

**Chief Executive Officer Urgent Decision Session – Planning:
Decision Record**

Planning Application:	2019/0883/FUL – Cranton, Church Crescent, Stutton
Decision Maker:	Janet Waggott, Chief Executive
Other Officers Present at Remote Meeting:	Martin Grainger, Head of Planning, Ruth Hardingham, Planning Development Manager, Gareth Stent, Principal Planning Officer, Glenn Sharpe, Solicitor and Victoria Foreman, Democratic Services Officer
Title of Decision:	CEO Urgent Decision Session – Planning: 2019/0883/FUL – Cranton, Church Crescent, Stutton
Ward(s):	Tadcaster
Type of Decision:	<input type="checkbox"/> Key decision <input type="checkbox"/> Non key decision discharging (or connected to the discharge of) an Executive function <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Specific delegation from Council or Committee <input type="checkbox"/> Grant of permission / licence <input type="checkbox"/> Affecting the rights of an individual <input type="checkbox"/> Awarding a contract or incurring expenditure which materially affects the financial position of the Council <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Decision under urgency
Details of decision:	<p>Location: 2019/0883/FUL – Cranton, Church Crescent, Stutton Proposal: Proposed demolition of existing bungalow and construction of 3no. new-build dwellings</p> <p>The application had been brought before the Chief Executive for consideration under urgency directed by the Head of Planning due to the sensitive consideration of infill policy matters in secondary villages.</p>

	<p>Officers explained that the scheme had previously been refused in 2019 for five reasons, as set out in the report. The resubmitted scheme now before the Chief Executive for consideration had dealt with some of the previous reasons for refusal, but some matters remained problematic.</p> <p>Objections and comments on the application had been received from the Parish Council, a local resident and also from Samuel Smiths Old Brewery; as such, counsel's advice had been sought.</p> <p>As part of the decision-making process the Planning Committee, including the Chair and Vice Chair, were consulted on the applications. These comments were collated and presented to the Chief Executive as part of her decision making.</p> <p>With regards to the Officer Update Note, Officers explained that reason for refusal no. 3 had been amended as a result of comments from a Member of the Planning Committee. It was also noted that a typo at paragraph 1.1 of the report should refer to the settlement of Stutton, not Sutton as written.</p> <p>Some Members had expressed their support for the recommendation for refusal as set out in the report.</p> <p>Officers explained that having had regard to the development plan, all other relevant local and national policy, consultation responses and all other material planning considerations, it was considered that the revised proposal was unacceptable in principle, and contrary to Core Strategy SP2 and SP4.</p> <p>The number of dwellings remained the same as previously refused. The changes to the layout, massing and design of the scheme had improved the scheme; however, the development still increased density and overall massing which failed to enhance the character of the local area.</p> <p>The Chief Executive noted that counsel's opinion supported the Officer recommendation for refusal.</p> <p>The Chief Executive, having considered the report, Officer Update Note and representations from Members and Officers in full, confirmed that she agreed with the Officer's recommendation for refusal.</p>
<p>Resolution:</p>	<p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. The proposed redevelopment for 3 dwellings would not provide a sustainable site for further housing in terms of its</p>

	<p>access to everyday facilities and a reliance on the private car. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies SP 1 and SP 2 of the Core Strategy and would conflict with paragraphs 11 and 102 of the NPPF.</p> <p>2. The proposal to demolish an existing dwelling and replace it with 3 dwellings does not fall within any of the listed acceptable in principle forms of development in secondary villages, which are identified in Policy SP4 a) and therefore the proposal fails to accord with Policy SP4 of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>3. The proposed development fails to preserve and enhance the character of the local area on account of the increased built form and increased density. The proposal is regarded as an over development of the site and contrary to Policy ENV1 (1) and (4), of the Selby District Local Plan, Policy SP 4 c) and d) and SP19 of Core Strategy, national policy contained within the NPPF and the Stutton Village Design Statement (Feb 2012).</p>
<p>Contact details for further information:</p>	<p>Planning Officer: Gareth Stent, Principal Planning Officer gstent@selby.gov.uk</p>
<p>Signed:</p>	<p><i>Janet Waggott</i></p> <p>Janet Waggott, Chief Executive</p>
<p>Date of Decision:</p>	<p>1 April 2020</p>