

Policy Review Committee

- Venue: Committee Room 2
- Date: 9 August 2011
- Present: Councillor M Jordan (Chair), Councillor Mrs M Davis, Councillor Mrs E Metcalfe, Councillor R Musgrave, Councillor I Nutt, Councillor R Packham, Councillor I Reynolds, Councillor Mrs A Spetch and Councillor R Sweeting
- Apologies for Absence: None
- Also Present: Councillor J Mackman and Councillor J Crawford
- Officers Present: Jonathan Lund, Deputy Chief Executive; Keith Dawson, Director; Eileen Scothern, Business Manager, Andrew McMillan, Policy Officer and Richard Besley, Democratic Services

12. Chair's Address to the Policy Review Committee

The Chair welcomed councillors to this special meeting to discuss the very important paper before them. He thanked Councillor Mackman and the officers for attending to answer the Committee's questions.

The Chair proposed to discuss the papers in sections making proposals as they went and urged Councillors to declare any personal or prejudicial interest as relevant items were discussed.

13. Report PR/11/5 – Site Allocations Development Plan Document (SADPD)

Councillor Mackman began by circulating a revised table on the Final Housing Distribution in the Designated Service Villages and an amended section on site allocations in Sherburn in Elmet.

Councillor Packham raised concerns over the Committee's role and Councillor Mackman explained the stages still to go through before the SADPD was adopted

Designated Service Villages (DSV)

Councillor Nutt, felt that far too many houses had been proposed for Brayton and that it was disproportionate. Brayton could not support anymore houses. There are already more than can be occupied at the moment.

Councillor Davis, had concerns for Selby Town. The Town Council wished to keep a "green corridor" round the town but Selby already ran into Brayton and only the river separated the town from Barlby. Access to Green Belt is further away and further development could not maintain a green corridor.

Councillor Metcalfe asked why the ten residential units earlier designated for Appleton Roebuck were now no longer present.

The Policy Officer, Andrew McMillan, outlined the methodology behind the allocation proposals which resulted in the figures for Brayton and how in the case of Appleton Roebuck no landowners had indicated that land was available for allocation.

Councillor Mackman reminded the Committee that the SADPD is a strategic document that will go to public examination and the Inspector would want to test the justification for how the Council allocated sites.

Councillor Mackman informed Councillors of the hierarchy of communities and their ranking of sustainability. He identified how the major villages of Thorpe Willoughby, Barlby and Brayton could sustain development because of their proximity to Selby.

Councillor Reynolds did not agree that it was wrong to phase development and that phasing should be reconsidered.

Councillor Musgrave felt that Appleton Roebuck would welcome the reinstatement of its 10% allocation and would not accept zero properties and asked what weight would be allocated to the allocations document in development control assessments

Councillor Mackman reminded Councillors that aside from allocations communities were still open to "windfall" planning applications for building and that despite extensive opportunities and calls for sites none had come forward from Appleton Roebuck.

Councillor Musgrave was aware of two potential sites and Eileen Scothern agreed to talk with the Councillor to identify the locations.

Phasing had been discounted by officers and the Executive and the government did not want delays in making housing available.

The Chair invited proposals arising from the discussions so far.

Proposed by Councillor Nutt and seconded by Councillor Reynolds.

1. To recommend the Executive to consider arrangements to phase the release of allocated sites in areas like Tadcaster and the designated service villages.

After a vote this proposal was **lost**.

Proposed by Councillor Packham and seconded by Councillor Metcalfe.

2. To recommend the Executive to adopt the new housing distribution proposals set out on page 29 draft Preferred Options SADPD (Agenda copy page #) instead of the revised version which proposes additions and deletions in respect of South Milford, Monk Fryston, North Duffield, Brotherton, Byram and Cawood.

This proposal was **carried**.

Proposed by Councillor Musgrave and seconded by Councillor Sweeting.

3. To ask the Executive to adopt a more proactive approach to identifying suitable development sites, particularly in areas like Appleton Roebuck.

This proposal was **carried**.

Gypsy / Traveller Sites

The Chair welcomed Councillor Crawford who had asked to speak on this matter as it had direct relevance to his ward.

Councillor Crawford felt that the paper was deeply flawed and asked that officers look at it again, taking into account the views of local communities. He took particular issue with the paper stating that responses from Brotherton and Byram were small, but that was at a point before those communities might be allocated a Gypsy/Traveller site at land at Old Great North Road, Brotherton.

He questioned the decision making and pointed out that the reason for discounting an alternative site at Hillcrest, had been that it had a recent planning application refused. However no mention was made of a similar refusal at the Brotherton site.

Councillor Crawford asked that the opening paragraph be re-drafted as it was inaccurate and criterion C in the proposed methodology be removed.

He also asked that the previous refusal at the Brotherton site be mentioned in the notes.

In relation to the Brotherton site, Councillor Crawford had serious concerns that the site had an electricity pylon situated in it, which raised Health and Safety issues. The pylon carried 250k volts as a major line out of Ferrrybridge Power Station.

Councillor Crawford was disappointed that as District Councillor for the ward he had not been informed of the proposal earlier and was aware that the landowner was consulted last March.

Eileen Scothern confirmed that the methodology had been amended after considering consultation responses. Following a call for sites at the previous stage no sites were submitted for Gypsy and Travellers, the Council therefore considered all sites submitted and deselected those sites not meeting the proposed methodology. As part of the last consultation four sites were submitted by landowners and using both the original methodology and the proposed new methodology the site at Brotherton scored highly.

Councillor Reynolds agreed with Councillor Crawford over the Brotherton site and thought any recommendation of suitability from the landowner could be questionable.

Councillor Reynolds agreed that the Council needed to look at this again in detail with a sub-committee made up of interested parties.

This was welcomed by Councillor Crawford who informed Councillors that in the East Riding a sub-committee made up of Councillors and representatives from the communities and Travellers group had identified sites which were agreed by all parties.

Councillor Davis sympathised with Councillor Crawford and recollected past sites nationally being hidden under motorway bridges, etc but Gypsy/Traveller communities deserved decent accommodation and homes in the community.

Councillor Davis felt Hillcrest was a more suitable site as it was already owned by Travellers, is occupied by Travellers and is where they wish to be.

Councillor Mackman was concerned that the Council was obliged to find new vacant sites and that Hillcrest was neither vacant nor new, however the Committee felt that adjacent land could be used.

Councillor Reynolds proposed and Councillor Packham seconded.

14. To recommend the Executive to look again at the question of suitable sites for Gypsies and Travellers; and

15. To appoint a working group of Councillors and representatives of Gypsy and Traveller communities to identify suitable sites, looking first at the potential development of land adjacent to exiting sites.

The proposals were **carried**.

Employment Land

Councillor Mackman highlighted the areas identified in this chapter.

Airfields

Councillor Nutt reminded the Committee of the loss of the proposed Science Park for Burn airfield and hoped that the Council did not miss out on those types of opportunities again.

Eileen Scothern confirmed that despite the best efforts Burn had not been supported by central government. She indicated that sites would not be penalised by lack of a proposed allocation and that any future similar project could be discussed as a windfall application.

Councillor Davis felt that the value of the site should be recognised and the Council should be more pro-active.

Councillor Davis proposed and Councillor Nutt seconded.

16. To identify a suitable form of words which does not allocate the site at Burn Airfield but which indicates that the Council would welcome comprehensive proposals for a significant or specialist development at that location.

This proposal was **carried**.

General Issues

Councillor Musgrave referred to the revised page on Green Belt land (Page 41 in Agenda papers) in relation to the re-grouping of sites, in particular Bilbrough and what counts as a major site in the Green Belt.

Councillor Musgrave proposed and Councillor Sweeting seconded.

17. To recommend the Executive to review and clarify the proposed definitions, industry sector classifications and criteria used to identify major sites in the Green Belt.

This proposal was **carried**.

Councillor Packham was concerned that where there was insufficient regard for traffic impact which could lead to problems.

This was supported by Councillor Davis who pointed out that Selby town had major transport issues that were not readily solvable.

Councillor Davis proposed and Councillor Nutt seconded.

18. To recommend the Executive to make highway impact a material consideration in allocating sites, particularly in urban areas and particularly in respect of the cumulative impact of development.

This proposal was **carried**.

Councillor Packham referred to proposals on page 40 regarding Historic Parks and Gardens and Historic battlegrounds and asked that Ancient Monuments (archaeological sites) be included. Officers felt that was a valid suggestion and would amend paper.

Individual Areas

Selby

Councillor Davis felt the town had a major lack of designated recreational open space, referring to specific sites off and around Wistow Road. Instead of “no allocation” she would have preferred them classed as recreational open space.

Councillor Davis proposed and Councillor Nutt seconded.

19. To recommend the Executive to allocate sites SELB002, SELB003, SELB005 and SELB031 as recreational open space.

This proposal was **carried**.

Councillor Davis urged officers not to remove car parks from the town as it would kill trade, in particular in relation to land known as Back Micklegate where a major town centre car park is situated. If multi level units and parking were proposed consideration should be given to flood areas and parking levels should be allocated to ground floor with development above.

Councillor Davis proposed and Councillor Nutt seconded,

20. To recommend the Executive to reconsider the proposed allocation of existing car parking for redevelopment and in particular to:

(a) safeguard existing car parking provision by requiring any development to take place above lower level car parking and/or

(b) ensure adequate provision for vans, including those used in connection with Selby Market.

This proposal was **carried**.

Sherburn in Elmet

On the matter of the revised pages, officers acknowledged that information had been provided late due to the necessity to correct references to green belt land.

Councillor Packham was concerned over the late change as it gave little time to scrutinise the changes.

Councillor Packham was concerned that the employment site allocated was too remote from the existing settlement and that more suitable land would be that below the airfield adjacent to Gascoigne Wood.

This view was supported by the Chair who had received comments from Sherburn airfield of the location of industrial sites in proximity to the runways and airfield approach.

Councillor Packham proposed and Councillor Jordan seconded.

21. To recommend the Executive to reconsider the proposed allocation of site SHER015.

This proposal was **carried**.

Councillor Nutt proposed and Councillor Packham seconded.

22. To recognise that proposals in respect of Sherburn had been amended within the previous 24 hours and to ask Councillor Jordan and Packham to consider and submit any views in relation to the revised proposals directly to the Executive, in advance of the Executive Briefing on 22 August 2011.

This proposal was **carried**.

Tadcaster

The Committee discussed Tadcaster town centre.

Councillor Mrs Eileen Metcalfe declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of proposals to designate land as retail sites which were adjacent to a retail property she owned. She left the meeting whilst that item of business was considered..

At this point as the meeting had been sitting for three hours, the Committee agreed to continue the meeting beyond three hours until business was concluded

Councillor Metcalfe proposed and Councillor Sweeting seconded.

13. To recommend the Executive to remove all of the wording after “No Allocation” in respect of the response on the former Papyrus Works (Site X 010) set out in the “Other discounted Sites” table on page 110.

This proposal was **carried**.

Cawood

Councillor Reynolds noted that sites had been transferred to North Duffield which was not an adjoining community and wondered why they could not have been accommodated in Cawood.

Officers confirmed that Cawood was covered by Flood Zone 3 and subject to an earlier proposal (2) to ask the Executive to re-look at the chart on Page 29.

Other sites were mentioned for suitability though no further resolutions were made.

The Chair thanked the Committee for its diligence and was pleased that a number of proposals had been tabled that would go through to the Executive for further consideration.

The meeting closed at 8:50pm