

## MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 16 FEBRUARY 2015 AT 7.00PM IN THE PARISH OFFICE

**Present:** Councillors P Doherty (Chairman), Mrs J Prescott, Mrs M Hunt, S Haskell, R Packham and Mrs S Hoyland (Project Officer).

1. **Apologies for absence** - Councillors C Lake and M Gibson.
2. **Declarations of Interest** - None.
3. **Plans for discussion:**
  - **2014/1091/REM** - Amended Plans - Reserved matters application (condition 2) for the erection of 120 dwellings together with an application to discharge conditions 3 (materials), 4 (site preparation), 5 (flood risk assessment), 6 (drainage), 7 (drainage), 8 (surface water), 9 (outfall structures), 10 (archaeological works), 11 (landscaping), 12 (investigation report), 14 (energy supply) and 15 (site levels) of application 2012/0468/EIA for outline application for the erection of a residential development of 120 No. dwellings and associated parking and public open space at **Land off Carousel Walk, Sherburn in Elmet. Comments agreed and submitted on 15 January 2015 - No objection to these amendments.**
  - **2014/1120/FUL** - Amended Drawings Consultation - Erection of 3 bed detached house with shared drive in the grounds of **51 Moor Lane, Sherburn in Elmet. Comments agreed and submitted on 21 January 2015 - No objection to amended drainage layout.**
  - **2015/0034/HPA** - Proposed first floor extension to form additional bedroom at **9 Moor Lane, Sherburn in Elmet. Comments agreed and submitted on 2 February 2015 - The Parish Council has some concerns about this proposal particularly in light of the previous refusal. In particular we note:-**
    1. **The plans are poor quality and the use of rooms is not specified.**
    2. **If the eastern most window in the south elevation is to be a bedroom, will it look into the rear windows of the adjacent property?**
    3. **Will the extension effectively be occupied as a separate dwelling?**
    4. **The design, in so far as it is possible to assess it on the basis of the submitted drawings, is poor.****In order to comment further we would suggest that you request a block plan showing the relationship to the adjacent property and the location of car parking and a floor plan showing use of rooms of the host dwelling and the "extension" (existing and proposed).**
4. **Decisions from Selby District/North Yorkshire:**
  - **2014/1232/LBC** - Listed building consent to facilitate the installation of 6No. rooflights at **4 Finkle Hill, Sherburn in Elmet - Granted.**
  - **2014/1231/FUL** - Installation of 6No. rooflights at **4 Finkle Hill, Sherburn in Elmet - Granted.**
  - **2014/1293/FUL** - Proposed location of sub-station to the rear of Plot 20 **Street Record, Low Street, Sherburn in Elmet - Granted.**

- **2014/1301/TPO** Application for consent to fell a dead Beech tree and carry out remedial works to a further 20No. Beech trees, 3No. Ash trees and 5No. Horse Chestnut trees under TPO37/1989 on land at junction with **Low Street, New Lane, Sherburn in Elmet - Authorised subject to conditions.**
- **2014/1121/EIA** - Section 73 application for the variation of Conditions 5 (flood risk assessment) and Condition 13 (design parameters) of approval 2012/0468/EIA for outline application for the erection of a residential development of 120 No. dwellings and associated parking and public open space at **Land off Carousel Walk, Sherburn in Elmet. - Granted.**
- **2014/1091/REM** - Reserved matters application (condition 2) for the erection of 120 dwellings together with an application to discharge conditions 3 (materials), 4 (site preparation), 5 (flood risk assessment), 6 (drainage), 7 (drainage), 8 (surface water), 9 (outfall structures), 10 (archaeological works), 11 (landscaping), 12 (investigation report), 14 (energy supply) and 15 (site levels) of application 2012/0468/EIA for outline application for the erection of a residential development of 120 No. dwellings and associated parking and public open space at **Land off Carousel Walk, Sherburn in Elmet - Granted.**
- **2014/0902/HAZ** - Application for consent under the Planning (Hazardous Substances) Act 1990 for the storage and use of substances at **Street Record, Moor Lane Trading Estate, Sherburn in Elmet - Granted.**
- **2014/1149/HPA** - Proposed single storey rear extension at **6 Heather Drive, Sherburn in Elmet - Granted.**
- **2014/1179/HPA** - Alterations and extension to form day room, utility room and cloakroom/WC at **49 Eversley Garth Crescent, Sherburn in Elmet - Granted.**
- **2014/1198/COU** - Retrospective change of use from hairdressers to estate agents (A1 to A2), change of shop front, doors/windows and remodelling of downstairs layout at **34 Low Street, Sherburn in Elmet - Granted.**
- **2014/1133/FUL** - Warehouse units Phase 2, Plots 2 & 3 at **Tornado House, Moxon Way, Sherburn in Elmet - Granted.**
- **2014/1290/FUL** - Proposed external alterations, general reconfiguration and improvement works to existing office/storage unit at **10 Swordfish Way, Sherburn in Elmet - Granted.**
- **2014/1235/FUL** - Section 73 application for variation of conditions 6 (Highways), 8 (Access), 11 (Highway Works), 24 (Archaeological Works), 25 (Archaeological Scheme of Investigation), 27 (Remediation Scheme), 32 (Boundary Treatments), 38 (Drawings) and removal of condition 10 (Groundworks) of approval 2013/0467/OUT outline application including access for B2/B8 use with ancillary offices (1,250,000sq.ft.) creation of a new bridge access and site infrastructure works at **Land at Former Airfield, Lennerton Lane, Sherburn in Elmet - Granted.**

5. **Plan Selby:**
  - **It was noted that agreed comments had been submitted on 15 January 2015 as appended herewith. An acknowledgment has been received and reference number 60 allocated.**
  
6. **Date of next meeting:**  
**Monday 16 March 2015 at 6.30pm** (before the PC meeting and if there are applications to discuss).

**SELBY DISTRICT COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION**  
**Comments on PLAN Selby submitted by Sherburn in Elmet Parish Council 15**  
**January 2015**

**Contact Details:**

Name: Sherburn in Elmet Parish Council  
Address: Eversley Park Centre, Low Street, Sherburn in Elmet, North Yorkshire  
Postcode: LS25 6BA  
Telephone no: 01977 681024  
Email address: clerk@sherburninemet-pc.gov.uk

**Comments:**

**Q39 a) How should Sherburn in Elmet grow and develop – what could a vision say?**

**b) What else is needed in Sherburn in Elmet that could be allocated a site?**

The Parish Council is of the view that no further housing or employment allocations will be required in Sherburn prior to 2027 purely on the basis of Core Strategy numbers (but please see response to question 24), as there is no logical reason to discount Sherburn allocations by 10% (see response to question 7). In Sherburn there is a need to consider how the services and facilities in the village can now be improved to address the existing shortfall and the proposed 30% increase in population and the vast over-provision of employment land.

The Parish Council wishes to be involved at all stages in the assessment of current services and facilities to meet current needs and those generated by the allocation of large housing estates.

We welcome the planning permission granted to ALDI on Low Street but would highlight the following matters that need to be addressed to ensure that there are adequate services and facilities to serve a population that is likely to reach 10000 within the plan period and will also need to serve the population of adjacent service villages that have already grown and are proposed for further growth (particularly South Milford and Church Fenton).

- The village is in need of indoor and outdoor leisure facilities. We would again highlight that we have no leisure centre whilst the High school pool is small and requires replacement. The community and the High School are working together to provide a large all weather pitch and it is understood that the District Council support this, but more needs to be done. There is also a need to look for an alternative location for an additional grass pitch and Club house for Sherburn Bears Amateur Rugby League club as they are growing fast and need a better quality pitch than that at Eversley Park
- There is a need to improve road links. Realistically the only option is to improve access to the A1 at Lumby and the road improvements needed to achieve this need to be considered.
- We have 2 railway stations, South Milford (should be Sherburn South) and Sherburn in Elmet and these could provide great links to Leeds, York, Selby and further afield. The District Council should support SADRUG to improve

both the quality of the stations and more importantly the services. Additional parking is also required (see answer to Q.25)

- There is a need for a Household Waste Re-cycling Centre to serve the south western part of Selby District. The logical location is Sherburn. Whilst this is a County matter the District Council should work with the County to achieve this.
- The cemetery at All Saints Church is nearly full. It is imperative that a new site is allocated and developed in the next two or three years if Sherburn residents are to be able to continue to be laid to rest in the village.

**This Initial Consultation focuses on Six Key Topic areas which are discussed in turn in this chapter:**

- Topic 1 T1 Providing Homes**
- Topic 2 T2 Promoting Prosperity**
- Topic 3 T3 Defining Areas for Promoting Development and Protecting Key Assets**
- Topic 4 T4 Infrastructure Needs**
- Topic 5 T5 Climate Change and Renewable Energy**
- Topic 6 T6 Protecting and Enhancing the Environment**

**Q6 a) Are these the right topics?**

**b) Is this a comprehensive list?**

**c) Which ones are most important and which ones are less relevant?**

The Parish Council is strongly of the view that the promotion of growth, whilst a relevant aspiration, should be carried out in a balanced way and protection of the environment, ensuring that infrastructure (and services and facilities) needs are equally important and should precede development.

**3.16 The Core Strategy minimum targets above form the basis of this Initial Consultation, but as more evidence is brought to light as the Plan progresses (for example the new Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) which is programmed for later this year), there may need to be adjustments made to the minimum targets.**

**Q7 a) Do you agree with the proposed approach to the base date?**

**b) Do you agree with the broad principles of the calculation method?**

Discounting of all planning permissions by 10% is not justified. Where large sites have detailed planning permission it is very unlikely that there will be a 10% shortfall – the whole site is likely to be developed with the specified number of houses within the plan period. We note that in Sherburn this 10% discount generates a further allocation of 60 dwellings. There is no logic to this approach – whilst typically smaller sites are sometimes not developed, large sites either aren't developed at all or are built out. We object to a further allocation of 60 units.

**Q8 a) Should PLAN Selby over-allocate to allow for any non-delivery on the allocations? By what method and by how much?**

- b) How should PLAN Selby seek to allocate sites in such a way as to secure delivery over the whole plan period?**
- c) Is there opportunity to have contingency sites in case others are not delivered elsewhere in the District? How might the contingency sites release be managed to maintain a 5 year housing land supply.**

We oppose the allocation of “contingency sites”. In practice these will just be the subject of early release. Whilst we accept that the Core Strategy figure is a minimum, it is pointless having any figure if large areas of additional land are to be identified. If delivery occurs too quickly (which frankly is unlikely in the present climate) a proper review of the plan should be undertaken. Otherwise a potential outcome will be land-banking, a large number of partially developed sites, and a lack of choice of sites in any review.

**Q9 a) Is a simple percentage growth across all Designated Service Villages a fair and appropriate starting point for deciding the split between the DSVs?**

**b) Bearing in mind issues such as land availability, flood risk and other technical constraints (e.g. highways capacity and access) are there particular criteria that should be taken into account in assessing the final *minimum target* for Designated Service Villages**

Percentage growth in Designated Service villages has little justification in planning terms. It is essential that allocations are based on a thorough assessment of settlement capacity taking account of constraints and availability of services and facilities. (This should have been the approach in the main settlements).

**Q11 In Tadcaster, three phases are proposed. Phase 1 and the contingency phase 2 are to be in Tadcaster and will follow the site selection methodology referred to in the previous section. However, how should PLAN Selby determine where the contingency Phase 3 sites should be located?**

The achievement of the District wide minimum requirement is not necessarily based on the need for sites in Tadcaster to come forward in total, particularly if a 10% contingency is to be built in anyway. In view of this there is likely to be no need for Phase 3 contingency, and as stated previously contingency sites are likely to be developed whether they are needed or not. If Tadcaster under-achieves, the starting point should be whether that impacts on the ability of the District as a whole to achieve the minimum requirement. If that is the case then clearly a Plan review will be required. Otherwise, it is a problem for Tadcaster, not Sherburn or other settlements, and there is no basis for other settlements to address the problem. In practice the Council should be ensuring that Tadcaster does meet its minimum requirement so that housing requirements (and in particular affordable housing needs) can be addressed in the location where Tadcaster residents want to live.

**Paragraph 3.74: The Council also supports the reuse of the former Gascoigne Wood mine, provided this is directly linked to the use of the existing rail infrastructure at the site.**

Sherburn Parish Council supports this approach. Unfortunately, the permissions granted on this site have failed to ensure this and we have no confidence that the District Council will ensure that this is the case.

**Paragraph 3.92 In tandem with further housing and employment development at Sherburn in Elmet, it is critically important that there is sufficient infrastructure and facilities in place to cater for any growth.**

Sherburn Parish Council has expressed this view on a regular basis for many years without the support of the District Council, and we are now in a position where there are planning permissions for large housing developments (meeting the minimum requirement) and employment development (at least 3 times greater than the Core Strategy requirement) but there has been little attempt to address the service and infrastructure requirements.

We live in hope that the District Council has now recognised that simply building houses and providing employment without appropriate infrastructure (including roads as well as services and facilities) is NOT sustainable development. We look forward to working with the County and District Councils to address their past mistakes.

**Q22 Should the Development Limits be drawn tightly to maintain the settlement pattern, or loosely around the settlements to enable sympathetic development?**

Development limits should be drawn on the basis of agreed criteria which enable them to reflect the situation on the ground. Sometimes these will be tight to existing development (e.g. adjacent to green belt,) and on other occasions much looser, to include degraded and derelict land where sympathetic development can improve the character of the area.

**Q24 How should PLAN Selby determine how much Safeguarded Land should be designated for potential future use?**

A good starting point would be to look at the capacity of existing safeguarded land. At present there are large areas of safeguarded land at Sherburn, far exceeding that required to meet the minimum requirement by 2027, even if the additional 60 units which have suddenly appeared in Plan Selby are allocated. There is no need to identify additional safeguarded land in Sherburn. The remaining safeguarded land should provide sufficient options long past 2027.

It is noted that the issue of Green Belt boundaries is to be the subject of further consultation but the Parish Council wish to comment on this issue in the context of its response relating to Safeguarded Land. Given the extent of safeguarded land it is our view that with 2 exceptions there is no basis for Green belt amendments at Sherburn. The exceptions are:

- The land between the railway and the by pass, south of the former Bacon Factory Pond, has been development as the By-Pass Business Park. This land is in the Green Belt. The Council considers this to be anomalous and would suggest a detailed assessment of the Green Belt boundary in this location to establish which parts of the site no longer fulfil a Green Belt function.

- Land west of Sherburn between Garden Lane and New Lane, adjacent to the High School, is occupied by Mytum and Selby, a recycling business. Part of the Mytum and Selby site is within the Green Belt and part is within the development limits. To the north of this site is an area of safeguarded land adjacent to Garden Lane, which is one of the few areas west of the village which is not in the locally important landscape area. The Council would support the allocation of the Mytum and Selby site for residential use, together with the adjacent safeguarded land, provided an alternative site could be found for the business on the industrial estate, and subject to an assessment of the traffic impacts on the village of such an allocation.

**Q25 Are there any infrastructure requirements that have not been identified, including small scale and local needs?**

See references above (Q39A):

- The village is in need of indoor and outdoor leisure facilities. We would again highlight that we have no leisure centre whilst the High school pool is small and requires replacement. The community and the High School are working together to provide a large all weather pitch and it is understood that the District Council support this, but more needs to be done. See also comments at Q39A relating to Sherburn Bears Amateur Rugby League Football Club
- There is a need to improve road links. Realistically the only option is to improve access to the A1 at Lumby and the road improvements needed to achieve this need to be considered.
- We have 2 railway stations, South Milford (should be Sherburn South) and Sherburn in Elmet and these could provide great links to Leeds, York, Selby and further afield. The District Council should support SADRUG to improve both the quality of the stations and more importantly the services.
- The 2011 IDP described the provision of additional car parking as a priority at the South Milford Railway Station. The latest draft downgrades this to "The Railway Station will require improvements should its use be impacted upon by significant development in the surrounding area particularly in terms of additional car parking." There are already parking problems and it is clear that the additional housing will add significantly to the problem, so we think it needs to be addressed now, rather than waiting for the inevitable. The same issues applies to Sherburn in Elmet Station
- There is a need for a Household Waste Re-cycling Centre to serve the south western part of Selby District. The logical location is Sherburn. Whilst this is a County matter the District Council should work with the County to achieve this.
- The cemetery at All Saints Church is nearly full. It is imperative that a new site is allocated and developed in the next two or three years if Sherburn residents are to be able to continue to be laid to rest in the village.

**Q27 a) Is this comprehensive? Are there other environmental assets that should be afforded some protection or have a policy basis?**

**b) Are the existing policies in the Core Strategy sufficient to protect these environmental assets or are further detailed policies**

**necessary?**

The Parish Council consider that detailed surveys and policies are required to protect environmental and heritage assets. There are a number of woods and other wildlife habitats that should be the subject of such protection in the Parish.

**Q29 Is there a case for PLAN Selby to consider developing a Local List for heritage assets?**

There are many heritage assets in Selby District that enjoy no protection. In Sherburn there is no conservation area and few listed buildings but that does not mean that there are no features that are important for retention for both aesthetic, cultural and community reasons. (The Old School on Kirkgate is a good example). Local communities should be consulted as to what they consider are the heritage assets worthy of protection in their area.

**Q31 Should PLAN Selby include policies for setting specific house types and sizes, tenures and specialist housing such as care homes and Self builds?**

Yes. These needs must be addressed.

**Q33 a) Should PLAN Selby have more detailed general policies on design by being more specific about the minimum design standards it will seek to achieve, including policy on development density, environmental and quality design benchmarks (such as BREEAM, Lifetime Homes, Secure By Design etc.)?**

**b) Should PLAN Selby establish design requirements in the new allocated sites that consider the layout, orientation and aesthetic of development proposals?**

Yes to both. Such policies are long overdue.

#### **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

The Practice Manager on behalf of the Doctors at the Sherburn Group Practice, The Medical Centre, Beech Grove, Sherburn in Elmet confirmed to us by email dated 8 January 2015 that the Partners were concerned that Plan Selby did not highlight the increased demands on the Healthcare provision within Sherburn in Elmet future developments. They specifically highlighted the lack of communication in regard to the provision of s.106 money to healthcare providers within future developments and stated that if future developments go ahead then provision must be made to all healthcare providers in the area to support the increase in population.

**Signed: MARGARET GIBSON, Clerk to Sherburn in Elmet Parish Council**

**Dated: 15 January 2015.**