

Planning Committee

Venue: Council Chamber - Civic Centre, Doncaster Road, Selby,
YO8 9FT

Date: Wednesday, 19 May 2021

Time: 2.00 pm

Present: Councillor J Cattanach in the Chair

Councillors I Chilvers, R Packham, D Mackay and S Shaw-Wright

Officers Present: Martin Grainger (Head of Planning), Glenn Sharpe (Solicitor), Irma Sinkeviciene (Planning Officer), Jenny Tyreman (Senior Planning Officer), Chris Fairchild (Senior Planning Officer), Jac Cruickshank (Planning Officer) and Palbinder Mann (Democratic Services Manager)

5 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ellis, Mackman and Welch.

Councillor Grogan was in attendance as a substitute for Councillor Ellis. Councillor Pearson was in attendance as a substitute for Councillor Mackman. Councillor Duckett was in attendance as a substitute for Councillor Welch.

6 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

Councillor Cattanach declared that he had received representations in respect of agenda items, 5.2 and 5.3 – Land Off Lowfield Road, Hillam and agenda item 5.4 – Tamwood, Station Road, Riccall.

Councillor Mackay declared that he had received representations in respect of agenda items, 5.2 and 5.3 – Land Off Lowfield Road, Hillam and agenda item 5.4 – Tamwood, Station Road, Riccall.

Councillor Packham declared that he had received representations in respect of agenda items, 5.2 and 5.3 – Land Off Lowfield Road, Hillam and agenda item 5.4 – Tamwood, Station Road, Riccall.

Councillor Shaw-Wright declared that he had received representations in

respect of agenda items, 5.2 and 5.3 – Land Off Lowfield Road, Hillam and agenda item 5.4 – Tamwood, Station Road, Riccall.

7 CHAIR'S ADDRESS TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

The Chair explained that following a query at a previous meeting concerning the safety of pavement signage in Selby and Tadcaster, he had received an email from an officer and the company who made the graphics for the signage that they were safe to use and designed to use on the surfaces they were currently being used on.

8 MINUTES

The Committee considered the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 28 April 2021.

RESOLVED:

To approve the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 28 April 2021 for signing by the Chairman.

9 PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED

The Planning Committee considered the following planning applications:

9.1 2020/0137/FUL - LAND ADJACENT TO 2 PROSPECT VILLAS, BARLOW COMMON ROAD, BARLOW

Application: 2020/0137/FUL

Location: Land Adjacent to 2 Prospect Villas, Barlow Common Road, Barlow

Proposal: Proposed erection of a storage building on land adjacent

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report which had been brought back before Planning Committee as it was previously deferred at a Planning Committee which took place on 10 February 2021.

Members noted that the application was for the proposed erection of a storage building on the land adjacent.

The Officer Update Note stated that since publication of the officer's report, an extension of time until 20 May 2021 had been agreed with the applicant via email. Additionally, the Committee was informed that since the report was written, the policy context noted at paragraph 4.3 of the report has been updated to reflect that the Local Plan had moved into the next stage of consultation.

The Members were also updated that since the publication of the Officer's Report and Officer's Update

note, there was an email received from one of the supporters of this application advising that they cannot remember making this representation.

The Committee was informed that there had been significant amendments since the previous application. The Committee asked questions regarding the location of the letters of support, how the application supported economic growth and the use of the building to be erected.

Richard Borrows, agent, was invited remotely into the meeting and spoke in support of the application.

Members debated the application. It was proposed and seconded that the application should be refused due to non-compliance with Policy SP13 of the Core Strategy. Upon being put to the vote, this proposal was lost. Following this, in accordance with the Officer's report it was proposed and seconded to APPROVE the application; a vote was taken on the proposal and it was carried.

RESOLVED:

To GRANT permission subject to the conditions set out at section 7 of the report.

9.2 2020/0631/FUL - LAND OFF LOWFIELD ROAD, HILLAM

Application: 2020/0631/FUL

Location: Land off Lowfield Road, Hillam, Leeds, West Yorkshire

Proposal: Erection of a livestock building with associated infrastructure (building 1 of 2)

The Assistant Principal Planning Officer presented the report which had been brought before Planning Committee as the application was a minor application where 10 or more letters of representation had been received which raised material planning considerations and where officers would otherwise determine the application contrary to these representations. Furthermore, it was explained that the ward councillor for the area where the proposal was located had requested the application to be heard by Planning Committee for reasons outlined in the report.

Members noted that the application was for the proposed erection of livestock building with associated

infrastructure.

The Officer Update Note outlined corrections to errors in the report.

The Committee asked questions regarding vehicular movements as a result of the application including the number of vehicles and how the vehicles would join the A63 from the location site. The Highways Officer from North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) was present and advised Members that vehicles would be routed through Gateforth to join the A63. Officers advised that Condition 14 required a Vehicle Management Plan for the routing of vehicles to and from the site from the A63 to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development, but that the proposal was to route vehicles from Lowfield Road through Gateforth to join the A63. Members also asked additional questions on the disposal of waste.

Julie Sadler, objector, confirmed she had nothing further to add to her statement on the previous application.

Susan Woodhall from Monk Fryston Parish Council, confirmed she had nothing further to add to her statement on the previous application.

Sam Harrison, agent, confirmed that he had nothing further to add to his statement on the previous application.

Members debated the application and raised concern at the number of vehicles to pass through the area as a result of the application and the direction they would be travelling in to join the A63. It was noted however that NYCC Highways had assessed the application and had not raised any objections to the proposal in respect of highway safety, subject to conditions listed in the recommendation. In accordance with the Officer's report it was proposed and seconded to APPROVE the application; a vote was taken on the proposal and it was carried.

RESOLVED:

To GRANT permission subject to the conditions set out at section 7 of the report.

9.3 2020/0650/FUL - LAND OFF LOWFIELD ROAD, HILLAM

Application: 2020/0650/FUL

Location: Land off Lowfield Road, Hillam, Leeds, West Yorkshire

Proposal: Erection of a livestock building with associated infrastructure (building 2 of 2)

The Assistant Principal Planning Officer presented the report which had been brought back before Planning Committee as the application was a major application where 10 or more letters of representation have been received which raise material planning considerations and where officers would otherwise determine the application contrary to these representations. Furthermore, it was explained that the the ward councillor for the area where the proposal was located has requested the application to be heard by Planning Committee for reasons outlined in the report.

Members noted that the application was for the proposed erection of livestock building with associated infrastructure.

The Officer Update Note outlined corrections to errors in the report in the report. Additionally, the Committee was informed that due to their being some queries with regard to the letters of representation, the validity of the remaining representations from residents with unknown addresses were being brought into question and therefore should be given limited weight when considering the application.

Julie Sadler, objector, confirmed she had nothing to further to add to her statement on the previous application.

Susan Woodhall from Monk Fryston Parish Council, confirmed she had nothing to further to add to her statement on the previous application.

Sam Harrison, agent, confirmed she had nothing to further to add to her statement on the previous application.

Members debated the application. In accordance with the Officer's report it was proposed and seconded to APPROVE the application; a vote was taken on the proposal and it was carried.

RESOLVED:

To GRANT permission subject to the conditions set out at section 7 of the report.

9.4 2020/1300/FUL - TAMWOOD, STATION ROAD, RICCALL

Application: 2020/1300/FUL

Location: Tamwood, Station Road, Riccall, York

Proposal: Demolition of existing dwelling, construction of seven residential properties

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report which had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections contrary to officers' recommendation to approve, and in addition to a request from the local Ward Member.

Members noted that the application was for the demolition of the existing dwelling and for the construction of seven residential properties.

The Officer Update Note outlined that following the publication of the officer report, two further responses had been received from the Ward Member and Riccall Parish Council requesting the determination of the application be deferred until the impending Riccall Conservation Area appraisal had been concluded. Additionally, a further response had been received stating the base maps for the plans did not reflect the current recent extensions and that impacts upon daylight and sunlight were worse than considered within the report.

It was also noted that the Update note included the following:

- Due to the applicants providing a Construction Management Plan and this being reviewed by officers, it was agreed that condition 6 in the recommendations was no longer needed.
- Due to the applicants providing a Phase 2 Ground Investigation Report and this being reviewed by the Contaminated Land Consultant, it was agreed that conditions 9, 10 and 11 in the recommendations was no longer needed and condition 12 had been included to reflect the Contaminated Land Consultant's recommended condition.

- An amendment to the recommendation of the application in the light of the Bat Survey Report produced by the applicant.
- Due to the applicants providing a drainage layout and micro drainage calculations, the Internal Drainage Board and Yorkshire Water had been reconsulted. It was stated however that condition 3 remained necessary and was included for determination.
- There was a correction to paragraph 6.9 where it incorrectly suggested the application had been submitted in outlined where it was a full application and all material considerations should be taken into account in the determination of the application.

In response to the query concerning Riccall Conservation Area appraisal, the Committee was informed by the Senior Planning Officer and the Head of Planning that it was unreasonable and unjustified to delay the determination of the application, and that it was appropriate to determine it based on the prevailing material circumstances of the application.

Matthew Pardoe, an agent speaking on behalf of a neighbour, was invited remotely into the meeting and spoke in objection to the application.

Brian Keen of Riccall Parish Council, was invited remotely into the meeting and spoke in objection to the application.

Councillor John Duggan, Ward Member, was invited remotely into the meeting and spoke in objection to the application.

Lee Vincent, agent, was invited remotely into the meeting and spoke in support of the application.

Members debated the application. It was proposed and seconded that the application should be deferred to allow a site visit to be conducted to gain a better understanding of the site location with regards impact upon the heritage and conservation, impact on the amenity of neighbours, highways, access, waste and recycling.

A vote was taken on the proposal and it was carried.

RESOLVED:

To DEFER the determination of the application to allow a site visit to be conducted.

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.

9.5 2021/0081/HPA - 2 THE GLADE, ESCRICK

Application: 2021/0081/HPA

Location: 2 The Glade, Escrick, York

Proposal: Erection of rear/side extensions to existing detached bungalow and garage and internal alterations to create additional living accommodation

The Planning Officer presented the report which had been brought before the Planning Committee due to it being called in by the Ward Councillor.

Members noted that the application was for the erection of rear/side extensions to the existing detached bungalow and garage along with internal alterations to create additional living accommodation.

Milton Thomas, applicant, was invited remotely into the meeting and spoke in support of the application.

In accordance with the Officer's report it was proposed and seconded to APPROVE the application; a vote was taken on the proposal and it was carried.

RESOLVED:

To GRANT permission subject to the conditions set out at section 7 of the report.

The meeting closed at 4.52 pm.