



Minutes

Planning Committee

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

Date: Wednesday, 8 December 2021

Time: 2.00 pm

Present: Councillor J Cattanach in the Chair

Councillors J Mackman (Vice-Chair), K Ellis, I Chilvers,
R Packham, P Welch, D Mackay and C Richardson

Councillor R Musgrave was also in attendance as a
substitute.

Officers Present: Martin Grainger – Head of Planning, Ruth Hardingham –
Planning Development Manager, Glenn Sharpe – Solicitor,
Fiona Ellwood – Principal Planning Officer, Gareth Stent –
Principal Planning Officer, Irma Sinkeviciene – Senior
Planning Officer, Victoria Foreman – Democratic Services
Officer

Public: 14

45 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

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

46 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

Councillor J Mackman declared a non-pecuniary personal interest in agenda item 5.1 – 2020/0014/FULM, Land Off Barff View, Burn, as he was the Chair of the Selby District Housing Committee; Councillor Mackman confirmed that he would leave the meeting during consideration thereof.

Councillor R Musgrave declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 5.1 – 2020/0014/FULM, Land Off Barff View, Burn, as he was the Executive Member for Place Shaping and as such, had a great deal of involvement with the Council's housing matters. Councillor Musgrave confirmed that he too would leave the meeting during consideration thereof.

Councillor R Musgrave also declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda items 5.4 and 5.5 - Land Off York Road, North Duffield and Green Lane North Duffield, as he was the North Yorkshire County Council elected Member for Escrick Division, which included North Duffield. Councillor Musgrave explained that he knew the speakers on the two items but had not discussed the applications with them. As such, he would not be leaving the meeting during consideration thereof.

Councillor K Ellis declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda items 5.2 and 5.3 - Land South of Electricity Substation, Rawfield Lane, Fairburn, 5.4 - 2020/1391/FUL - Land Off York Road, North Duffield, 5.5 - 2021/0913/S73 - Green Lane, North Duffield and 5.6 - 2021/1295/REM - Yew Tree House, Main Street, Kelfield, as he had received representation on each item, but would not leave the meeting during consideration thereof.

Councillors J Cattanach, R Packham and D MacKay declared non-pecuniary interests in agenda items 5.7 - 2020/0718/FUL - New Coates Farm, Hirst Road, Carlton and 5.8 - 2020/0719/FUL - Coates Hall Lodge, Hirst Road, Carlton, as they had all received representations for both applications. However, Councillors Cattanach, MacKay and Packham all confirmed that they would not be leaving the meeting during consideration thereof.

47 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 the agenda items would be taken in the following order:

Item 5.5 - 2021/0913/S73 - Green Lane, North Duffield
Item 5.4 - 2020/1391/FUL - Land Off York Road, North Duffield
Item 5.2 - 2021/0789/FULM - Land South of Electricity Substation, Rawfield Lane, Fairburn
Item 5.3 - 2021/0633/FULM - Land South of Electricity Substation, Rawfield Lane, Fairburn
Item 5.6 - 2021/1295/REM - Yew Tree House, Main Street, Kelfield
Item 5.7 - 2020/0718/FUL - New Coates Farm, Hirst Road, Carlton
Item 5.8 - 2020/0719/FUL - Coates Hall Lodge, Hirst Road, Carlton
Item 5.1 - 2020/0014/FULM - Land Off Barff View, Burn, Selby

48 MINUTES

The Committee considered the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 10 November 2021.

The Chair informed the Committee that wording regarding the vote to extend

the meeting past three hours had been omitted from the minutes, and that this would be added in by Officers. As such, the minutes could be agreed, subject to the aforementioned amendment.

The amendment was proposed and seconded, and vote taken.

RESOLVED:

To approve the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 10 November 2021 for signing by the Chairman, subject to the amendment above.

49 PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED

The Planning Committee considered the following planning applications.

49.1 2021/0913/S73 - GREEN LANE, NORTH DUFFIELD

Application: 2021/0913/S73

Location: Green Lane, North Duffield, Selby

Proposal: Section 73 application to remove condition 07 (Highway Improvement Works) of approval 2018/0273/REM Reserved matters application relating to Reserved Matters approval appearance, landscaping, layout, scale and access of approval 2015/0520/OUT Outline application (with all matters reserved) for residential development (9 dwellings) granted on 13 March 2018

The Principal Planning Officer presented the application which had been brought before Planning Committee at the request of Councillor Karl Arthur. Additionally, 14 letters of representation had been received which raised material planning considerations in objection to the scheme, and Officers would otherwise determine the application contrary to these representations.

Members noted that the application was a Section 73 application to remove condition 07 (Highway Improvement Works) of approval 2018/0273/REM Reserved matters application relating to Reserved Matters approval appearance, landscaping, layout, scale and access of approval 2015/0520/OUT Outline application (with all matters reserved) for residential development (9 dwellings) granted on 13 March 2018.

The Committee asked numerous questions of the Officer about the scheme, in particular about the highway verges, installation of a footpath by the Highways Authority and connection to the main part of the settlement. It was also queried as to whether the footpath

could be put on the north side of Green Lane; Officers explained that this had been discussed when the outline planning permission had been granted but reminded Members that this matter was not before the Committee for consideration. The southern side had been assessed as better, and any subsequent change would require removal, variation or deletion of the specific arrangement already agreed as part of the outline permission.

Nancy Gray, objector, was invited to speak at the meeting and spoke against the application.

Councillor Bob Wells, Parish Council representative, was invited to speak at the meeting and spoke against the application. A picture relating to the application had been submitted by Councillor Wells had been circulated to the Committee by email before the meeting.

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

Members debated the application further and acknowledged that the footpath agreed as part of the original permission was essential and part of the local amenity, and as such, should be retained. Therefore, permission should be refused.

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

RESOLVED:

That permission be REFUSED for the following reason:

- **that the proposed highway improvement works shown on approved drawing number 1449.01 (Section 278 footway design) controlled by condition 7 of reserved matters permission 2018/0273/REM and discharged through 2019/0658/DOC were still considered to be reasonable and necessary in the interests of the safety and the convenience of highway users, in accordance with policies ENV1 and T1 of the Selby District Local Plan.**

49.2 2020/1391/FUL - LAND OFF YORK ROAD, NORTH DUFFIELD

Application: 2020/1391/FUL

Location: Land Off York Road, North Duffield

Proposal: Change of use of land from agriculture to domestic curtilage and formation of new field boundary (retrospective)

The Senior Planning Officer presented the application which had been brought before the Committee as it was a departure from the Selby District Core Strategy. However, Officers considered that there were material planning considerations and were therefore recommending approval of the application.

Members noted that the application was for a change of use of land from agriculture to domestic curtilage and formation of new field boundary (retrospective).

An Officer Update Note had been circulated and published online ahead of the meeting which gave details of an amendment to Condition 05.

The Committee asked questions about the scheme relating to visibility of the strip of land, the number of letters of support and if there was a need for a fixed boundary. Officers explained that the character and appearance of the rural setting had to be considered, regardless of where it could be viewed from.

Councillor Bob Wells, Parish Council representative, was invited to speak at the meeting and spoke in favour the application.

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

Members debated the application further and agreed with the Officer's recommendation and accompanying conditions set out in the report. However, some Members felt that Condition 05 was not needed, as the removal of permitted development rights was excessive.

It was proposed and seconded that permission be GRANTED.

An amendment was subsequently proposed and seconded that permission should be GRANTED, but subject to the removal of Condition 05. A vote was taken on the amended proposal and was CARRIED.

RESOLVED:

That the application be GRANTED, subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 7 of the report and the removal of Condition 05, as detailed in the Officer Update Note.

49.3 2021/0789/FULM - LAND SOUTH OF ELECTRICITY SUBSTATION, RAWFIELD LANE, FAIRBURN

Application: 2021/0789/FULM

Location: Land South of Electricity Substation, Rawfield Lane, Fairburn

Proposal: Construction of a zero-carbon energy storage and management facility including containerised batteries, synchronous condensers and associated infrastructure, access and landscaping

The Principal Planning Officer presented the application which had been brought before Planning Committee as the scheme was inappropriate development in the Green Belt and Very Special Circumstances were required to approve it.

Members noted that the application was for the construction of a zero-carbon energy storage and management facility including containerised batteries, synchronous condensers and associated infrastructure, access and landscaping.

An Officer Update Note had been circulated and published online ahead of the meeting which gave details of a letter from Zero Carbon which set out key details and benefits of the scheme. It also gave updated consultation responses from North Yorkshire County Council's Ecologist and the Lead Local Flood Authority, as well as Hillam Parish Council and the applicant.

The Committee asked numerous questions of the Officer about the scheme in relation to more detailed dimensions of the transformers and buildings associated with the scheme, as well as the related infrastructure and which parish councils had been consulted.

Officers gave a detailed answers to the various queries about the scale and height of the numerous components of the proposal, and confirmed that all four relevant parish councils, namely Burton Salmon, Hillam, Monk Fryston and Fairburn, had been consulted.

James Blackburn, applicant, was invited to speak at the meeting and spoke in favour of the application.

Members debated the application further and acknowledged that the proposals and report before them were very complicated. The views of the Committee were that the scheme constituted inappropriate development in the green belt, that it resulted in harm to the openness of the green belt both spatially and visually, that it was not a production unit and did not generate green energy but was merely a storage facility taking and storing power from the grid and was not of national significance or strategic importance. Therefore, it was not justified in the green belt location.

The Committee agreed that there were other places in the Selby District where such a scheme would be better suited as it was not in keeping with the local area. The very special circumstances required for such development in the green belt had not been met and, as such, the application should be refused.

There was no proposer or seconder for the application to be granted.

The reasons for refusal were summarised by the Committee and were as follows:

- the impact on the green belt would be substantial by way of inappropriate development, as the scheme represented a significant encroachment into open green belt on agricultural land;
- the detrimental impact on the openness of the green belt which was highly protected by both local and national planning policy, which express the green belt's importance to the government, in particular its openness and permanence;
- the impact on the character of the green belt, which would again be significant due to the height of the structures and solid density of the multiple battery units;
- the proposed battery storage units were not in keeping with the green belt and would be of detriment and do harm;
- the whole areas would become industrialised and urbanised, and therefore out of character with the local conservation villages of Monk Fryston and Hillam;
- highway safety would be compromised due to

increased traffic on the A63 and at the crossroads of the junction of the A63 and Rawfield Lane;

- the scheme did not constitute renewable energy provision and was inappropriate development which failed to preserve the openness of the green belt and was contrary to Policy SP3 of the Selby District Council Core Strategy and of the NPPF; and
- lastly, very special circumstances did not exist to outweigh the harm to the green belt.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be REFUSED. A vote was taken and was CARRIED.

RESOLVED:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

- the impact on the green belt would be substantial by way of inappropriate development, as the scheme represented a significant encroachment into open green belt on agricultural land;
- the detrimental impact on the openness of the green belt which was highly protected by both local and national planning policy, which express the green belt's importance to the government, in particular its openness and permanence;
- the impact on the character of the green belt, which would again be significant due to the height of the structures and solid density of the multiple battery units;
- the proposed battery storage units were not in keeping with the green belt and would be of detriment and do harm;
- the whole areas would become industrialised and urbanised, and therefore out of character with the local conservation villages of Monk Fryston and Hillam;
- highway safety would be compromised due to increased traffic on the A63 and at the crossroads of the junction of the A63 and Rawfield Lane;

- the scheme did not constitute renewable energy provision and was inappropriate development which failed to preserve the openness of the green belt and was contrary to Policy SP3 of the Selby District Council Core Strategy and of the NPPF; and
- lastly, very special circumstances did not exist to outweigh the harm to the green belt.

49.4 2021/0633/FULM - LAND SOUTH OF ELECTRICITY SUBSTATION, RAWFIELD LANE, FAIRBURN

Application: 2021/0633/FULM

Location: Land South of Electricity Substation, Rawfield Lane, Fairburn

Proposal: Installation and operation of a battery storage facility and ancillary development on land off Rawfield Lane, Monk Fryston

The Principal Planning Officer presented the application which had been brought before Planning Committee as the scheme was inappropriate development in the Green Belt and Very Special Circumstances were required to approve it.

Members noted that the application was for the installation and operation of a battery storage facility and ancillary development on land off Rawfield Lane, Monk Fryston.

An Officer Update Note had been circulated and published online ahead of the meeting which explained that whilst Hillam Parish Council had not submitted any formal observations regarding the application, and had agreed at a recent meeting that it had none to submit on behalf of the Hillam residents, it wished to stress that the Planning Committee must seriously consider any concerns of other local Parish Councils, and not leave them overlooked, which often felt like the case when the applicant was a large organisation.

The Update Note also set out additional points from the applicant regarding connection to the National Grid and location of a temporary construction compound. As a result, Officers confirmed that an additional condition would be required to secure the containment and restoration of the construction compound site before the

facility was brought into use.

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

Members debated the application further, and as with application 20211/0789/FULM which they had considered previously, felt that the scheme again constituted inappropriate development in the green belt, resulted in harm to the openness of the green belt and the character of the area. The very special circumstances required for such development in the green belt had not been met and the application should be refused.

There was no proposer or seconder for the application to be granted.

The reasons for refusal were summarised by the Committee and were as follows:

- the impact on the green belt would be substantial by way of inappropriate development, as the scheme represented a significant encroachment into open green belt on agricultural land;
- the detrimental impact on the openness of the green belt which was highly protected by both local and national planning policy, which express the green belt's importance to the government, in particular its openness and permanence;
- the impact on the character of the green belt, which would again be significant due to the height of the structures and solid density of the multiple battery units;
- the proposed battery storage units were not in keeping with the green belt and would be of detriment and do harm;
- the whole areas would become industrialised and urbanised, and therefore out of character with the local conservation villages of Monk Fryston and Hillam;
- highway safety would be compromised due to increased traffic on the A63 and at the crossroads of the junction of the A63 and Rawfield Lane;
- the scheme did not constitute renewable energy provision and was inappropriate development which failed to preserve the openness of the green belt and was contrary to Policy SP3 of the Selby District Council Core Strategy and of the NPPF; and
- lastly, very special circumstances did not exist to

outweigh the harm to the green belt.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be REFUSED. A vote was taken and was CARRIED.

RESOLVED:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

- the impact on the green belt would be substantial by way of inappropriate development, as the scheme represented a significant encroachment into open green belt on agricultural land;
- the detrimental impact on the openness of the green belt which was highly protected by both local and national planning policy, which express the green belt's importance to the government, in particular its openness and permanence;
- the impact on the character of the green belt, which would again be significant due to the height of the structures and solid density of the multiple battery units;
- the proposed battery storage units were not in keeping with the green belt and would be of detriment and do harm;
- the whole areas would become industrialised and urbanised, and therefore out of character with the local conservation villages of Monk Fryston and Hillam;
- highway safety would be compromised due to increased traffic on the A63 and at the crossroads of the junction of the A63 and Rawfield Lane;
- the scheme did not constitute renewable energy provision and was inappropriate development which failed to preserve the openness of the green belt and was contrary to Policy SP3 of the Selby District Council Core Strategy and of the NPPF; and
- lastly, very special circumstances

did not exist to outweigh the harm to the green belt.

49.5 2021/1295/REM - YEW TREE HOUSE, MAIN STREET, KELFIELD

Application: 2021/1295/REM

Location: Yew Tree House, Main Street, Kelfield

Proposal: Reserved matters application (following the 2017/0701/OUT) including access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the erection of 6 No dwellings

The Principal Planning Officer presented the application which had been brought before Planning Committee because 11 letters of representation had been received, which raised material planning considerations in objection to the scheme and officers would otherwise determine the application contrary to these representations.

Members noted that the application was a reserved matters application (following the 2017/0701/OUT) including access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the erection of 6 No dwellings.

An Officer Update Note had been circulated and published online ahead of the meeting which gave details of a consultation responses from Kelfield Parish Council and the Conservation Officer, responses to concerns by the agent, further letters of support, an added letter of objection and two additional conditions.

The Committee asked Officers about the elevations and the views of the Conservation Officer. Officers explained that further discussions were undertaken with the Conservation Officer who had sought assurance that some parts involved in the scheme could be protected, despite the fact that Yew Tree House was a non-designated heritage asset, was not listed or in a conservation area and could therefore be demolished. The Conservation Officer had also been of the view that the layout of the dwelling should be more traditional. Officers reminded the Committee that the application before them was for reserved matters, and that the site already had outline permission.

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

Members debated the application further and acknowledged that Officers were unsure if a suggested layout plan of the dwellings was shown during the outline stage of the application.

Some Members expressed unease that the views of the Conservation Officer were not being given appropriate weight, as they had expressed a number of concerns. The scheme before the Committee was different from the original indicative layout, and whilst the application should not be refused, Officers should speak to the Conservation Officer further in order for more information to be garnered before the Committee took a decision.

Officers acknowledged that the Conservation Officer's response had only been received in the week prior to the meeting, but that the agent for the application had wanted the scheme determined. Officers also explained that they didn't feel the Conservation Officer's response was critical, as the site was not in a conservation area, nor a listed building; there was also a resourcing issue within the Conservation Team.

Some Members felt that as the scheme before them was a reserved matters application, design was a subjective thing; Members were being asked to consider what was before them. If Officers had duly reflected on the Conservation Officer's comments, the Committee should determine the application.

Other Members were of the opinion that the Committee should not feel pressured into determining the scheme, and as such, that the application should be deferred, and the agent asked to again consider the Conservation Officer's concerns. There were members of the Committee who felt that the arrangement of the dwellings was too cramped and constituted overdevelopment on the site, that the proposed access arrangements were unsatisfactory and may contribute to overlooking and that parking may become an issue for residents in the future. It was strongly suggested that the views of the Committee should be fed back to the agent.

There was no proposal forthcoming from Members to grant the application.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be DEFERRED in order for amendments to the scheme to come forward. A vote was taken and was carried.

RESOLVED:

That the application be DEFERRED in order for a number of amendments to come forward, for the following reasons:

- **a design that better reflects the Conservation Officer's comments;**
- **for the issue of over development to be addressed;**
- **for minimum privacy distances to be considered;**
- **a suggested reduction in the number of accesses; and**
- **the need for differing and smaller house types.**

At this point in the proceedings Members proposed and seconded that the meeting of the Committee should continue beyond the three-hour time limit.

RESOLVED:

To continue the meeting beyond three hours.

The meeting was then adjourned at 4.40pm by the Chair for ten minutes to facilitate a comfort break. The meeting reconvened at 4.50pm.

49.6 2020/0718/FUL - NEW COATES FARM, HIRST ROAD, CARLTON

Application: 2020/0718/FUL

Location: New Coates Farm, Hirst Road, Carlton

Proposal: Creation of a bund/bank to protect properties from flooding (retrospective)

The Senior Planning Officer presented the application which had been brought before Planning Committee as 16 letters of representation had been received, which raised material planning considerations in objection to the scheme, and Officers would otherwise determine the application contrary to these representations.

Members noted that the application was for the creation of a bund/bank to protect properties from flooding (retrospective).

An Officer Update Note had been circulated and published online ahead of the meeting which gave details of a further representation by the applicant, which

expressed concerns that report did not provide a summary of the applicant's counter arguments to all the specific objections submitted that had mentioned tree removal, bund height above the damp proof course, flooding of the applicants in 2020 and existence of the bund at that time.

Officers explained that the representation was not considered to have changed the Officer recommendation as it was in line with the Environment Agency's view that the bund would not have a negative impact with regards to flooding in the local area. The Environment Agency were aware of all the objections that had been submitted. The response highlighted that the Environment Agency's objections had been withdrawn.

The Committee asked about the bunds made of soil and the location of the village of Carlton in relation to the application site.

The Democratic Services Officer read out a speech submitted by Kenneth Foulkes, objector. Mr Foulkes had asked that the speech be read out on his behalf to the Committee.

Members debated the application further and some stated their familiarity with the area and their understanding of what the applicants were trying to do. It was a vital point that the Environment Agency did not see any threats with what was proposed and expressed a sympathy with the applicants for trying to protect themselves from flooding in the future.

The Committee asked for clarification as to which property on the location plans was Coates Hall and were of the opinion that the Environment Agency should be in attendance at the meeting to answer their questions.

Officers reported that no representatives had been available. However, Members were assured that a site visit had been undertaken by the Environment Agency who had been satisfied with the proposals.

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 at paragraph 7 of the report.

49.7 2020/0719/FUL - COATES HALL LODGE, HIRST ROAD, CARLTON

Application: 2020/0719/FUL

Location: Coates Hall Lodge, Hirst Road, Carlton

Proposal: Creation of a bund/bank for flood protection (retrospective)

The Senior Planning Officer presented the application which had been brought before Planning Committee as the application was being considered at the same time as 2020/0718/FUL; cumulatively the two applications formed a single entity. This application had received 6 letters of representation and 2020/0718/FUL had received 16 letters of representation, which raised material planning considerations in objection to the scheme, and Officers would otherwise determine the application contrary to these representations.

Members noted that the application was for the creation of a bund/bank for flood protection (retrospective).

An Officer Update Note had been circulated and published online ahead of the meeting which gave details of a further representation by the applicant, which expressed concerns that report did not provide a summary of the applicant's counter arguments to all the specific objections submitted that had mentioned tree removal, bund height above the damp proof course, flooding of the applicants in 2020 and existence of the bund at that time.

Officers explained that the representation was not considered to have changed the Officer recommendation as it was in line with the Environment Agency's view that the bund would not have a negative impact with regards to flooding in the local area. The Environment Agency were aware of all the objections that had been submitted. The response highlighted that the Environment Agency's objections had been withdrawn.

Members expressed their support for the application; it was subsequently 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.

49.8 2020/0014/FULM - LAND OFF BARFF VIEW, BURN

Application: 2020/0014/FULM

Location: Land Off Barff View, Burn

Proposal: Proposed construction of 10 affordable homes, to include a two-storey block of six two-bedroom apartments and four single-storey two-bedroom semi-detached properties

The Principal Planning Officer presented the application which due to it being an application by Selby District Council for its own development on its own land.

Members noted that the application was for the proposed construction of 10 affordable homes, to include a two-storey block of six two-bedroom apartments and four single-storey two-bedroom semi-detached properties.

An Officer Update Note had been circulated and published online ahead of the meeting which gave details of further consultation responses received from the Lead Local Flood Authority following some additional information provided by the applicant.

As a result, further information was required from the applicant on the following matters; a review of the design and calculations for the highway and surface water drainage systems for the developments to reduce the discharge rate as close as possible to greenfield run off rates, whilst acknowledging the size restriction of 75mm orifice size/control; determining the requirements of the Highway Authority for adopting the new section of highway, and confirmation of the impact of the ground water in terms of the cellular storage area, and whether mitigation should be incorporated into the design.

The Committee asked the Officer to clarify what the correct recommendation was; Officers confirmed that the revised recommendation, as detailed in the Officer Update Note, was incorrect. The Committee were instead asked to agree that the decision should be minded to approve, with authority to approve deferred to the Head of Planning Services, subject to receipt of the above additional information, and subject to that information satisfying the requirements of the Lead Local Flood Authority, and subject to any additional relevant appropriate conditions arising from that consultee.

Members also asked questions relating to comments from Burn Parish Council, the layout of the scheme, potential loss of biodiversity, potential flooding and car parking.

Officers explained that the layout of the scheme had not changed since the application was originally submitted. Officers had tried to create a balance between the loss of biodiversity and the benefits of social housing that was sorely needed in the district. With regards to flooding, Members were informed that various flood risk assessments had been produced with some concerns raised; however, the Environment Agency had withdrawn its objections. There were various measures that would be undertaken to mitigate, counteract and plan for any future flooding. The Environment Agency had wanted levels to be raised further; as a result, there was a condition that set such levels.

Members discussed the application further, with some of the opinion it was important to recognise that Officers had considered the overall balance of the proposals and made a judgement. It was essential that flooding issues were resolved, but the balance was that the need for affordable homes outweighed the risks.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be minded for approval, with authority to approve deferred to the Head of Planning Services, subject to receipt of the above additional information, and subject to that information satisfying the requirements of the Lead Local Flood Authority, and subject to any additional relevant appropriate conditions arising from that consultee. A vote was taken and was lost. As a result of the vote, clear reasons for refusal were required.

After some further discussion, it was proposed and seconded that the application be deferred in order to allow Officers to undertake further work on the application by supplying more detail on potential flooding and the suitability of car parking provision, and subject to:

- the receipt of the additional information from the Lead Local Flood Authority;
- that information satisfying the requirements of the Lead Local Flood Authority; and
- any additional relevant appropriate conditions arising from that consultee.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be

GRANTED. A vote was taken and was carried.

RESOLVED:

That the application be DEFERRED in order for Officers to undertake further work on the application by supplying additional detail on potential flooding and the suitability of car parking provision on the site.

The meeting closed at 6.00 pm.

This page is intentionally left blank