



MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE SHERBURN IN ELMET PARISH COUNCIL

Date: 27th February 2019

Time: 2.30pm

Location: The Harry Mountain Room Eversley Park Centre, Low Street, Sherburn in Elmet LS25 6BA

Present: Cllrs Doherty (Chair), Boyd, Buckle, Hunt and Prescott

Apologies: Cllr Wake

Members of the Public: None

1. Apologies for absence

Cllr Wake

2. Declarations of interest

Cllr Doherty Community Trust. Cllrs Buckle and Boyd Sherburn Festival.

3. Public Speaking Session

No members of the public were present

4. Planning Applications: -

2017/0621/OUTM	Land west of Garden Lane	The Parish Council object to this application as per the comments below.
2019/0135/HPA	30 Saxon Way	No objection

ITEM 5. To consider the following:-

i) Potential recurrence of problems with pipe works and associated highways issues in the village centre.

The Parish Council to write to Area 7 Highways office stating that contractors working on the recent water leak at the crossroads in the centre of Sherburn commented that the weight of traffic meant a recurrence was likely. Given the serious disruption and delay which the leak and subsequent roadworks caused we wonder whether Highways have received a report from the contractor and if so whether any action is being taken.

ii) Pinfold Way – planning condition to remove the Japanese Knotweed prior to commencing work (2016/1256/OUTM).

The Parish Council to write to the developer (Cllr Prescott to supply contact details) and ask them to confirm reports that Japanese Knotweed has been removed from the site. If it has can they please supply a copy of the contractor's report confirming that it has been eradicated.

Signed by the Chair of the Committee

Date

2017/0621/OUTM

The Parish Council remain opposed to this application and maintain the concerns we expressed previously in our submissions of 21st July 2017 and 25th September 2017. We would also comment:-

1. Selby District Council have demonstrated that they have a five year housing land supply and, as noted elsewhere, Sherburn in Elmet has significantly exceeded its plan target only 7 years into a 15 year plan period. Given that this is safeguarded land it is clear that there is no justification for releasing it now. Our submission of 21st July 2017 covers this point in some detail.
2. Despite the proposed work to widen a short stretch of carriageway to 4.6 metres, this will still not be sufficient for a car and HGV to pass each other. We feel that access along a single carriageway is fundamentally unsafe for a road which is both the main access to the High School and access to a waste and recycling works. It must be emphasised that the road is a single carriageway for most of the length south of the Garden Lane/Tomlinson Way junction and that on site parking means that a significant section of Garden Lane north of the Garden Lane/Tomlinson Way junction is effectively single carriageway.
We must also point out that the revised Transport Assessment does not take any account of the likely increase in vehicles using the Garden Lane/Tomlinson Way and Garden Lane/Church Hill junctions as a route between Leeds and the Redrow/Persimmon/Strata developments on the southeast side of Sherburn.
3. The fact that 15 of the plots here are designated as self-build gives significant cause for concern about the likelihood of noise and disturbance from the scheme.
4. The design and layout of the site indicate that this is simply Phase 1 of a two stage development. The application was originally for 69 homes and has been replaced by one for 27 homes because it was clear the 69 home development was likely to be refused. The Parish Council do not believe that reducing the application to 27 homes (with a likely intention of more to follow) provides good reason to approve this application.
5. We are concerned that there will be inadequate space for refuse lorries and emergency service vehicles to turn and manoeuvre within the site.

We repeat our previously expressed view that this application represents piecemeal and unplanned development and will result in pressure on existing services, facilities and infrastructure and shows a lack of coordinated, planned land use planning and would prejudice the plan making process.