

SHERBURN-IN-ELMET PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE SHERBURN IN ELMET PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 17TH JULY 2017 AT 6.00PM IN THE PARISH COUNCIL OFFICE

Present: Councillors – P Doherty (Chair), L Wake, C Lake, D. Buckle, K Devers, M Hunt and Anne-Marie Oldroyd (Community Development Manager).

1. Apologies for absence – J Prescott
2. Declarations of interest – Cllrs Doherty and Devers in respect of the Community Trust
3. Plans for discussion

Business

- **2017/0640/FUL** The installation of three battery units capable of storing up to 3MW of power and associated works. Land Off, Fenton Lane, Sherburn In Elmet.
[No objections.](#)
- **2017/0612/ADV** Advert consent to display two fascia signs (illuminated). Hurricane House, Moxon Way, Sherburn In Elmet.
[No objections.](#)
- **2017/0621/OUTM** Outline for residential development for up to 69no. dwellings with access. (All other matters reserved). Land West Of, Garden Lane, Sherburn In Elmet.
[Parish Council objects - detailed comments are attached.](#)
- **2017/0641/TPO** Application for consent to carry out minor pruning/removal of deadwood to Lime Tree (T1), major pruning/partial pollarding to Lime Tree (T2), removal of limb/reduction of growth/crown clean/re-balance to Sycamore Tree (T3) and Sycamore Tree (T4) covered by TPO 6/1989. Rudstone House, 26A Kirkgate, Sherburn In Elmet.
[Parish Council object to the major pruning/partial pollarding of Lime Tree \(T2\).](#)

Construction Sites

Strata – [Parish Council discussed letter received from Paul Silk and resolved to write to Selby Planning Dept.](#)

Redrow

Persimmon

4. Decisions from Selby District

- **2016/1456/EIA** Proposed Installation of a Refused Derived Fuel (RDF) fired Combined Heat and Power (CHP) plant with 8000m2 Factory Extension and Associated Infrastructure. Kingspan Insulation Ltd, Enterprise Way, Sherburn In Elmet. **Granted**
- **2016/1409/OUTM** Outline application for residential development with all matters reserved. Street Record, Hodgsons Lane, Sherburn In Elmet. **Granted**
- **2017/0581/ADV** Advertisement consent for display on one totem sign (internally illuminated). Land At, Bishopdyke Road, Sherburn In Elmet. **Granted**

5. Date of next meeting – 21st August 2017

2017/0621/OUTM

Sherburn in Elmet Parish Council object to this application on the following grounds:-

- Principle
- Release of Safeguarded Lane
- Traffic
- Pressure on Local Services

Principle

The Parish Council have requested up to date information on the five year supply of housing land, but to date that has not been received.

If the District Council can demonstrate a five year supply of housing land then we cannot see any justification for approving this application. Sherburn already has construction sites and committed developments for over 1200 homes - a figure well in excess of the 790 detailed in the Core Strategy.

Policy SP5 of the Core Strategy sets out the distribution of the identified housing need across the District and confirms that Sherburn is required to contribute at least 11% of the overall total of 7,200 new homes within the plan period to 2027 which equates to 790 units. However, it is of concern that current permissions totaling over 1200 units equates to approximately **17%** of the overall requirement, a huge increase of 6%, with all applications being approved within approximately 3 years or post adoption of the post NPPF Core Strategy.

Even if the District Council concede that there is not a five year supply of housing land in Selby District, the Parish Council does not accept that this should mean that all planning applications for housing within the village should be approved.

Planning law states that applications for planning permission should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This applies to developments that comply with the development plan and those that don't. In both cases other material considerations are relevant. The NPPF is one of those material considerations.

Paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that even if it is conceded that relevant policies of the development plan are out of date, permission can be refused:

- where adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, **when assessed against the policies in this framework as a whole.**
- Where specific policies in this framework indicate development should be restricted.

It is the view of the Council that both circumstances apply in this case.

Therefore, the current application represents piecemeal and unplanned development and will result in pressure on existing services, facilities and infrastructure and shows a lack of coordinated, plan-led

land use planning and would prejudice the plan making process.

Release of Safeguarded Land

The Parish Council also consider it relevant that this site is safeguarded land, part of some 45 hectares in Sherburn. This land was removed from the Green Belt to provide a long-term supply of development land to be released only if necessary.

Policy SL1 of the Local Plan states that safeguarded land is to be protected from development until required by a Local Plan review. Similarly, paragraph 85 of the NPPF makes it clear that planning permission for permanent development on safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan review proposing its development.

There is, therefore, no justification to give planning permission for the development of any safeguarded land in an ad hoc way at this stage given the significant contribution Sherburn in making to the overall supply of new houses in the District.

It should be noted that safeguarded land is a long term strategic planning tool and an integral element of Green Belt Policy. It is our contention that whilst it is not specifically mentioned in footnote 9 of the NPPF, (which in any event commences with the words “for example”) it is clearly one of the specific policies in the Framework which indicate that development should be restricted referred to in paragraph 14.

In addition any decision to release safeguarded land without proper consideration through the local plan process prevents proper consultation with the community on the nature, location and extent of any future development in the village. Officers recognised this in the report to the Planning Committee in June 2016, and stated that: “the lack of community involvement to shape the future role and character of Sherburn in Elmet”, which would be the result of approval, “is a material consideration”.

Traffic

The Parish Council have serious concerns regarding the transport information which accompanies this application.

In June we queried the trip rates which have been used as it was clear that they significantly underestimated the amount of traffic which this development would generate. To date no response has been received.

The Local Highways Authority have requested an assessment of nearby junctions. We agree that this is necessary, but until it is provided we cannot make informed comment.

We must also point out that the Transport Assessment which was supplied with this application only details average weekday flows, which enables the consultants to quote a peak hour two-way flow of 106 vehicles. The original document does not include the full data, so we requested that and it shows a peak of 156 vehicles during the PM rush hour. We would further point out that the traffic data covers a seven day period, but the first two days of that are during school holidays and as such are not admissible for these purposes.

Furthermore we have genuine concerns that the Automatic Traffic Counter used to gather the data was incorrectly sited and as result seriously underestimates the amount of traffic using Garden Lane. We have requested evidence of the siting of the ATC. To date that has not been received.

The road width is an issue here. A Manual for Streets states that a road width of 4.8 metres is needed to allow a car and HGV to pass each other. The road here will be widened to 4.6 metres and is less than that (4.1 metres) in places. This is inadequate for a road that provides access to the High School and a skip hire and waste haulage business.

A lack of off-street parking means that the stretch of Garden Lane by the junction with Tomlinson Way always has cars parked on it, so that it is in effect a single-track road, which often leads to queuing onto the busy and tight bend on the B1222 Church Hill. This is already a significant safety problem, but it will become much worse if this development goes ahead.

There is a proposal to provide a stretch of 2 metre wide footpath on the west side of Garden Lane, but that will still leave various stretches of footpath which are less than 1 metre wide. This is clearly an issue especially given that school children often walk in groups, and furthermore the footway is at its narrowest at the crest of a bend where visibility is poor.

In September 2016 the High School sent the following polite reminder to all parents:-

Polite reminder, please do not use Garden Lane to pick up/drop off your child. The road is too narrow and this is a health and safety risk. The police are concerned about students' safety and will be monitoring.

The High School have recently objected to this application noting that "Taking the current situation into consideration the additional houses would increase the traffic on Garden Lane therefore making a bad situation worse. An alternative access road needs to be sourced".

As noted above additional information is still awaited so we reserve the right to make further comments. However we object to this application on the grounds that it does not provide safe and suitable access when the road is so narrow that some vehicles will be forced to mount the pavement if they want to pass each other. Please remember that this is one of the two access roads to the High School and as such will be used by hundreds of school children.

Pressure on Local Services

Whilst the approved Core Strategy set a minimum requirement of 790 for Sherburn by 2027, with current commitments this figure will easily be exceeded, and with little increase in facilities.

Taking into account the nearby Hodgson's Lane sites approved for 270, 150 and 70 homes, the increase in the number of houses in Sherburn between 2012 and 2027 will be over 1200 houses, without taking account of windfall sites such as that recently approved for 20 houses on Moor Lane. 1200 houses would represent a percentage increase in the total number of houses in the village of over 40% and an increase of over 30% on the level of growth the Inspector considered appropriate "in the absence of key services". It is also relevant that, once existing commitments are completed the village will have expanded by around 80% between 1981 and 2021 with little improvement in services and facilities.

The "absence of many key services" as identified by the Inspector at the Core Strategy Examination, is well documented:

- The nearest household waste recycling centre is at Tadcaster, as is the sports hall and swimming pool. (about 6.4 miles). A larger HWRC and further leisure facilities are at Selby (9 miles).
- The only sports hall (an old gymnasium where there are the usual climbing bars and previously cricket nets) is at the High School. The only other "hall" of any size is the main room at Eversley Park Centre which is over subscribed and basic.
- Community facilities are oversubscribed and unable to accommodate the type and number of recreational activities required in a village of this population. Likewise, existing courses and activities are oversubscribed. This leads to people having to travel to access recreational activities or missing out if transport is not available.

- In the village centre there are no banks (previously two).
- The capacity of schools and the doctors' surgery are already a concern. The County Council has commented in relation to this application that a shortfall in primary school places would result and "We would reiterate our view that a masterplan approach to the growth of Sherburn during the Plan period would provide the best opportunity to successfully plan future education provision".
- There are no NHS dentist places available with the nearest spaces being in Castleford, a 20 minute drive.
- There is no fire station, despite the large and expanding industrial estate housing many higher risk enterprises. Tadcaster has a fire station.
- Despite the growth of Sherburn over the years the village is essentially served by roads that have the characteristic of country lanes. The other main settlements in the district are all served by A roads; we are the only main settlement which has B roads listed amongst their primary access routes (Plan Selby Highways Assessment Part A).
- Both railway stations lack anything like adequate parking and have limited services, which is particularly unfortunate for an area that has such a high degree of out commuting.
- The village centre lacks car parking. A recent report from Selby District Council revealed the following:

Sherburn in Elmet, population 6657, has a total of 180 parking spaces which translates as **36.98** residents per Parking Space

This compares to Tadcaster. Population 6003, 356 parking spaces which equates to 16.87 residents per Parking Space.

And Selby: Population 14731, 1760 parking spaces which equates to 8.37 residents per parking space

Adding the 718 homes already under construction will add about another 1650 to the population of Sherburn. So with a population of 8307 we will have 46.15 residents for each parking space.

With regard to education provision, we must quote the following point made in June this year in connection with another planning application (2016/1409/OUT):-

"NYCC Children and Young People's Service remain concerned about the cumulative impact of successive individual applications in Sherburn-in-Elmet and their potential impact on the future availability of sufficient school places.

We must reiterate our view that a masterplan approach to the growth of Sherburn during the Plan period would provide the best opportunity to successfully plan future education provision. "

Conclusion

In summary, we accept that Sherburn is a sustainable location and will always attract those wanting to

build houses, especially for Leeds commuters. However, over the last 40 years the village has become a dormitory without improvement to infrastructure and services. The figures used to inform housing scale and distribution in the Core Strategy were evidence based and have now been far exceeded, which raises the question of need and, more importantly, demand within the settlement.

Selby District Council are about to engage in a full-scale consultation on the future of the three “market towns” which will enable residents to finally influence if, when and where there will be additional development and what services and facilities are necessary to bring the village into the 21st century.

The Parish Council ask that this this application is refused so that we don't again end up in a position where Sherburn residents are faced with a fait accompli. Allowing yet more unplanned development would result in:

- the prevention of a plan led coordinated and comprehensive land use approach to the planning of the town without justified need being demonstrated.
- the lack of community involvement which empowers local people to shape their surroundings and the failure of the Council to fulfil its commitment to the community that decisions on the release of safeguarded land would be made through the Local Plan process.

The District Council must now recognise that simply building houses and providing employment without appropriate infrastructure (including roads as well as services and facilities) is NOT sustainable development. In addition, whilst our schools can accommodate the current increase in pupil numbers from existing permissions (with the planned growth of Athelstan and Hungate Schools) any larger increase in population in the plan period will result in insufficient capacity at Sherburn and South Milford for primary school children. This can only be addressed by a plan led approach.

With permissions for over 1200 new houses over 7 separate sites there is clearly no established need or justifiable reason to release further land in Sherburn at the present time and certainly not in advance of further consideration of evidence to inform distribution across the District through Plan Selby.

We request that this application is refused.