

Planning Committee

Venue:	Council Chamber - Civic Centre, Doncaster Road, Selby, YO8 9FT
Date:	Wednesday, 10 November 2021
Time:	2.00 pm
Present:	Councillor J Cattanach in the Chair Councillors 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, Diane Holgate – Preincipal Planning Officer, Garth Stent – Principal Planning Officer, Jac Cruicshank – Planning Officer, Ashley Pratt – North Yorkshire County Council Highways Officer, Jack Hopper – Environmental Health Officer, Victoria Foreman – Democratic Services Officer
Press:	1
Public:	27

40 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

41 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

All Committee Members declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda items 5.1 - 2020/0149/FULM – Sellite Blocks Ltd., Long Lane, Great Heck, Goole and 5.3 – Staynor Hall, Abbots Road, Selby as they had all received several representations in relation to the two applications; however, no Members were required to leave the meeting during consideration thereof.

42 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.

The Chair announced that the order of business had been amended so that item 5.3 (2015/0452/EIA – Staynor Hall, Abbots Road, Selby) would be taken first, followed by item 5.1 (2020/0149/FULM - Sellite Blocks Ltd., Long Lane, Great Heck) and lastly item 5.2 (2021/0860/HPA – 19 Dower Chase, Escrick).

43 MINUTES

The Committee considered the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 6 October 2021.

RESOLVED:

To approve the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 6 October 2021 for signing by the Chairman.

44 PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED

The Planning Committee considered the following planning applications.

44.1 2015/0452/EIA (8/19/1011AV/PA) - STAYNOR HALL, ABBOTS ROAD, SELBY

Application: 2015/0542/EIA

Location: Staynor Hall, Abbots Road, Selby

Proposal: Reserved matters application for the erection of 215 dwellings following outline approval CO/2002/1185 (8/19/1011C/PA) for the erection of 1200 dwellings (4 existing to be demolished) employment, public open space, shopping and community facilities (including up to 2,000 sq. m of shops) together with associated footpaths, cycleways, roads, engineering at Phase 4

The Planning Officer presented the application which had been brought to Committee as it was a significant residential development that had received 3rd party objections, which raised material planning considerations in objection to the scheme, and Officers would otherwise determine the application contrary to these representations. The application was also EIA development owing to the original outline consent.

Members noted that the application was for a reserved matters application for the erection of 215 dwellings following outline approval CO/2002/1185 (8/19/1011C/PA) for the erection of 1200 dwellings (4 existing to be demolished) employment, public open space, shopping and community facilities (including up to

2,000 sq. m of shops) together with associated footpaths, cycleways, roads, engineering at Phase 4.

In attendance at the meeting was a Highways Officer from North Yorkshire County Council.

An Officer Update Note had been circulated and published online ahead of the meeting which contained significant additional information for the consideration of Members; it included a consultation response from Selby Town Council, an additional representation from Selby College and their consultants WSP, seven supplementary objections from residents, further information from the applicant's agent and comments from North Yorkshire Police and VPK Holdings. There were also amendments to Conditions 4, 5, 9, 12 and 13.

The Committee asked numerous questions of the Officer about various aspects of the application. These included access to the Staynor Hall estate via Abbots Road and related road safety issues for students and residents, the distance of the proposed houses from Staynor Wood, noise impact on residential properties, landscaping and the potential effect of the scheme on ancient woodland, piling and scheme viability, access arrangements as per the outline of the original masterplan, the removal of trees and verges to provide the aforementioned access and the width of the resulting hardstanding. The Committee also queried if any other points of access had been considered as part of the scheme; Officers confirmed that in the original 2002/2005 application access via Bawtry Road had been contemplated but was deemed to be not possible.

Judith Firth, objector, was invited to speak at the meeting and spoke against the application.

The Committee noted that the Chair had given his permission for a second objector to speak at the meeting; as such Phil Sayles, Principal of Selby College, was invited to speak at the meeting and spoke against the application.

Councillor Steve Shaw-Wright, Ward Councillor, was invited to speak at the meeting and spoke against the application.

Paul Butler, applicant, was invited to speak at the meeting and spoke for the application.

Members went on to debate the application in detail. The Committee felt that traffic surveys around the college should be undertaken at peak times if not already done, as this was a crucial piece of information. The Officer from North Yorkshire County Council confirmed that there were no objections to the scheme from the Highways Team.

The Committee asked if alternative access points along East Common Lane had been considered; Officers responded that it had not been included in past discussions. Members were reminded that they needed to consider the matters before them, but should the application be deferred, alternative access could be explored, which would likely require significant reengineering of the scheme.

Members made it clear that they had contemplated the various options as set out in the report, and whilst some were supportive of the recommendation to grant, the majority of the Committee were of the opinion that the proposed access was not safe, and as such, the application should be deferred in order for Officers to consider it again. As well as deferral, a site visit was proposed to be undertaken at peak traffic times in order for Members to see the reality of traffic flow down Abbots Road. The Committee also felt that the impact on the adjoining woodland needed to be explored further, the Landscape Architect consulted on the scheme and alternative access investigated.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be DEFERRED. A vote was taken and was carried.

RESOLVED:

That the application be DEFERRED in order for:

- **a site visit, at peak traffic times, to be undertaken;**
- **Officers to explore further alternative access to the site and the impact of the proposals on the nearby woodland; and**
- **the Landscape Architect to be consulted on the scheme.**

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9, a vote was taken for the meeting to continue beyond three hours in length in the event it ran over this time.

RESOLVED:

To continue the meeting beyond three hours if needed.

44.2 2020/0149/FULM - SELLITE BLOCKS LTD., LONG LANE, GREAT HECK, GOOLE

Application: 2020/0149/FULM

Location: Sellite 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 considered by the Committee on 6 October 2021, as the application was a major application where 10 or more letters of representation had been received against the officer recommendation. Members had resolved to defer the application for a site visit to assess the impact on the highway, visual impact on the countryside and the impact on occupiers of residential properties. The Committee had also deferred for further information with regards to the necessary conditions, HGV traffic movements, hours of operation, clarification of emissions from the plant and further details on visual impact. Planning Committee Members, Parish Councillors and Mr Vendy as agent for Heck Parish Council had been invited to the site visit along with NYCC Highways Officer and SDC Environmental Health Officer.

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

In attendance at the meeting was an Environmental Health Officer from Selby District Council.

An Officer Update Note had been circulated and published online ahead of the meeting which gave details of an amendment to the recommendation and Heads of Terms for the legal agreement, additional information from the applicant relating to traffic routing, draft CEMPs and the landscaping scheme, comparison of building heights to other tall buildings in the district and lastly

additional representations from objectors that referred to the Local Plan and landscaping.

The Committee asked numerous questions of the Officer about the scheme which covered other block manufacturing in the area, building elevation and visibility of the highest point, night-time operations and resultant noise and the views of the Landscape Officer.

Officers explained that the facility was one of a number of such businesses in the area, which also included environmental and waste recycling companies.

The Committee were informed that a noise impact assessment had been undertaken by Environmental Health at both day and night; the operations at night were between 11.00pm and 7.00am. The Environmental Health Officer was satisfied that suitable mitigation measures were in place to reduce noise. Officers also confirmed that the night operations were reduced from those in the day and that there were fully enforceable conditions regarding the use of such things as vehicle reversal beepers.

Lastly, Members noted that in terms of the Landscape Officer's report when considering views of the facility, the landscape effects were moderate adverse to negligible, as were the visual effects. Officers confirmed that subject to the landscaping scheme, the residual effects on the landscape were not considered to be significant. The proposed development would be visible from close, medium and long-range regions of the surrounding landscape because of the substantial height and scale. Mitigation measures would reduce the visual effects but were less effective in terms of the tallest part of the building. As a result, it was accepted by all parties that the tallest part of the building would be seen, which could not be mitigated against.

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 constituted a major application; some Members felt that the proposals were acceptable and that potential effects on the surrounding landscape and residential amenity were manageable though the numerous conditions attached to the Officer's recommendation.

Other Committee Members strongly felt that in terms of the scheme's carbon footprint there needed to be policies that took this into account so it could be properly assessed; as a result some Members stated they would not be supporting the application.

The site visit undertaken by the Committee was judged to have been very useful as it had allowed Members to assess how the proposals would impact the surrounding area; on balance, the application was felt to be acceptable.

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

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the application be GRANTED, subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 3 of the report and the Officer Update Note, and the completion of a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) in relation to the following matters:**
 - a) long term landscape and ecology management plan (30 years);**
 - b) delivery of 10% biodiversity net gain on land identified within the blue land (owned by the applicant) in accordance with a detailed scheme to be agreed; and**
 - c) traffic routing plan for HGVs.**
- 2. That the Head of Planning/Panning**

Development Manager be authorised to issue the planning permission on completion of the agreement.

44.3 2021/0860/HPA - 19 DOWER CHASE, ESCRICK

Application: 2021/0149/FULM

Location: 19 Dower Chase, Escrick

Proposal: Erection of a new first floor annexe over the existing garage

The Planning Officer presented the application which had been brought to Committee as the applicant was a Ward Councillor.

Members noted that the application was for the erection of a new first floor annexe over the existing garage.

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

RESOLVED:

That the application be GRANTED, subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 7 of the report.

The meeting closed at 5.22 pm.