

## Planning Committee

Venue:	Council Chamber - Civic Centre, Doncaster Road, Selby, YO8 9FT
Date:	Wednesday, 5 June 2019
Time:	2.00 pm
Present:	Councillor J Cattanach in the Chair  Councillors I Chilvers, R Packham, P Welch, M Topping, K Ellis, D Mackay, M Jordan and J Mackman
Officers Present:	Martin Grainger, Head of Planning, Ruth Hardingham, Planning Development Manager, Bob Pritchard, Solicitor, Fiona Ellwood, Principal Planning Officer, Jac Cruickshank, Planning Officer, Laura Holden, Planning Officer and Victoria Foreman, Democratic Services Officer
Press:	1
Public:	14

### **1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

### **2 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

All Committee Members declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to agenda item 5.1 – 2019/0124/FUL Paddock Lodge, Airfield Lane, Acaster Selby as they had all received email representations from the applicant in relation to the application.

### **3 CHAIR'S ADDRESS TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**

The Chair informed the Committee that an officer update note had been circulated.

The Committee noted that the order of business would be as set out in the agenda papers.

#### 4 MINUTES

The Committee considered the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 24 April 2019.

**RESOLVED:**

**To approve the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 24 April 2019 for signing by the Chairman.**

#### 5 PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED

The Planning Committee considered the following applications:

**5.1 2019/0124/FUL - PADDOCK LODGE, AIRFIELD LANE, ACASTER SELBY**

**Application:** 2019/0124/FUL

**Location:** Paddock Lodge, Airfield Lane, Acaster Selby

**Proposal:** Erection of two single storey residential dwellings and new car port (Retrospective)

The Principal Planning Officer presented the application which had been brought before Planning Committee at the request of Councillor R Musgrave.

The Principal Planning Officer corrected the percentages in paragraph 4.8 from 39% and 43% to 64% and 75% respectively.

The Principal Planning Officer also corrected the percentages in paragraph 4.17 from 39% and 43% to 63/64% and 75% respectively.

The Committee noted that the application was for the erection of two single storey residential dwellings and new car port (Retrospective).

In relation to the officer update note, the Committee acknowledged that corrections had been made to the footprint and volume figures in the tables at paragraph 4.16 of the report. Additional information had also been received from the applicant, namely a new landscaping plan which provided for native hedge planting and tree planting around the site and pointed to where tree planting had already occurred, and an updated Flood Risk Assessment report which corrected some wording and gave details of recommended floor finishes.

Members noted that it was considered that the planting would in time improve the overall impact of the development on the character and appearance of the area. However, the application was assessed on the basis of the current situation and the new plan did not change the assessment in relation to the Green Belt or the impact on the openness.

Members asked questions of the Officer in relation to the calculation of the footprint and volume figures and the significance of a third building on the site, a barn, which had already been converted.

Councillor R Musgrave, local Ward Member, spoke in objection to the application.

Simon Armstrong, applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Members considered the application and agreed that local and national planning policies were clear regarding development on the Green Belt and the very special circumstances that were required for any such development to be allowed. The Committee agreed that very special circumstances necessary to clearly outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and the harm to the openness of the Green Belt had not been demonstrated to justify granting the application, and that there was a need for consistency of approach and considerable risk in setting a precedent for permitting such development on the Green Belt.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be refused. The decision was unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED:**

**To REFUSE for the reasons set out at paragraph 6 of the report and the officer update note.**

**5.2 2018/1170/FUL - ROSEGARTH, YORK ROAD, BARLBY**

**Application:** 2018/1170/FUL

**Location:** Rosegarth, York Road, Barlby

**Proposal:** Proposed front and rear single storey extensions, raising of roof, changes to external fenestration and façade treatment

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

application had been called into Committee on the basis of (i) overdevelopment of the site, (ii) public complaints and (iii) loss of amenity to surrounding bungalows. Furthermore, at least 10 letters of representation had been received which raised material planning considerations and Officers would otherwise determine the application contrary to these representations.

The Committee noted that the application was for proposed front and rear single storey extensions, raising of roof, changes to external fenestration and façade treatment

In relation to the officer update note, the Committee acknowledged for clarification that the proposal's description was amended from 'Proposed erection of replacement enlarged dwelling' to 'Proposed front and rear single storey extensions (with rooms in the roof space), raising of roof, changes to external fenestration and facade treatment'. The amended application description was re-consulted upon with no further comments received.

Members queried if neighbours were re-consulted on the reduced roof height and if representations had been received regarding the two further car parking spaces at the site.

Barbara Weatherill, objector, in objection to the application.

Councillor S Duckett, local Ward Member, spoke in objection to the application.

Members considered the application and expressed concern regarding parking and access at the property, as well as issues that had been raised by the neighbours regarding appearance, materials and loss of amenity. The Committee were of the opinion that the application should be deferred and a site visit arranged.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be deferred in order for a site visit to be undertaken.

**RESOLVED:**

**To DEFER consideration of the application in order for the Committee to undertake a site visit.**

**5.3 2019/0147/OUT - LAND OFF FRIARS MEADOW, FRIARS MEADOW, SELBY**

**Application:** 2019/0147/OUT

**Location:** Land Off Friars Meadow, Friars Meadow, Selby

**Proposal:** Outline application for the erection of up to two self-build plots with all matters reserved

The Planning Officer presented the application which had been brought before Planning Committee as more than 10 letters of support had been received, contrary to the Officer recommendations to refuse the application.

The Committee noted that the application was an outline application for the erections of up to two self-build plots with all matters reserved.

Members asked for a definition of self-build and were satisfied with the explanation given by Officers.

In relation to the officer update note, the Committee acknowledged that there was an error on page 61, which stated that the Local Plan was to be adopted in 2019. Progress on the Site Allocations Local Plan had been delayed pending further technical work on the potential development options for Tadcaster. The Council was also considering the implications of the revised National Planning Policy Framework published in July. A revised Local Development Scheme which would set out the timescales for the next stages of the plan would be published in due course. It was not considered that these matters altered the assessment of the application.

Colin Heath, objector, spoke in objection to the application.

Donaldina Ryan, applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Members considered the application and agreed that the application was outside of permitted development limits and in the open countryside, and did not comprise any of the types of development that were acceptable in principle under Policy SP2A(c) of the Core Strategy.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be refused.

**RESOLVED:**

**To REFUSE the application for the reasons set out at paragraph 6 of the report and the officer update note.**

The meeting closed at 3.26 pm.