that the traffic lights are already stretched to near capacity. Chairman states we should also be looking at development in South Milford which at present have 171 agreed housing developments and another 115 which will be approved soon. This will also have impact on streets and traffic lights at Sherburn. Resident asked if we have South Milford "on board" with this traffic survey, Chairman states they are concerned but up to now have not wished to join forces to fight this. He would make further attempts to get them on board. Councillor Doherty had contacted 3 firms about this traffic survey, one did not, one from Wetherby came out and was very helpful but has not got the software to put a plan together. The other one David Tucker Associates which he has used up to now are interested and have the software the cost if they use our data including video footage etc would start at £250 and as they state these issues usually become protracted could be up to £750. If this goes to an appeal would possibly be very costly. Discussion took place about amount of traffic in South Milford already narrow streets, the rat runs through the estates. Councillor Doherty states if we convince Highways about traffic lights problems, they would then have to investigate rat run areas.

Agreed that Councillor Doherty go ahead and get proper costings for this project and also what it would cost if the company did a full survey using their own data. Also agreed that delegated powers be given to the Planning committee to progress this matter as it is easier to call a legal planning meeting than full council meetings.

Councillor Doherty pointed out that as the Core Strategy is not due for finalising until the 19th July and these plans have to be in by the 11th July they are actually premature to the finalised planning proposals.

County Councillor Jordan stated that some of the S106 money comes from landowners and that the schools are first in the pecking order for that. He has already raised the matter of extra traffic from the trading estate, this has increased vastly since Optaire opened up and that is just one firm on the estate, he is trying to get County to look at the traffic issues with the trading estate. He also states that the Athelstan School proposals are on the NYCC website for viewing, Councillor Haskell would put link on our website for residents to view.

Chairman asked if he could rely on the other two District Councillors to back him on our objections to the proposals for development at District Council, as they had not supported him previously when he sought to resist inappropriate development at Sherburn in full Council meetings. Both Councillor Jordan and Hobson agreed they would back him at District meetings. The only good thing about this re-presentation is it gives us more time to put proper proposals together.

Low Cost Housing

Resident asked what proportion of this housing would be low cost, Chairman stated that district council stipulate 40% but developers felt that 25% would be sufficient to meet Sherburn needs. Councillor Devers asked that it should be in any permission granted that all people who bid for this housing should

have 100% nomination rights from this village. We need affordable housing for people in this village not from outside. Councillor Lake stated that bringing in people from urban areas who are not used to semi-rural villages does not work.

Link Road

Resident asked will it be built before the 500 odd houses? Councillor Doherty reports that it will eventually be built but it would not help with Leeds Traffic and there is no commitment on any of these proposals to when this link will be built.

Summing up the objections the Chairman stated that if the development does go ahead against our wishes we should make sure we get planning gain money to address issues in the village. We should write to SDC a holding letter stating we will be making formal objections to the proposals. We should send in previous letter re-worded and include concerns of residents about

- a) **Car parking in village centre.**
- b) **More Medical and Dental facilities needed.**
- c) **Indoor Sports Facilities**
- e) **Bus services.**
- f) **Can the sewage works cope.**
- g) **Emergency services**

The Chairman thanked all present for their attendance and input and closed the meeting.