

Officer Update Note
Planning Committee 14 June 2017

Item 7.1

APPLICATION NUMBER:	2016/1345/OUTM	PARISH:	Gateforth Parish Council
APPLICANT:	Sherwood Brothers Ltd	VALID DATE:	22nd November 2016
		EXPIRY DATE:	21st February 2017
PROPOSAL:	Outline application for residential development including access (all other matters reserved) on land		
LOCATION:	Land At Field Lane Thorpe Willoughby Selby North Yorkshire		

Hambleton and Gateforth Parish Councils were both notified of this planning application and no comments have been received.

Item 7.2

APPLICATION NUMBER:	8/58/1049A/PA 2016/1256/OUTM	PARISH:	Sherburn in Elmet Parish
APPLICANT:	Mr David Wainwright	VALID DATE:	20 October 2016
		EXPIRY DATE:	13 April 2017
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.		
LOCATION:	Land at Hodgsons Lane Sherburn In Elmet		

Consultations

Comments have been received from the Policy Team. These comments are:

1. The Council's Five Year Housing Land Supply

In December of 2016, an appeal decision¹ found that the Council had less than a 5 year housing supply. This means that in accordance with paragraph 49 of the NPPF, the Council's policies for the supply of housing cannot be considered up to date. Relevant policies which deal with housing supply in the Core Strategy are:

- SP5: The Scale and Distribution of Housing, parts A and B.

An approval on this site (if its deliverability can be proved by the applicant) would help the Council to restore its 5 year supply of housing.

2. The Principle of Development

As this is an application for housing in an authority that does not have a 5 year housing supply, paragraph 14 of the NPPF applies, which states that:

"At the heart of the framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development", and for decision taking this means, unless material considerations indicate otherwise, approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

- Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this framework taken as a whole; or
- specific policies in this framework indicate development should be restricted."

The examples given of specific policies in the footnote to paragraph 14 include those policies relating to sites protected under the Birds and Habitats Directives and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Heritage Coast or within a National Park (or the Broads Authority); designated heritage assets; and locations at risk of flooding or coastal erosion.

CS Policies SP2 and SP4 direct the majority of new development to the Market Towns and Designated Service Villages (DSVs), restricting development in the open countryside. Sherburn in Elmet is defined in the Core Strategy as a Local Service Centre, where further housing, employment, retail, commercial and leisure growth will take place appropriate to the size and role of each settlement.

This outline proposal for 60 dwellings is on land that is adjacent to, but outside of, the defined Development Limits of Sherburn in Elmet as defined on the Policies Map of the SDLP. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy SP2A(c) of the Core Strategy. Development Limits are currently under review as part of the PLAN Selby sites and allocations document in line with commentary detailed in the Core Strategy. In evaluating the application, the relationship of the proposal to the edge of the settlement and defined Development Limit (as set out on the Policies Map) should be given due consideration as detailed under Section 4 of this response.

3. Previous Levels of Growth and the Scale of the Proposal

¹ APP/N2739/W/16/3144900

The Core Strategy designates levels of growth to settlements based on their infrastructure capacity and sustainability. When assessing whether the adverse impacts of a housing scheme would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, in terms of the effect on the settlements character, infrastructure capacity and sustainability, it is important to determine the impact a proposed scheme has on this level of growth.

The scale of this individual proposal, at 60 dwellings, is not considered to be appropriate to the size and role of a settlement designated as a Local Service Centre, however the individual scale of the proposal must also be considered in terms of the cumulative impact it would have with the previous levels of growth in this settlement that have occurred since the start of the plan period. To date, Sherburn in Elmet has seen 312 (gross) dwellings built in the settlement since the start of the Plan Period (310 net) in April 2011 and has extant gross approvals for 703 dwellings (701 net), giving a gross total of 1015 dwellings (1011 net).

It is important to determine the impact a proposed scheme has on this level of growth, taking into account the scale of the proposal itself and the cumulative impact of previous levels of development since the start of the plan period. When assessing whether the adverse impacts of a housing scheme would significantly and demonstrably outweigh its benefits, the effect on the settlements character, infrastructure capacity and sustainability must be measured.

4. Relation of the Proposal to the Development Limit

When assessing whether the adverse impacts of a housing scheme would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, it is important to determine the impact the proposed scheme has on its surroundings. Core Strategy Policy SP18 aims to protect the high quality and local distinctiveness of the natural and man-made environment. The site is located in the countryside and outside of the Development Limits. The draft PLAN Selby evidence document "Settlement Setting Landscape Assessment" (January 2016) finds that the overall landscape assessment parcel for the area to which the application relates is of medium sensitivity to development. It also assesses the settlement edge to be of moderate importance to protect from development. The proposal extends significantly into the countryside and in determining the application, thought will need to be applied as to:

- the overall impact of the proposed development on the countryside;
- whether the current Development Limit as defined in the Policies Map remains robustly defined, or has changed and,
- whether the proposed development would set a new clearly defensible boundary.

Detailed issues to consider when reviewing the potential impact of the development, include:

- planning history;
- physical extent of existing settlement;
- settlement form and character;
- the type, function and range of buildings on the edge of the settlement;
- impact of the development on the countryside, environment and amenity, and

- the extent of current defensible boundaries, which are durable and likely to be permanent, and whether the development would erode or contribute towards maintaining a clear defensible boundary.

5. Safeguarded Land

The site is located within an area designated as Safeguarded Land (SL) under saved policy SL1 of the 2005 SDLP. The original intention of SL was to provide a 'reserve' of land to meet long term growth requirements post 2006, to be released in a controlled and phased manner – potentially over successive reviews of the Local Plan. This position accords with paragraph 85 of the NPPF which places importance on a plan-led approach to the use of 'safeguarded land' within development plans. The restrictive wording of paragraph 85 in the NPPF qualifies safeguarded land as a NPPF footnote 9 specific policy, referred to at the end of paragraph 14 of the NPPF, which indicates that development should be restricted.

When deciding whether this area of safeguarded land should be released, consideration needs to be given to the balanced growth of the settlement to ensure that services / facilities keep track with growth and that development occurs through a phased and managed process. When making this decision, the fact that Sherburn has exceeded its Core Strategy minimum growth requirement of 790 dwellings by a significant amount, less than 6 years into a 15 year plan period (albeit these are mixture of permissions and completions) should be taken into account. However this consideration should be balanced against the fact that the authority no longer has a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land and the fact that policy SP5 (The Scale and Distribution of Housing) has been rendered out of date by the lack of a 5 year housing supply, as per para 49 of the NPPF.

Assessment

2.6 The Appropriateness of the Location of the Application Site for Residential Development in Respect of Current Housing Policy and Guidance on Sustainability Contained within the Development Plan and the NPPF.

Members should note that the reference to Policy SP1 being displaced referred to in Paragraph 2.7.7 and 2.22.4 should be deleted.

Item 7.4

APPLICATION NUMBER:	8/58/1050A/PA 2016/1409/OUTM	PARISH:	Sherburn in Elmet Parish
APPLICANT:	Mr John Harrison, Mr David Harrison and Mr Bernard Harrison	VALID DATE:	2 December 2016
		EXPIRY DATE:	3 March 2017
PROPOSAL:	Outline application for residential development with all matters reserved		

LOCATION:	Land at Hodgsons Lane Sherburn In Elmet LS25 6EN
-----------	--

Since the Committee report was written comments have been received from Policy.

Consultations

1.4.2 Lead Officer – Policy

The application should be considered against both the saved policies in the adopted 2005 Selby District Local Plan (SDLP) and the 2013 Selby District Core Strategy (CS).

The key issues which should be addressed are:

1. The Council's Five Year Housing Land Supply
2. The Principle of Development
3. Previous Levels of Growth and the Scale of the Proposal
4. Relation of the Proposal to the Development Limit
5. Safeguarded Land

1. The Council's Five Year Housing Land Supply

In December of 2016, an appeal decision found that the Council had less than a 5 year housing supply. This means that in accordance with paragraph 49 of the NPPF, the Council's policies for the supply of housing cannot be considered up to date. Relevant policies which deal with housing supply in the Core Strategy are:

- SP5: The Scale and Distribution of Housing, parts A and B.

An approval on this site (if its deliverability can be proved by the applicant) would help the Council to restore its 5 year supply of housing.

2. The Principle of Development

As this is an application for housing in an authority that does not have a 5 year housing supply, paragraph 14 of the NPPF applies, which states that:

"At the heart of the framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development", and for decision taking this means, unless material considerations indicate otherwise, approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

- Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this framework taken as a whole; or
- specific policies in this framework indicate development should be restricted.”

The examples given of specific policies in the footnote to paragraph 14 include those policies relating to sites protected under the Birds and Habitats Directives and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Heritage Coast or within a National Park (or the Broads Authority); designated heritage assets; and locations at risk of flooding or coastal erosion.

CS Policies SP2 and SP4 direct the majority of new development to the Market Towns and Designated Service Villages (DSVs), restricting development in the open countryside. Sherburn in Elmet is defined in the Core Strategy as a Local Service Centre, where further housing, employment, retail, commercial and leisure growth will take place appropriate to the size and role of each settlement.

This outline proposal for 150 dwellings is on land that is adjacent to, but outside of, the defined Development Limits of Sherburn in Elmet as defined on the Policies Map of the SDLP. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy SP2A(c) of the Core Strategy. Development Limits are currently under review as part of the PLAN Selby sites and allocations document in line with commentary detailed in the Core Strategy. In evaluating the application, the relationship of the proposal to the edge of the settlement and defined Development Limit (as set out on the Policies Map) should be given due consideration as detailed under Section 4 of this response.

3. Previous Levels of Growth and the Scale of the Proposal

The Core Strategy designates levels of growth to settlements based on their infrastructure capacity and sustainability. When assessing whether the adverse impacts of a housing scheme would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, in terms of the effect on the settlements character, infrastructure capacity and sustainability, it is important to determine the impact a proposed scheme has on this level of growth.

The scale of this individual proposal, at 150 dwellings, is not considered to be appropriate to the size and role of a settlement designated as a Local Service Centre in the Core Strategy, however the individual scale of the proposal must also be considered in terms of the cumulative impact it would have with the

previous levels of growth in this settlement that have occurred since the start of the plan period. To date, Sherburn in Elmet has seen 312 (gross) dwellings built in the settlement since the start of the Plan Period (310 net) in April 2011 and has extant gross approvals for 703 dwellings (701 net), giving a gross total of 1015 dwellings (1011 net).

It is important to determine the impact a proposed scheme has on this level of growth, taking into account the scale of the proposal itself and the cumulative impact of previous levels of development since the start of the plan period. When assessing whether the adverse impacts of a housing scheme would significantly and demonstrably outweigh its benefits, the effect on the settlements character, infrastructure capacity and sustainability must be measured.

4. Relation of the Proposal to the Development Limit

When assessing whether the adverse impacts of a housing scheme would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, it is important to determine the impact the proposed scheme has on its surroundings. Core Strategy Policy SP18 aims to protect the high quality and local distinctiveness of the natural and man-made environment. The site is located in the countryside and outside of the Development Limits. The draft PLAN Selby evidence document "Settlement Setting Landscape Assessment" (January 2016) finds that that the overall landscape assessment parcel for the area to which the application relates is of medium sensitivity to development. It also assesses the settlement edge to be of moderate importance to protect from development. The proposal extends into the countryside and in determining the application, thought will need to be applied as to:

- the overall impact of the proposed development on the countryside;
- whether the current Development Limit as defined in the Policies Map remains robustly defined, or has changed and,
- whether the proposed development would set a new clearly defensible boundary.

Detailed issues to consider when reviewing the potential impact of the development, include:

- planning history;
- physical extent of existing settlement;
- settlement form and character;
- the type, function and range of buildings on the edge of the settlement;
- impact of the development on the countryside, environment and amenity, and

- the extent of current defensible boundaries, which are durable and likely to be permanent, and whether the development would erode or contribute towards maintaining a clear defensible boundary.

5. Safeguarded Land

The site is located within an area designated as Safeguarded Land (SL) under saved policy SL1 of the 2005 SDLP. The original intention of SL was to provide a 'reserve' of land to meet long term growth requirements post 2006, to be released in a controlled and phased manner – potentially over successive reviews of the Local Plan. This position accords with paragraph 85 of the NPPF which places importance on a plan-led approach to the use of 'safeguarded land' within development plans. The restrictive wording of paragraph 85 in the NPPF qualifies safeguarded land as a NPPF footnote 9 specific policy, referred to at the end of paragraph 14 of the NPPF, which indicates that development should be restricted.

When deciding whether this area of safeguarded land should be released, consideration needs to be given to the balanced growth of the settlement to ensure that services / facilities keep track with growth and that development occurs through a phased and managed process. When making this decision, the fact that Sherburn has exceeded its Core Strategy minimum growth requirement of 790 dwellings by a significant amount, less than 6 years into a 15 year plan period (albeit these are mostly permissions rather than completions) should be taken into account. However this consideration should be balanced against the fact that the authority no longer has a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land and the fact that policy SP5 (The Scale and Distribution of Housing) has been rendered out of date by the lack of a 5 year housing supply, as per para 49 of the NPPF.

Assessment

2.6 The Appropriateness of the Location of the Application Site for Residential Development in Respect of Current Housing Policy and Guidance on Sustainability Contained within the Development Plan and the NPPF.

Members should note that the reference to Policy SP1 being displaced referred to in Paragraph 2.6.8 and 2.23.6 should be deleted.

2.9 Flood Risk

Sequential Test

Members should note that Paragraphs 2.9.5 and 2.9.6 which refer to alternative sites should be deleted.

Item 7.5

APPLICATION NUMBER:	2016/1456/EIA	PARISH:	Sherburn In Elmet Parish Council
APPLICANT:	Kingspan	VALID DATE: EXPIRY DATE:	13th December 2016 4th April 2017
PROPOSAL:	Proposed Installation of a Refused Derived Fuel (RDF) fired Combined Heat and Power (CHP) plant with 8000m ² Factory Extension and Associated Infrastructure		
LOCATION:	Kingspan Insulation Ltd Enterprise Way Sherburn In Elmet North Yorkshire LS25 6NE		

Sherburn- in-Elmet Parish Council Comments

The Parish Council continue to have concerns regarding possible air pollution and note that no account has been taken of the cumulative impact of this site, when combined with emissions from the peak power generation plants proposed nearby at Gascoigne Wood (2015/1034/FUL, 2015/0017/FUL and 2015/0674/FUL). The Parish Council request that an assessment is provided of the cumulative impact of this site, when combined with the peak power generation plants proposed nearby at Gascoigne Wood.

With regard to the Transport Statement addendum, in their letter of the 5th January the Local Highways Authority requested that the assessment should take into account "any vacant units on the industrial estate". This has not been done and we ask that the Planning Officer requests this information.

Officer Response

Air Quality is covered in the committee report under paragraph 2.10. The Environmental Health Officer is satisfied that the impacts on existing pollutant concentrations would not be significant at any location within the relevant assessment extents.

Highways issues are addressed section 2.8 of the report. In relation to the transport addendum, the Highway Authority was re-consulted and is satisfied that it has an acceptable scope and methodology in relation to trip rates, traffic generation and traffic generation.

Comments received from UKWIN (UK Without Incineration Network)

Reference made to several applications at other authorities and appeal decisions where a Design Stage R1 Planning condition is imposed to promote movement of waste up the waste hierarchy in line with local and national policies. A conditions is suggested as follows;

"Prior to the development hereby permitted being brought into use, the operator shall submit to the Waste Planning Authority for approval in writing, verification that the

facility has achieved [Design] Stage R1 Status through Design Stage Certification from the Environment Agency. The facility shall thereafter be configured in accordance with these approved details. Once operational, alterations to the processing plant may be undertaken to satisfy Best Available Technique or continued compliance with R1".

Reason

"To confirm the status of the plant and to ensure the waste hierarchy is considered and implemented fully in accordance with the National Planning Policy on Waste."

It is considered that this would be covered by other legislation under the need for an Environmental Permit through the EA. It is not normally appropriate for planning authorities to repeat conditions which can be controlled through other means. However, as a 'belt and braces' it is recommended that this conditions be imposed and the applicant has agreed to accept this.

Comments received from T Hill resident from Derbyshire

Other items are required on this application namely;

- (i) A climate Change analysis
- (ii) Details of the expected RDF Composition
- (iii) A Sankey energy Flow Diagram for the CHP Plant
- (iv) Arising from the Waste Framework Directive Annex 2, Design R1 calculations

Officer Response

- (i) above is only required under the new EIA Regs which don't apply to this application due to the date it was submitted
- (ii) This has been provided and discussed with Environmental Health and appropriate conditions imposed
- (iii) There is no requirement to submit this on this planning application
- (iv) See comments above from UKWIN and additional condition. In relation to calculations, this would be covered under other legislation relating to the Environmental Permit and Building Regulations

Additional Consultation with NCCC SuDs Officer

Due to the scale of the development this consultation was found to be necessary but was only recently sent. Comments have not been received yet.

Officer Response and change to recommendation

Recommend approval be delegated to officers subject to the comments from Suds not raising any insurmountable issues and subject to any appropriate conditions they recommend and also subject to the additional condition referred to above.

Item 7.8

APPLICATION NUMBER:	2016/1337/OUTM 8/18/453A/PA	PARISH:	Hemingbrough Parish Council
APPLICANT:	York Diocesan Board of Finance	VALID DATE:	3 January 2017
		EXPIRY DATE:	4 April 2017
PROPOSAL:	Outline application for residential development of up to 21 dwellings (with all matters reserved) on land to the east of		
LOCATION:	School Road, Hemingbrough, Selby, North Yorkshire		

Additional comments have been received from the Policy Team. The comments remain the same as per the 16 January 2016 comments except in regards to the Council's five year housing land supply and previous levels of growth which are now as follows:

The Council's Five Year Housing Land Supply

In December of 2016, an appeal decision found that the Council had less than a 5 year housing supply. This means that in accordance with paragraph 49 of the NPPF, the Council's policies for the supply of housing cannot be considered up to date. Relevant policies which deal with housing supply in the Core Strategy are:

SP5: The Scale and Distribution of Housing, parts A and B.

An approval on this site (if its deliverability can be proved by the applicant) would help the Council to restore its 5 year supply of housing.

Previous Levels of Growth and the Scale of the Proposal

The Core Strategy designates levels of growth to settlements based on their infrastructure capacity and sustainability. When assessing whether the adverse impacts of a housing scheme would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, in terms of the effect on the settlements character, infrastructure capacity and sustainability, it is important to determine the impact a proposed scheme has on this level of growth.

The scale of this individual proposal, at 21 dwellings, is considered to be appropriate to the size and role of a settlement designated as a Designated Service Village, however the individual scale of the proposal must also be considered in terms of the cumulative impact it would have with the previous levels of growth in this settlement that have occurred since the start of the plan period. To date, Hemingbrough has seen 15 (gross) dwellings (13 net) built in the settlement since the start of the Plan

Period in April 2011 and has extant gross approvals for 11 dwellings (11 net), giving a gross total of 26 dwellings (24 net).

It is important to determine the impact a proposed scheme has on this level of growth, taking into account the scale of the proposal itself and the cumulative impact of previous levels of development since the start of the plan period. When assessing whether the adverse impacts of a housing scheme would significantly and demonstrably outweigh its benefits, the effect on the settlements character, infrastructure capacity and sustainability must be measured.

Item 7.9

APPLICATION NUMBER:	2016/1314/FULM	PARISH:	Barlby And Osgodby Parish Council
APPLICANT:	Barratt Homes Yorkshire East Division	VALID DATE: EXPIRY DATE:	18th November 2016 17th February 2017
PROPOSAL:	Proposed residential development (partial re-plan of approval 2013/0478/FUL), associated infrastructure, play areas and incidental open space		
LOCATION:	Turnhead Farm York Road Barlby Selby North Yorkshire YO8 5JZ		

Barlby Town Council Comments - Object.

The Council objects to there being additional vehicular access points onto Old York Road as this is a primary route for pupils attending Barlby High School and is a safe cycle route. The original single access point should be maintained to avoid additional vehicle movements onto Old York Road.

There is no evidence of a pedestrian footway from the development to the High School, which may necessitate School age children crossing (the very busy) York Road twice to access the School. Pedestrian safety should be an integral part of this large development.

There are concerns that the high water table in this area will preclude soakaways.

There are serious concerns about the ground conditions as sources suggest that this area was historically used as a dump for waste (which may be hazardous) from previous users of the Olympia Park site and as such the land could have levels of contamination.

This is considered to be an overdevelopment of the site.

Additional development will put further pressure on the Barlby Ponds Nature Conservation site with no proposed mitigation measures.

NYCC Highways Comments -

A further comment has been received as follows-

Although the proposed layout is acceptable to the Local Highway Authority the Landscape proposals do provide some concerns regarding the locations of hedges and trees close to adoptable areas. In order to accord with the County Council's protocol regarding trees within new developments and to prevent hedges growing out over the highway it is recommended that the following condition be appended to any permission issued –

There shall be no trees planted within 1.5m of any footway or 2.5m of any road which is intended to become highway maintainable at the public expense and no hedges planted within 0.8m of any footway or road which is intended to become highway maintainable at the public expense.

Reason-

In accordance with Policies T1 and T2 of the Selby District Local Plan and in the interests of highway safety and the general amenity of the area.

Comments from Ouse and Derwent IDB

This application sits within the Ouse and Derwent Internal Drainage Board district. The Board does have assets adjacent to the site in the form of Wood Close Drain; this watercourse is known to be subject to high flows during storm events.

The Board wishes to state that where possible the risk of flooding should be reduced and that, as far as is practicable, surface water arising from a developed site should be managed in a sustainable manner to mimic the surface water flows arising from the site prior to the proposed development. This should be considered whether the surface water arrangements from the site are to connect to a public or private asset (watercourse or sewer) before out-falling into a watercourse or, to outfall directly into a watercourse in the Board's area.

The applicant should be advised that the Board's prior consent is required for any development including fences or planting within 9.00m of the bank top of any watercourse within or forming the boundary of the site. Any proposals to culvert, bridge, fill in or make a discharge to the watercourse will also require the Board's prior consent.

The site is in an area where drainage problems could exist and development should not be allowed until the Authority is satisfied that surface water drainage has been satisfactorily provided for. Any approved development should not adversely affect the surface water drainage of the area and amenity of adjacent properties.

The Board notes that this is an application for a residential development (partial re-plan of approval 2013/0478/FUL), associated infrastructure, play areas and

incidental open space. This appears to enlarge the impermeable area on site and has the potential to increase the rate of surface water run-off from the site if this is not effectively constrained.

The Board observes that the application form indicates that the surface water from the site is to be disposed of to an Existing Watercourse. The Board has previously been in contact with the applicant regarding the original proposals for this site (Planning Application 2013/0478/FUL), and agreed a maximum rate of discharge from this site of 12.6 l/s, via a connection into Wood Close Drain (Ouse and Derwent Internal Drainage Board Consent 533C).

It would appear from the Adoptable Drainage Layout provided with the current application that it remains the applicant's intention to discharge at this rate (see Adoptable Drainage Layout – Drawing Number 36431/017 Revision R, dated 29.10.12). If this is the case the Board would have no concern about that aspect of the application.

The Board would however suggest that the Local Authority satisfy its self that the appropriate surface water storage volume has been incorporated into the design to take into account the increase in the impermeable area associated with the revised application. The Board have no objection to the development in principal but recommend that the Local Authority ask the applicant to confirm the final drainage strategy and obtain any other necessary consent before any approval is granted.

(OFFICER NOTE – Condition 4 in the report on page 272 already requires a detailed design to be submitted for this.)

The Board recommend that any approval granted should include a number of additional conditions. Officers have reviewed these conditions and it is proposed that the following be added -

1 Details of the condition and ability of any watercourse intended to accept surface water flows should be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Planning Authority prior to works commencing.

Reason:

To ensure that the receiving watercourse is capable of accepting the increased discharge without detriment to other users and to ensure the proper drainage of the site in accordance with Policy SP19 of the Core Strategy and ENV1 of the Selby District Local Plan.

2 All drainage routes through the Site shall be maintained both during the works on site and after completion of the works in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Planning Authority, prior to commencement of work.

Informative:

Drainage routes are considered to include all methods by which water may be transferred through the Site and shall include such systems as “ridge and furrow” and “overland flows”. The effect of raising Site levels on adjacent property must be carefully considered and appropriate measures taken to negate influences.

Reason: To ensure that the site is properly drained in accordance with Policy SP19 of the Core Strategy and ENV1 of the Selby District Local Plan.

3 A strip of land 9 metres wide adjacent to the top of both banks of all watercourses on Site shall be kept clear of all new buildings and structures (including gates, walls, fences and trees) unless agreed otherwise in writing with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Internal Drainage Board. Ground levels must not be raised within this area. Details of access arrangements to watercourses shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Planning Authority in consultation with the Internal Drainage Board and thereafter implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason:

To maintain access to the watercourse for maintenance or improvements to ensure that the site is properly drained in accordance with Policy SP19 of the Core Strategy and ENV1 of the Selby District Local Plan.

4 No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until details of any temporary works in, under, over or adjacent to the watercourse have been submitted to and approved by and implemented to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Internal Drainage Board.

Reason:

To ensure that the watercourse can still be maintained whilst works are carried out on the application site and to accord with Policy SP19 of the Core Strategy and ENV1 of the Selby District Local Plan.

5 There shall be no storage of any materials including soil adjacent to the bank top of any watercourses at any time, both during and after the construction period.

Reason:

To ensure that there will be no risk of the watercourse becoming blocked by debris from stockpiles or bank slipping due to increased loading of the bank top and to accord with Policy SP19 of the Core Strategy and ENV1 of the Selby District Local Plan.