

SHERBURN-IN-ELMET PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

**MINUTES OF THE SHERBURN IN ELMET PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON
MONDAY 21st MARCH 2016 AT 6.30PM IN THE PARISH COUNCIL OFFICE**

Present: Councillors T Streatfield (Chairman), Mrs. J Prescott, M Jordan, R Packham, C Lake, D Buckle, Mrs. J Brown and D Palmer (CDO).

Minutes by D Palmer (CDO)

- 1. Apologies for absence –P Doherty**
- 2. Declarations of interest**
- 3. Plans for discussion**

Business

- **2016/0175/HPA** – Proposed rear single storey extension at 41 Pastures Way, Sherburn in Elmet North Yorkshire.
[No objection to this application subject to neighbours](#)
- **2014/0222/HPA** – Query raised regarding size of extension at 91 Moor Lane, Sherburn in Elmet, North Yorkshire.
[Appears to have built this extension larger than the agreed size on the initial planning application put forward. There was a query whether the additional space taken was within the permitted area not requiring planning permission. Enquire with Planning Officers and put in enforcement complaint to Rachael Robinson.](#)
- **YVNA/2015/0848/OUT** – Outline application for residential development comprising of up to 60 dwellings, areas of open space, landscaping and associated infrastructure with all matters reserved except on land to the North. Outline application for residential development with all matters reserved on land at Pinfold Garth Sherburn in Elmet
[Sustainability](#)

[The Council's current position is that there is a five-year supply. The question the Parish Council ask is if there is a five-year supply, why grant consent for development that clearly is not sustainable.](#)

[We reiterate the comments of the Core Strategy Inspector from June 2013, endorsing Policy SP5 which indicated that new allocations to accommodate 700 houses by 2027 would be required in Sherburn. In reaching this conclusion he further concluded that:](#)

[“the absence of many key services in the town and the limited opportunities for expanding its small town centre militate against greater housing development unless part of a comprehensive planned expansion.”](#)

[In reaching this conclusion it is clear that the Inspector was not convinced that development over and above the 700 figure would be sustainable unless the “absence of key services” was addressed. We agree with this conclusion.](#)

This is a part of the very large amount of Safeguarded land referred to in the Selby District Local Plan. In the absence of: a proper review of all of this land; the need to release any of it in the plan period; and of the means to address the Inspector's concerns regarding key services, there is no basis to arbitrarily release the first piece of safeguarded land that happens to be the subject of a speculative planning application.

The Parish Council is of the view that these issues, particularly the lack of key services, should be properly considered through the proposed Site Allocations Plan (Plan Selby) and sites should not be released on an ad hoc basis in the absence of such consideration.

Highways

We refer to the Local Highway Authority Considerations and Recommendation dated 22nd January 2016. SCP produced a Transport Assessment dated 28th October 2015 which the Parish Council responded to in a detailed note in November 2015. This highlighted a number of significant issues with the Transport Assessment (e.g. the mistaken use of an access only road as a through route).

The Parish Council now see that the Local Highway Authority have recommended acceptance following what they describe as "protracted discussions with the applicants". No record of any part of these discussions has been posted on the Planning Portal. If the LHA have had protracted discussions with the applicant's transport consultants then it is essential that those discussions are accessible in a publicly available reference document.

The Local Highway Authority Considerations and Recommendation document essentially posts their conclusions as to why they feel this scheme is acceptable. It does not provide any of the background information. For example we are told that " SCP have worked with the LHA's senior signals engineer to provide a computer simulation which best represents the operation of the village centre signals ", but none of the calculations have been provided.

The LHA state that "the key improvement to the village centre signals is the installation of the MOVA operating system", but they have not provided any evidence of the improvements which MOVA will provide. The Parish Council noted in November that if it is suggested that MOVA will bring improvements to the village centre traffic signals, then evidence specific to this junction must be provided. No such evidence has been provided.

At the moment local residents are being presented with the LHA's conclusions, without the supporting evidence. Without that evidence it is impossible for local residents or the Parish Council to make informed comment.

Unoccupied Units

When the planning application (2013/0467/OUT) for the major expansion of Sherburn Industrial Park was considered in 2014 the developers argued that the traffic implications of existing vacant units should not be considered. This was contrary to both government and NYCC guidelines. They described the former Supercook building and the Sherburn 550 building as "obsolete" and "compromised design". Despite protests from the Parish Council no account was taken of these vacant units.

The former Supercook building has been taken over by Ultimo Kitchens and is being fitted out prior to full occupation and a planning application (2016/0113/COU) has been submitted for a change of use to facilitate occupation of the Sherburn 550 building by a manufacturer of modular homes.

It is very clear that the description of these units as "obsolete" and "compromised design" was incorrect and the traffic implications of these vacant units should have been considered.

These vacant units are now being brought into use, but this planning application does not follow the guidelines and take account of them. It is irrefutable that the past decision to exclude these buildings was flawed and until the traffic implications of their use are included then the Transport Assessment submitted in support of this application will be incomplete and inaccurate.

Extract from Transport Issues and Developments: A Guide, Appendix D, Checklist for a Transport Assessment (NYCC)

- **YVNA/2016/0076/FUL** – Application for plot substitution of 21 dwellings to current consent at Low Street, Sherburn in Elmet.
This Council has no comments.
- **2016/0195/OUT** – Outline application for up to 270 dwellings including details of vehicular access all other matters reserved. Land at Hodgsons Gate, Hodgsons Lane, Sherburn in Elmet.
Based on an argument of a previous application where this council objected to an application due to the 85% capacity on the roundabout. The argument was rejected but since then units on the industrial park not expected to be utilized has come in to use along with a further phase of units to be erected. This Council objects to this application based upon the increase of traffic due all of these factors, we believe, will take the capacity on the roundabout above the accepted 85% threshold.

Sustainability

The Council's current position is that there is a five-year supply. The question the Parish Council ask is if there is a five-year supply, why grant consent for development that clearly is not sustainable.

We reiterate the comments of the Core Strategy Inspector from June 2013, endorsing Policy SP5 which indicated that new allocations to accommodate 700 houses by 2027 would be required in Sherburn. In reaching this conclusion he further concluded that:

“the absence of many key services in the town and the limited opportunities for expanding its small town centre militate against greater housing development unless part of a comprehensive planned expansion.”

In reaching this conclusion it is clear that the Inspector was not convinced that development over and above the 700 figure would be sustainable unless the “absence of key services” was addressed. We agree with this conclusion.

This is a part of the very large amount of Safeguarded land referred to in the Selby District Local Plan. In the absence of: a proper review of all of this land; the need to release any of it in the plan period; and of the means to address the Inspector’s concerns regarding key services, there is no basis to arbitrarily release the first piece of safeguarded land that happens to be the subject of a speculative planning application.

The Parish Council is of the view that these issues, particularly the lack of key services, should be properly considered through the proposed Site Allocations Plan (Plan Selby) and sites should not be released on an ad hoc basis in the absence of such consideration.

Highways

We refer to the Local Highway Authority Considerations and Recommendation dated 22nd January 2016. SCP produced a Transport Assessment dated 28th October 2015 which the Parish Council responded to in a detailed note in November 2015. This highlighted a number of significant issues with the Transport Assessment (e.g. the mistaken use of an access only road as a through route).

The Parish Council now see that the Local Highway Authority have recommended acceptance following what they describe as "protracted discussions with the applicants". No record of any part of these discussions has been posted on the Planning Portal. If the LHA have had protracted discussions with the applicant's transport consultants then it is essential that those discussions are accessible in a publicly available reference document.

The Local Highway Authority Considerations and Recommendation document essentially posts their conclusions as to why they feel this scheme is acceptable. It does not provide any of the background information. For example we are told that " SCP have worked with the LHA's senior signals engineer to provide a computer simulation which best represents the operation of the village centre signals ", but none of the calculations have been provided.

The LHA state that "the key improvement to the village centre signals is the installation of the MOVA operating system", but they have not provided any evidence of the improvements which MOVA will provide. The Parish Council noted in November that if it is suggested that MOVA will bring improvements to the village centre traffic signals, then evidence specific to this junction must be provided. No such evidence has been provided.

At the moment local residents are being presented with the LHA's conclusions, without the supporting evidence. Without that evidence it is impossible for local residents or the Parish Council to make informed comment.

Unoccupied Units

When the planning application (2013/0467/OUT) for the major expansion of Sherburn Industrial Park was considered in 2014 the developers argued that the traffic implications of existing vacant units should not be considered. This was contrary to both government and NYCC guidelines. They described the former Supercook building and the Sherburn 550 building as "obsolete" and "compromised design". Despite protests from the Parish Council no account was taken of these vacant units.

The former Supercook building has been taken over by Ultimo Kitchens and is being fitted out prior to full occupation and a planning application (2016/0113/COU) has been submitted for a change of use to facilitate occupation of the Sherburn 550 building by a manufacturer of modular homes.

It is very clear that the description of these units as "obsolete" and "compromised design" was incorrect and the traffic implications of these vacant units should have been considered.

These vacant units are now being brought into use, but this planning application does not follow the guidelines and take account of them. It is irrefutable that the past decision to exclude these buildings was flawed and until the traffic implications of their use are included then the Transport Assessment submitted in support of this application will be incomplete and inaccurate.

Construction Sites

Strata
Redrow
Persimmon

It was suggested there had been an improvement with the road sweepers on Low Street. Persimmon and Redrow now use the same sweeper rather than each having one thus reducing the number of circuits. Fewer complaints were being expressed now the sites have become established. However, this feeling was due to the developers causing less mess because the show houses were coming to completion, therefore, they were keeping the frontage tidy. The other concern was the footpath on the opposite side of the road from the new housing. There had been a number of concerns of this footpath being made up with dirt thrown on by a deficient road sweeper. It was suggested to make contact with enforcement and request the developers sweep it clean.

4. **Decisions from Selby District** – 2015/1247/ADV - [Refused](#)
2015/1209/ADV – [Refused](#)
2015/1362/FUL - Retrospective
application for siting static caravan on
Garden Lane [Refused](#)
5. **Any other business-** None
6. **Date of next meeting** – 18th April 2016