

Minutes

Planning Committee

Venue:	Council Chamber
Date:	29 June 2016
Time:	2.00 pm
Present:	Councillors Cattanach (Chair), D Peart (Vice Chair) Mrs L Casling, I Chilvers, J Deans, D Mackay, C Pearson, P Welch, and B Marshall.
Apologies for Absence:	None.
Officers Present:	Dave Sykes – Planning Consultant, Jonathan Carr Interim Lead Officer, Ruth Hardingham – Interim Deputy Lead Officer Planning, Tim Coyne – Highways Officer, North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC), Kelly Dawson – Senior Solicitor, and Janine Jenkinson – Democratic Services Officer.

Public: 56

Press: 1

7. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

All Councillors declared that they had received representations in relation to all applications on the agenda.

8. CHAIR'S ADDRESS TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

The Chair introduced Jonathan Carr, Interim Lead Officer and Dave Sykes, Planning Consultant to the Committee.

9. SUSPENSION OF COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES

The Committee considered the suspension of Council Procedure Rules 15.1 and 15.6 (a) in the Constitution, to allow a more effective discussion on applications.

RESOLVED:

To agree the suspension of Council Procedure Rules 15.1 and 15.6 (a) for the Committee meeting.

10. MINUTES

The Committee considered the minutes of the Committee meetings held on 1 June and 8 June 2016.

RESOLVED:

To approve the minutes of the Planning Committee meetings held on 1 June and 8 June 2016, and they be signed by the Chair.

11. PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED

- 11.1 Application: 2016/0195/OUT
 Location: Hodgson's Lane, Sherburn In Elmet
 Proposal: Outline application for up to 270 residential dwellings including details of vehicular access (all other matters reserved).**

The Planning Consultant presented the report and referred the Committee to the additional information provided in the update note.

The application had been brought to the Planning Committee due to it being a departure from the Development Plan and more than 10 letters of objection being received. In addition, Councillor Buckle had requested that the item be presented to Committee for the reasons outlined in the report.

The Planning Consultant advised the Committee that taking into consideration the change in the circumstances regarding the District's five year housing land supply since Councillors made their decision on an identical application (2015/0544/OUT) in November 2015, and all other relevant planning matters, the application was considered unacceptable and therefore should be refused.

The Committee was therefore recommended to refuse the application.

Mr D Buckle, local resident spoke in objection to the application.

Mr P Doherty, Parish Councillor, spoke in objection to the application.

Councillor B Packham, Ward Councillor spoke in objection to the application.

Mr D Hann, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application.

The Planning Consultant's recommendation to refuse the application was moved and seconded.

RESOLVED:

To REFUSE the application for the reasons detailed in section 5.0 of the report.

- 11.2 Application: 2015/0544/OUT**
Location: Hodgson's Lane, Sherburn In Elmet
Proposal: Outline application for up to 270
residential dwellings including
details of vehicular access (all
other matters reserved).

The Senior Solicitor introduced the application and explained that the report provided Councillors with an update, including the position with regard to the appeal that had been lodged with the Planning Inspectorate. Councillors were informed that as soon as an appeal was lodged with the Planning Inspectorate it became a decision to be determined at appeal by the appointed Inspector.

Members were advised that the application had been brought to Planning Committee to seek Councillors' view on how the application would have been determined for the purpose of agreeing the Council's case at the appeal. The Inspectorate would be informed of the decision, and the reasons for the decision would form the basis of the Council's case at a public inquiry.

The Planning Consultant presented the report and referred the Committee to the additional information provided in the update note.

Mr D Buckle, local resident spoke in objection to the application.

Mr P Doherty, Parish Councillor, spoke in objection to the application.

Councillor B Packham, Ward Councillor spoke in objection to the application.

Mr D Hann, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application.

The Planning Consultant's recommendation to indicate refusal of the application was moved and seconded.

RESOLVED:

That the Planning Inspectorate be notified that the local planning authority was minded to REFUSE the application for the reasons detailed in section 2.0 of the report.

11.3 Application: 2015/0895/OUT
Location: Land at Hodgson's Lane, Sherburn In Elmet
Proposal: Outline application (with all detailed matters reserved) for residential development.

The Planning Consultant presented the report and referred the Committee to the additional information provided in the update note. This update note included an additional recommended reason for refusal based on the proposals adverse impact on the landscape character of the area. Councillors were advised that the application had been brought to Planning Committee because 10 or more letters in support had been received. The proposal was also a departure from the Development Plan and was considered to be locally controversial given the level of objections received. Councillor Buckle had also requested that the application be considered at Committee for the reasons detailed in the report
Planning Consultant advised that having had regard to all relevant planning matters, the application was considered unacceptable and therefore should be refused.

The Committee was therefore recommended to refuse the application.
Mr D Buckle, local resident spoke in objection to the application.

Mr P Doherty, Parish Councillor, spoke in objection to the application.

Councillor B Packham, Ward Councillor spoke in objection to the application.

Mr A Cowling, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application.

The Planning Consultant's recommendation to refuse the application was moved and seconded.

RESOLVED:

To REFUSE the application, for the reasons detailed in section 3.0 of the report and the additional reason detailed in the update note.

11.4 Application: 2015/0848/OUT
Location: Pinfold Garth, Sherburn In Elmet
Proposal: Outline application for residential development comprising up to 60 dwellings, areas of open space, landscaping and associated infrastructure with all matters reserved except access on land to north.

The Planning Consultant presented the report and referred the Committee to the additional information provided in the update note. A further update was presented which referred to North Yorkshire Highways acceptance of alternative visibility splays at the proposed access onto Pinfold Garth to that which had originally been proposed in the application. The Planning Consultant referred members to the relatively modest size of this proposal compared to the proposals on adjacent sites considered earlier in

the agenda. Members attention was also drawn to this site's visual containment from the wider countryside provided by the hedgerows and trees along the site's northern and eastern boundaries.

The application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the proposal being a departure from the Development Plan and it being considered locally controversial given the level of objections received. Councillor Buckle had also requested that the application be considered by the Committee for the reasons detailed in the report.

The Planning Consultant advised that, having regard to all relevant planning matters the application was considered unacceptable and therefore should be refused.

The Committee was therefore recommended to refuse the application.

E Woodward, local resident spoke in objection to the application.

Mr P Doherty, Parish Councillor, spoke in objection to the application.

Councillor B Packham, Ward Councillor spoke in objection to the application.

Mr S Natkus, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application.

The Planning Consultant's recommendation to refuse the application was moved and seconded.

RESOLVED:

To REFUSE the application for the reasons detailed in section 3.0 of the report.

The Chair closed the meeting at 4.00 pm