

Planning Committee

Venue:	Council Chamber - Civic Centre, Doncaster Road, Selby, YO8 9FT
Date:	Wednesday, 6 October 2021
Time:	2.00 pm
Present:	Councillor J Cattanach in the Chair Councillors J Mackman (Vice-Chair), M Topping, K Ellis, R Packham, P Welch, D Mackay and C Richardson
Officers Present:	Martin Grainger - Head of Planning, Ruth Hardingham – Planning Development Manager, Glenn Sharpe – Solicitor, Diane Holgate – Principal Planning Officer, Rebecca Leggott – Planning Project Officer, Ryan King – Senior Planning Policy Officer, Victoria Foreman – Democratic Services Officer
Press:	1
Public:	14

34 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor I Chilvers.

35 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

All Committee Members declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 5.1 2020/0149/FULM – Sellite Blocks Ltd., Long Lane, Great Heck, Goole as they had all received a number of representations in relation to the application; however, no Members were required to leave the meeting during consideration thereof.

Councillor M Topping declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda items 5.3 and 5.4 – 2021/0349/FUL and 2021/0638/FUL – Birchwood Lodge, Market Weighton Road, Barlby, Selby as he had received representations from residents and had attended site visits with Councillor K Arthur and the Head of Planning; as such, Councillor Topping confirmed that due to his previous involvement he would not be taking part in the consideration of either item and would be leaving the meeting during consideration thereof.

36 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.

37 MINUTES

The Committee considered the minutes of the Planning Committee meetings held on 18 August 2021 and 8 September 2021.

RESOLVED:

To approve the minutes of the Planning Committee meetings held on 18 August 2021 and 8 September 2021 for signing by the Chairman.

38 PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED

The Planning Committee considered the following planning applications:

38.1 2020/0149/FULM - SELITE BLOCKS LTD, LONG LANE, GREAT HECK, GOOLE

Application: 2020/0149/FULM

Location: Selite Blocks Ltd., Long Lane, Great Heck, Goole

Proposal: Proposed erection of a foamed glass manufacturing facility including hard surfacing for material storage

The Principal Planning Officer presented the application which had been brought before Planning Committee as it was a major application where 10 or more letters of representation had been received that raised material planning considerations against the recommendation.

Members noted that the application was for the proposed erection of a foamed glass manufacturing facility including hard surfacing for material storage.

The Officer Update Note had been circulated and published online ahead of the meeting which gave details of corrected wording to the recommendation and paragraph 1.3 of the report, as well as an update on the NYCC Highways and Transportation consultation. Several additional conditions and informatives were also set out in the update note, alongside details of further representations received from local residents.

The Committee asked numerous questions of the Officer regarding; vehicular access to the site, the views of the Landscape Architect and the Environmental Health Officer, the visual impact, potential dust and pollution from the site, the source of the glass to be used in production, noise monitoring, job creation, the substances to be produced by chimneys and exhausts on the building and whether the concerns of the Highways Authority had been addressed.

With regards to access, Officers explained that there was to be new access for HGVs but that existing pedestrian access would be maintained.

Members noted that the Landscape Architect and Environmental Health Officer's concerns had been addressed, as well as those of the Highways Authority. Potential pollution from the site was constantly monitored and there were standards in place to manage emissions. A great deal of the work by the facility would be internal and there were dampening down facilities on site which would reduce dust.

Officers clarified that whilst the business would be using a novel technology, it was the same company undertaking the work that would tie in with glass recycling products in the area; the processes would operate alongside each other. It was hoped that the glass for recycling would come from local facilities.

The Committee understood that noise monitoring exercises undertaken on site would meet professional standards, with the work based on a shift pattern. Approximately 34 new jobs were being created on site, with an increase of around 14 HGV movements a day. Lastly, Members also noted that the chimneys would be producing water vapour.

Stuart Vendy, objector, was invited to speak at the meeting and spoke against the application.

John Hunter, Heck Parish Council, was invited to speak at the meeting and spoke against the application.

Councillor J McCartney, Ward Member, was invited to speak at the meeting and spoke against the application.

Colin Hope, applicant, was invited to speak to the meeting and spoke in favour of the application.

Members debated the application further and acknowledged that the scheme before them was a major application in the open countryside, outside development limits and was subject to several objections. As such, the Committee felt that both a site visit and additional information would be appropriate before a decision was taken, therefore consideration of the application should be deferred. Some Members also had concerns around several the pre-conditions on which they wanted further explanations from Officers.

It was proposed and seconded that consideration of the application be deferred, that additional information be provided and a site visit undertaken. A vote was taken on the proposal and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED:

That consideration of the application be DEFERRED in order for additional information be provided to the Committee and for a site visit to be undertaken.

38.2 2020/1041/FUL - GOTHIC FARM, MAIN STREET, NORTH DUFFIELD, SELBY

Application: 2020/1041/FUL

Location: Gothic Farm, Main Street, North Duffield, Selby

Proposal: Proposed conversion of existing agricultural building to 2no dwellings with garages and erection of 3no dwellings with garages following demolition of existing farm buildings

The Senior Planning Policy Officer presented the application which had been brought before Planning Committee as the proposal was contrary to the requirements of the Development Plan in that it did not strictly accord with the provisions of Policy SP2(c) of the Selby District Core Strategy, as the proposal included the erection of a dwelling outside the defined Development Limit of the settlement. However, the proposal would comply with all other relevant criteria, and it was considered that there were material considerations which would support the recommendation for approval.

Members noted that the application was for the proposed conversion of an existing agricultural building to 2no dwellings with garages and erection of 3no dwellings with

garages following demolition of existing farm buildings.

The Committee asked if a tree survey had been undertaken and therefore if the impact on the countryside had been properly assessed. There was also some discussion around the preferred allocation of the site. Officers confirmed that a tree survey had not been done but that the trees listed on site would all be retained.

Bob Wells, North Duffield Parish Council was invited to speak at the meeting and expressed the Parish Council's support for the application, subject to some issues of concern.

Leo Tindell, agent, was invited to speak at the meeting and spoke in favour of the application.

Members debated the application further, with Committee Members expressing their support for the scheme and the maintenance of the existing farmhouse on the site, but again raised concerns around the preservation of the existing trees. Whilst it could be acceptable to refuse the application as part of the site fell outside of development limits, there were also reasons why it would be acceptable to approve it, including the redevelopment of a farmstead in its setting, its situation on the village outskirts and the replacement of derelict buildings with practical ones. The proposals were of a good design and would accommodate any extension to the village in the future.

It was proposed by Members that Condition 03 should be amended to include the words 'in writing' as follows:

*'03. No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Internal Drainage Board has approved a Scheme for the provision of surface water drainage works **in writing.**'*

The Committee also felt that affordable housing should be offered on such sites as this.

A query was raised regarding the potential inclusion of pavement by the developer on Back Lane; Officers explained that this did not constitute part of the application and as such was not appropriate for discussion.

Members asked whether a condition would be needed in

writing to ensure that trees on site were not removed, despite assurances from the agent that they would not. The Legal Officer reminded Members that conditions had to be appropriate and enforceable. The Committee understood the importance of trees to the setting and character of the site and were unsure as to how the effect of the existing trees could be fully understood without a tree survey having been carried out; the retention of the site's trees was important.

It was suggested that it be delegated to the Head of Planning, in conjunction with Officers, to draft and include an additional condition to ensure the retention and protection of the trees on the site from damage.

Members agreed with the proposal and as such it was accordingly proposed and seconded that the application should be GRANTED. A vote was taken and the application and was approved.

RESOLVED:

To GRANT the application subject to:

- 1. the completion of a Unilateral Undertaking;**
- 2. the conditions set out at paragraph 7 of the report; and**
- 3. delegation to the Head of Planning, in conjunction with Officers, to draft and include an additional condition to ensure the retention and protection of the trees on site from damage.**

38.3 2021/0349/FUL - BIRCHWOOD LODGE, MARKET WEIGHTON ROAD, BARLBY, SELBY

Councillor M Topping left the meeting at this point.

Application: 2021/0349/FUL

Location: Birchwood Lodge, Market Weighton Road, Barlby, Selby

Proposal: Erection of two buildings for use as E(g)(iii) industrial workshops following demolition of an existing building used for B8 storage

The Planning Project Officer presented the application which had been brought before Planning Committee as

the application had been called in by the Ward Member, Councillor Arthur, due to concerns over the adverse impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers through visual and noise impacts.

Members noted that the application was for the erection of two buildings for use as E(g)(iii) industrial workshops following demolition of an existing building used for B8 storage.

The Committee asked questions of the Officer regarding the footprint of the new buildings, the use of other buildings for storage and as workshops and the noise implications of a building next to a residential unit.

Officers explained that the footprint of the new building would be larger than that of the existing one, and that whilst the building next to the residential unit would be used for engineering there would be restrictions in place to ensure that there was no impact on noise, dust etc. as it was purely for light industrial work.

Michael McDonald, objector, was unable to attend the meeting to speak in person but had provided a copy of his speech, which was read out by the Democratic Services Officer; Mr McDonald's representation was against the application.

Councillor K Arthur, Ward Member, was unable to attend the meeting to speak in person but had provided a copy of his speech, which was read out by the Democratic Services Officer; Councillor Arthur's representation expressed concerns about the application and asked that further mitigations be implemented in order to protect the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

Jonathan Forman, agent, was unable to attend the meeting to speak in person but had provided a copy of his speech, which was read out by the Democratic Services Officer; Mr Forman's representation was in support of the application.

Members debated the application further, with Members expressing their general support for the scheme following a previous site visit.

The Committee acknowledged that concerns had been raised regarding cladding and noise the impact on residential amenity, as well as the piecemeal expansion of the location. Members asked Officers to speak to the

applicant about the latter issue and the need for a long-term view of what was planned for the future of the business and, therefore, the site itself.

Officers confirmed that they had started a dialogue with the site owners to encourage an understanding of their future plans.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be GRANTED. A vote was taken and the application and was approved.

RESOLVED:

To GRANT the application subject to the conditions set out at paragraph 7 of the report.

38.4 2021/0638/FUL - BIRCHWOOD LODGE, MARKET WEIGHTON ROAD, BARLBY, SELBY

Application: 2021/0638/FUL

Location: Birchwood Lodge, Market Weighton Road, Barlby, Selby

Proposal: Single storey B8 storage unit

The Planning Project Officer presented the application which had been brought before Planning Committee as the application had been called in by Ward Councillor Arthur, due to concerns over the adverse impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, through visual and noise impacts.

Members noted that the application was for a single storey B8 storage unit.

The Committee asked questions of the Officer regarding the location of the building on site and any potential impact on trees. Officers explained that the storage unit was to be made from a shipping container and, as such, would not require foundations that could have potentially damaged tree roots. It was suggested that if Members felt they required further information, the application should be deferred, or a specific condition constructed by Officers (in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee) to specify the protection of trees near to where the single storey storage unit was to be erected.

Michael McDonald, objector, was unable to attend the meeting to speak in person but had provided a copy of his speech, which was read out by the Democratic

Services Officer; Mr McDonald's representation was against the application.

Councillor K Arthur, Ward Member, was unable to attend the meeting to speak in person but had provided a copy of his speech, which was read out by the Democratic Services Officer; Councillor Arthur's representation expressed concerns about the application and asked that further mitigations be implemented in order to protect the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

Jonathan Forman, agent, was unable to attend the meeting to speak in person but had provided a copy of his speech, which was read out by the Democratic Services Officer; Mr Forman's representation was in support of the application.

Members debated the application further, particularly in relation to the previously raised concerns about the trees next to where the storage unit was to be placed. The Committee closely examined the plans that had been supplied alongside the report; the plans indicated that there was in fact suitable room between the trees and the hardstanding to prevent damage to nearby trees. As a result, the Committee withdrew their concerns and agreed that an additional condition or further information were not required.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be GRANTED. A vote was taken and the application and was approved.

RESOLVED:

To GRANT the application subject to the conditions set out at paragraph 7 of the report.

39 MEMBER BRIEFING: GASCOIGNE WOOD FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

Members received a briefing from representatives of the Gascoigne Wood Rail Freight Interchange site, a potentially significant development at the former Gascoigne Wood Colliery site off New Lennerton Lane, Sherburn in Elmet. The Committee acknowledged that the proposals were still evolving but had reached a point where public consultation had commenced and a dialogue with Members and their preliminary (without prejudice) thoughts on the underlying principles to be presented by the potential applicants were now sought.

The Committee asked a number of questions in relation to the siting of the car park and gatehouse, occupation of the site, how long the work would take and

when it would commence, the use of the existing rail infrastructure and links to the climate change agenda and sustainability, the transportation of staff and the total size of the entire site.

The representatives for the scheme explained that they were currently unsure which businesses would end up occupying the very large site, but that a zero-carbon agenda was being pushed, hence the focus on the use of the existing rail infrastructure across the entire site; Members were informed that the site would not be brought forward without the use of the rail element. It was hoped that work on the site would start in the next year or so, and it was estimated that it would take around seven years to complete.

In terms of the transport of potential staff that would work on site, it was expected that they would arrive by car and by bus, but this would also depend on who the end user and occupier of the site was. It was acknowledged that the sustainability of transport was key, and that options such as the use of nearby train stations in South Milford and Sherburn in Elmet would have to be explored, as well as improvements to cycle facilities. Members noted that most jobs on the site were likely to be in manufacturing and it was hoped that local people from the Selby district would be filling these jobs.

Members were supportive of the proposed design, particularly in relation to it being landscape led, in muted colours and with a biodiversity net gain.

Lastly, the Committee were informed that the total size of the entire site was 49.6 hectares.

RESOLVED:

Members thanked the scheme's representatives for attending the meeting and noted the information.

The meeting closed at 5.10 pm.