Minutes

Planning Committee

Venue:	Council Chamber - Civic Centre, Doncaster Road, Selby, YO8 9FT
Date:	Wednesday, 7 July 2021
Time:	2.00 pm
Present:	Councillor J Mackman in the Chair J Mackman (Vice-Chair), M Topping, K Ellis, I Chilvers, R Packham, P Welch, D Mackay and C Richardson
Officers Present:	Martin Grainger – Head of Planning, Ruth Hardingham – Planning Development Manager, Glenn Sharpe – Solicitor, Mandy Cooper – Senior Planning Officer, Chris Fairchild – Senior Planning Officer, Jac Cruickshank – Planning Officer Victoria Foreman – Democratic Services Officer

21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor J Cattanach. There was no substitute appointed.

22 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

There were no disclosures of interest.

23 CHAIR'S ADDRESS TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

The Chair announced that an Officer Update Note had been circulated and was available to view alongside the agenda on the Council's website.

The Committee noted that any late representations on the applications would be summarised by the Officer in their presentation.

24 PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED

The Planning Committee considered the following planning applications:

24.1 2019/0712/FUL - THE WORKSHOP, RYTHER ROAD, CAWOOD

Application: 2019/0712/FUL

Location: The Workshop, Ryther Road, Cawood
Proposal: Conversion and alteration of storage building to form a single dwelling

The Planning Officer presented the application which had been brought before Planning Committee as the proposal was contrary to the requirements of the development plan (namely Criterion 1 of Policy H12 of the Selby District Local Plan), but it was considered that there were material considerations which would justify approval of the application.

Members noted that the application was for the conversion and alteration of storage building to form a single dwelling.

The Officer Update Note set out details of re-consultation with North Yorkshire County Council Highways on the amended layout plan, as well as additional conditions relating to land contamination and drainage. There was also an extra informative from Yorkshire Water Services regarding any sewer adoption or diversion.

Members debated the application and expressed their support for the scheme.

In accordance with the Officer's report, it was proposed and seconded that the application be GRANTED. A vote was taken on the proposal and was carried.

RESOLVED:

To GRANT the application subject to the conditions set out at paragraph 7 of the report and the Officer Update Note.

24.2 2020/1300/FUL - TAMWOOD, STATION ROAD, RICCALL

Application: 2020/1300/FUL
Location: Tamwood, Station Road, Riccall
Proposal: Demolition of the existing dwelling, and construction of seven residential properties

The Senior Planning Officer presented the application which had been brought before Planning Committee due to the number of objections received which were contrary to the Officers' recommendation to approve, and in addition at the request of the local Ward Member.

Members noted that the application was for the demolition of the existing dwelling, and construction of

seven residential properties.

The Committee asked questions of the Officer regarding the preservation of trees on the site and tree surveys, the density of development, the provision of parking and the space for larger vehicles such as delivery and refuse lorries, the withdrawal of previous applications by the applicant, design of the scheme and the functionality of the chimneys.

Officers confirmed that the trees on site had been considered by an expert who was content that they could be retained, and that the proposals for seven properties did not constitute overdevelopment. The County Ecologist considered the site's bat surveys as completed and was satisfied with the proposed scheme; bat tubes and nest boxes for birds would be provided and was a matter which would be conditioned. Officers were unable to confirm if the chimneys on the properties would be decorative or functional; this would be for the applicants to answer.

In attendance remotely at the meeting was an Officer from the North Yorkshire County Council Highways Team, who expressed the view that there would be sufficient space on site for lorries and refuse vehicles.

The Officer Update Note set out changes to the scheme design (site plans and plot layouts/elevations), an updated ecology report regarding bats, clarification from the arboriculturist on tree retention, revisions to existing conditions and the addition of various new conditions.

Mr Matthew Pardoe, objector, was invited remotely into the meeting and spoke against the application.

Mr Brian Keen, parish council representative, was invited remotely into the meeting and spoke against the application.

Councillor John Duggan, objector, was invited remotely into the meeting and spoke against the application.

Mr Lee Vincent, agent, was in attendance at the meeting in person and spoke in favour of the application.

Members debated the application in detail and expressed their concerns about the scheme. The Committee noted that whilst there were several revised drawings, the changes had been relatively minor and as such had not

required re-consultation.

Councillors referenced the recent site visit by the Committee and as a result repeated their concerns regarding space on Station Road for larger vehicles.

Some Members expressed their support for the application and stated that it was preferable to build in already built-up sites such as the one currently before the Committee, as opposed to the open countryside. No issues had been raised by North Yorkshire County Council and trees on site would be retained.

It was felt by the majority of the Committee that the main issues with the proposals were highways, residential amenity, nature conservation, the impact on the character of the local area and the impact on the conservation area. Whilst the application could not be refused on highways or density grounds, there were still significant concerns from Members around nature conservation. The retention of trees was very important, more so than ever with the low carbon agenda, and there was no positive contribution to conservation in the scheme, despite the site being surrounded on three sides by the conservation area. Trees on the site would be damaged or put under threat and the spaciousness of the plot being lost had already been acknowledged by the Conservation Officer.

Members disagreed with the Officer's recommendation in the report as it was contrary to policies SP 4(c), SP 18, SP 19, ENV 25 and ENV 1(i)(5).

The Chair informed the meeting that he would be abstaining from any decision on the application as he was not present at the meeting at which it had first been considered and had also not attended the site visit.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be refused for the following reasons: detrimental impact to the setting of the conservation area, overdevelopment of the site with the loss of residential amenity, the lack of parking facilities and highways safety issues and that the privacy of neighbours would be compromised by overlooking and overshadowing.

A vote was taken on REFUSAL and was carried.

RESOLVED:

1. To REFUSE the application for the

following reasons:

- **the detrimental impact to the setting of the conservation area;**
- **the overdevelopment of the site with the loss of residential amenity;**
- **the lack of parking facilities and highways safety issues;**
- **that the privacy of neighbours would be compromised by overlooking and overshadowing; and**

2. **To delegate to Officers the agreement of the precise wording, in consultation with Councillor J Mackman and Councillor R Packham.**

24.3 2019/0759/FUL - LAND ADJACENT A163, MARKET WEIGHTON ROAD, NORTH DUFFIELD

Application: 2019/0759/FUL
Location: Land adjacent A163, Market Weighton Road, North Duffield
Proposal: Proposed erection of 5 dwellings and associated infrastructure

The Senior Planning Officer presented the application which had been brought before Planning Committee as an update to the report considered at the Planning Committee held on 27 January 2021. Members debated the proposal; acknowledged that it was not a straightforward scheme and expressed concerns given it was a departure from the Council's Development Plan and a site that had been given initial permission when the Council did not have a five-year land supply.

Members noted that the application was for the proposed erection of five dwellings and the associated infrastructure.

The Officer Update Note stated that 2015/0517/OUT had lapsed and that several separate applications had been submitted and subsequently approved, despite the Local Planning Authority now having a five-year (plus) land supply for housing. Condition 17 (the removal of permitted development rights in respect of conversion of garages) was to be omitted, and at page 61 of the report the informatives relating to consent and those following should state 'Internal Drainage Board's' consent rather than 'Board's consent'.

The Committee asked questions of the Officer regarding the limited landscaping and how some Members felt that this would impact on the character of the site, as there were still no measures to address this on the revised scheme.

Members queried whether the Parish Council had been consulted again on the revised proposals before the meeting; Officers explained that as the changes had been so minimal, consultation was not required. The Parish Council's previous objections had been focused on the housing types. Members acknowledged that the layout of the houses on the site had not been altered.

Vikki Sykes, agent, was invited remotely into the meeting and spoke in favour of the application.

Members debated the application further, with some Committee Members not accepting the arguments given in the report and by Officers for the lack of planting on the western edge of the site, which would, in some Members' opinions, be detrimental. Other Members questioned whether tree planting was a serious enough issue to justify going against the Officer's recommendation.

Other Members expressed a strong opposition to the scheme and gave a few reasons for refusal. These reasons included:

- that there were no extant planning permissions on the site, as all previous permissions for outline and reserved maters had lapsed;
- that the proposed housing development on the site was a departure from the Development Plan which was the statutory starting point for decision making;
- that there were no material planning considerations which outweighed the conflicts with the up-to-date Development Plan;
- that the proposed development was outside the statutory development limits of North Duffield and in the open countryside, in breach of planning policy; and
- that given the proposals were a departure from the Development Plan, by definition they were not sustainable; as such in this regard there were no significant social, economic and environmental benefits to the village of North Duffield.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be REFUSED. An amendment was subsequently proposed

that the application be APPROVED, subject to an amendment to Condition 15 that further details on tree planting would be confirmed in due course.

A vote was taken on the amendment to APPROVE the application and was LOST.

A vote was taken on the substantive motion to REFUSE the application and was CARRIED.

RESOLVED:

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

- **there were no extant planning permissions on the site, as all previous permissions for outline and reserved maters had lapsed;**
- **the proposed housing development on the site was a departure from the Development Plan which was the statutory starting point for decision making;**
- **there were no material planning considerations which outweighed the conflicts with the up-to-date Development Plan;**
- **the proposed development was outside the statutory development limits of North Duffield and in the open countryside, in breach of planning policy;**
- **that given the proposals were a departure from the Development Plan, by definition they were not sustainable; as such in this regard there were no significant social, economic and environmental benefits to the village of North Duffield; and**

2. **To delegate to Officers the agreement of the precise wording, in consultation with Councillor J Mackman and Councillor R Packham.**

The meeting closed at 4.03 pm.