

## Planning Committee

Venue: Microsoft Teams - Remote  
Date: Wednesday, 23 December 2020  
Time: 2.00 pm

Present remotely via Teams: Councillor J Cattanach in the Chair

Councillors J Mackman (Vice-Chair), I Chilvers, K Ellis, D Mackay, R Musgrave, R Packham, S Shaw-Wright and P Welch

Officers Present remotely via Teams: Martin Grainger (Head of Planning), Glenn Sharpe (Solicitor), Ruth Hardingham (Planning Development Manager), Irma Sinkeviciene (Planning Officer), Jac Cruickshank (Planning Officer) and Palbinder Mann (Democratic Services Manager)

### **56 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor M Topping. Councillor R Musgrave was in attendance at the meeting as a substitute for Councillor Topping.

### **57 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

Councillor Musgrave declared a personal interest in agenda item 4.1 2019/1232/FUL – Catterton Barn, Moor Lane, Catterton as he knew the applicant however stated that this would not impact this decision making and he would be keeping an open mind on the application.

Councillor Musgrave declared a personal interest in agenda item 4.2 2020/0449/HPA – 2 The Glade, Escrick, York as he had attended the Parish Council meeting where the application had been discussed however stated that he would be keeping an open mind on the application.

### **58 CHAIR'S ADDRESS TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**

The Chair announced that an Officer Update Note had been circulated and could be viewed alongside the agenda on the Council's website.

Lastly, the Committee noted that agenda items 4.3 and 4.4. – 2020/0821/FUL

and 2020/1168/FUL – Land Adjacent Village Hall, Main Street, Church Fenton had been withdrawn by the applicant and as such would not be considered at the meeting.

## **59 PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED**

The Planning Committee considered the following planning applications:

### **59.1 2019/1232/FUL - CATTERTON BARN, MOOR LANE, CATTERTON**

**Application:** 2019/1232/FUL

**Location:** Catterton Barn, Moor Lane, Catterton

**Proposal:** Proposed partial rebuild and change of use of agricultural barn to residential use (C3) to provide holiday accommodation

The Planning Officer presented the application which had been brought before Planning Committee as more than 10 letters of representation had been received which raised material planning considerations, and Officers would otherwise determine the application contrary to these representations.

The Committee noted that the application was for the proposed partial rebuild and change of use of agricultural barn to residential use (C3) to provide holiday accommodation.

The Committee asked questions in relation to the type of development such as whether it constituted tourist accommodation or a housing development. In discussion the type of development, the Committee queried which policies should be applied to the application.

Rob Crolla, agent, was invited remotely into the meeting and spoke in support of the application.

Members debated the application in full and noted that an identical application had been rejected in 2017 and had also been rejected by the Planning Inspector at appeal. Some Members felt that this application was contrary to policies in the Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and as such there were no material planning considerations that would make them go against the officer recommendation.

Other Members were of the opinion that the application could be acceptable in principle if classed as tourist accommodation and could be controlled with conditions.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be REFUSED; a vote was taken on the proposal and was CARRIED.

Due to arriving late into the meeting, Councillor Shaw-Wright did not take part in the discussion or vote on this application.

**RESOLVED:**

**That the application be REFUSED for the reasons set out below:**

- i) The proposed development represents the erection of an isolated new dwelling for holiday occupation which would be outside the development limits on land in the open countryside. The development would not constitute any of the types of development acceptable in principle in the countryside defined within Policy SP2 of the Core Strategy, nor would it improve or contribute to the local rural economy or enhance the vitality of a rural settlement. It would therefore fail to comply with the aims of Policies SP1, SP2 and SP13 of the Core Strategy and with Policy RT11 of the Selby District Local Plan and with the NPPF.**
  
- ii) Although it is considered that the development is acceptable with respect to design and proposed boundary treatments, the scheme still introduces a new dwelling into the countryside which results in a harmful urbanising impact on the character and appearance of the area. This conflicts with the aims of Policies SP13D, SP18 and SP19 of the Core Strategy, with Policy ENV1 and RT11 of the Local Plan and with the NPPF.**

## 59.2 2020/0449/HPA - 2 THE GLADE, ESCRICK, YORK

**Application:** 2020/0449/HPA

**Location:** 2 The Glade, Escrick, York

**Proposal:** Conversion of dormer bungalow to include single and two storey front and rear extensions and front dormer roof extensions complete with internal alterations to create additional living accommodation

The Planning Officer presented the application which had been brought before Planning Committee as the application had been called in by the local Ward Member.

The Committee noted that the application was the conversion of a dormer bungalow to include single and two storey front and rear extensions and front dormer roof extensions complete with internal alterations to create additional living accommodation.

The Officer Update Note outlined the following points:

- Clarified the description of the proposal.
- That an additional letter of representation had been received however raised no objections to the application.
- Clarified errors that were contained under section five in the report.

The Committee asked questions in relation to the scale of the extension and how that impacted and compared to neighbouring properties. Additionally, Members queried the impact of losing a bungalow in the area.

Amy Morgan, representing objectors, was invited remotely into the meeting and spoke against the application.

Lilian Coulson, representing Escrick Parish Council, was invited remotely into the meeting and spoke against the application.

Louise Adkins, applicant, was invited remotely into the meeting and spoke in support of the application.

Members debated the application in full and felt that the application would impact the neighbouring properties and was out of character for the street it was located. Concern was raised at the design of the application, the

impact of removing a bungalow in the area and that due to the size and scale, it constituted overdevelopment. As such it was felt that the application was contrary to policies SP8 and SP19 of the Local Plan and ENV1 of the Local Plan.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be REFUSED; a vote was taken on the proposal and was CARRIED.

**RESOLVED:**

- 1. To REFUSE the application for the following reasons:**

**The application constitutes overdevelopment for the area due to its size and scale and therefore fails to comply with policy SP19 of the Core Strategy and ENV1 of the Local Plan. The application is also contrary to policy SP8 of the Core Strategy which relates to housing mix as the application proposes the change from a bungalow to a large house.**

- 2. To ask Officers to formally draft the reasons for refusal based on those set out by Members above.**

The meeting closed at 3.30 pm.