

**South Cave Parish Council  
Planning Meeting 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2015**

The Meeting of South Cave Parish Council Planning Committee took place in the Town Hall, Market Place, South Cave at 7.00pm.

Present: Cllrs L. Turner (Chair), Barnett, M. Turner, Kingdom, Franks, Kelly, Bateman, Thornham, Foley & Kingdom  
Clerk - L Fielding  
X1 Members of the Public  
X1 Ward Councillor

**2152 Apologies for absence**

Cllr Barnett proposed apologies is accepted from Cllrs Warren, seconded Cllr Kelly, All in favour

**2153 Declarations of Interest**

Cllrs L. Turner (Chair), Barnett, M. Turner, Kingdom, Franks, Kelly, Bateman, Thornham, Foley & Kingdom declared a non pecuniary Interest in minute reference 2154 (i)  
Cllr Kingdom declared a non pecuniary interest in minute reference 2156 (i)  
Cllr Bateman Declared a non pecuniary Interest in Minute reference 2154 (iii)

**2154 Tree Applications**

(i) 15/03210/TCA

Proposal: SOUTH CAVE CONSERVATION AREA: Holly; Crown reduce by one third and prune back to boundary from property in Wold View, South Cave.

Location: King George V Playing Field Bacchus Lane South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire

Applicant: South Cave Parish Council

Application type: Tree Works in Conservation Areas

Cllr Barnett proposed the Parish Council raise no objection to the application, seconded Cllr Munby All in favour

(ii) 15/03284/TCA

Proposal: SOUTH CAVE CONSERVATION AREA - Re-pollard Weeping Willow to previous point of pruning and shape to reduce overhang of park and property.

Location: Southfield House 67 Church Street South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire HU15 2EP

Applicant: Mrs Lynn Webster

Application type: Tree Works in Conservation Areas

Cllr Munby proposed the Parish Council raise no objection to the application, Seconded Cllr Foley, All in favour

(iii) 15/03286/TCA

Proposal: SOUTH CAVE CONSERVATION AREA - Crown reduce Maple by 20% and surroundings.

Location: Marshland House 41 Church Street South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire HU152EP

Applicant: Mr Norman Elliot

Application type: Tree Works in Conservation Areas

Cllr Foley proposed the Parish Council raise no objection to the application, Seconded Cllr Munby, All in favour

(iv) 15/02866/TPO

Proposal: TPO127 CHURCH STREET SOUTH CAVE 1968 W3: Sycamore; Canopy raise to 7 metres to improve shape and re-balance the tree.

Location: 16 Wesley Close South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire HU15 2EJ

Applicant: Mr Robert Garrod

Application type: Works to Protected Trees

Cllr Kingdom proposed the Parish Council recommend refusal to the application due to the crown lifting proposals being excessive. If the ERYC are minded to approve the application, the Parish

Council request down lifting to be no more than 4 metres, providing the main tree stem remains.

Seconded Cllr M. Turner, All in favour

(v) 15/03305/TCA

Proposal: SOUTH CAVE CONSERVATION AREA - Fell Maple tree in garden due to disease.

Location: 11 Church Hill South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire HU15 2EU

Applicant: Ros & Andy Fairburn

Application type: Tree Works in Conservation Areas

Cllr Barnett proposed the Parish Council raise no objection to the application providing the tree has been professionally diagnosed as being diseased and a suitable replacement be planted. Seconded Cllr Kelly, All in favour

## 2155 Tree Decisions

(i) 15/02753/TCA

Proposal: SOUTH CAVE CONSERVATION AREA - Fell tree adjacent to 21 Wold View due to blocking light, growing onto the roof of the property and interfering with the satellite dish. Fell tree to the front of 26 Wold View. Fell tree at 29 Wold View due to blocking light and weeping sap.

Location: 21, 26 And 29 Wold View South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire HU15 2EF

Applicant: Hanover Housing

Approved (REF)

(ii) 15/02596/TPO

SOUTH CAVE CONSERVATION AREA \_ TPO SOUTH CAVE 1971 (REF:268): Fell 6 Beech trees due to Cambial death detected, large cavities and decay.

Location: 11 Castle Drive South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire HU15 2ES

Applicant: Mrs Angela Ilse

Approved (Partial NO Obj)

(iii) 15/02937/TCA

SOUTH CAVE CONSERVATION AREA: Ash; fell due to storm damage, Maple, Ash and Sycamore; crown lift to 4 metres above ground. also crown lift Beech to 4 metres above ground and crown clean.

Location: Beck Cottage 20A Barnards Drive South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire HU15 2HL

Applicant: Mrs A Obrian

Approved (Partial No Obj)

The Committee noted the decisions made by the East Riding of Yorkshire Council

## 2156 Planning Applications

(i) 15/02649/STPLF

<b>Proposal:</b>	Hybrid application consisting of: (a) Full application for the creation of a new vehicular and pedestrian access onto Market Place, (b) Demolition of number 70
<b>Location:</b>	Market Place, (c) Demolition of buildings to the rear of 68 and 70 Market Place, (d) Full application for an extension to 68 Market Place, (e) Full application for the erection of 4 dwellings and 4 detached garages on land to the rear of 68 and 70 Market Place, (f) Outline application for the development of 115 homes on land to the north of Middle Garth Drive (all matters reserved) Location: Land South And East Of Old Priory 8 Station Road South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire HU15 2AA
<b>Applicant:</b>	Applicant: C Watts, J Usher, C Lindley
<b>Application type:</b>	Application type: Strategic - Full Planning Permission

Cllr M Turner proposed the Parish Council recommend refusal to the application:

On behalf of the village, the Parish would again wish to reiterate it's objection to this proposed development. The application notice and title used by the Authority do not indicate that this

application extends the previous approval to include an additional site and increase housing densities, and the Parish Council feel the application is misleading in this respect.

The changes submitted have not addressed the Parish's concerns to the previous approved application and our substantial objections remain or are increased due to the doubling of house numbers.

We previously felt that the changes to the highway access onto the A1034, reducing the 9m radii and 4.5m vision splay depth, while more visually acceptable than before are at the unacceptable cost of reducing the standard guidance visibility splay onto this very busy 'A' road which has a large amount of passing HGV's. While highway officers and travel consultants deal in theory it remains for the village residents to live with the reality of speeding traffic, poor visibility and wet roads and the proposal to reduce these vital safety features is unacceptable. The increased numbers cars from the revised application that are now to use this proposed junction gives us grave concerns.

This is the sort of compromise that led to the inadequate junctions at Little Wold Lane /Beverley Road and more recently Trinity Fold/Beverley Road.

The access issue to the main H1dj (now part of SCAV-A) allocation site has been continually spelt out to ERYC over the SHLAA and LDP consultation. The ransom strip onto The Stray at the designed access point and the defective Little Wold Lane /Beverley Road junction with a further ransom strip prevents the bringing forward of the site until both issues are addressed. The access through the conservation area onto the busy A1034 by demolishing 70 Market Place remains the only vehicular access the danger of which is now increased with a further 55 dwellings using the access compared to 60 of the extant permission. We would argue that the conservation area issues should be re-examined due to the greater traffic flows (and therefore harm) now being produced.

The applicant has still made no effort to justify the demolition of 70 Market Place other than for the provision of vehicle access to the larger site outside of the conservation area.

The Council's policy E26 is that demolition should not be granted unless either the building is demonstrably incapable of economic repair (which the applicant has chosen not to argue) or the development will preserve or enhance the conservation area. Increasing the number of cars using this new proposed junction does not preserve or enhance the conservation area. NPPF para 129 also requires where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of or damage to a heritage asset the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision. This simple workers cottage as the applicant points out, is on the important transition between the more urban centre to the South and rural aspect to the North (para 9.39 page 50). The Council has recently adopted a revised South Cave Conservation Area following a conservation area appraisal, when this application has been current, and in which this area remains.

The conservation Area Officer remains concerned in his report that the access to the outline site will cause a certain amount of harm to the character and appearance of the area.

NPPF 134 states; Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

The harm caused by this development should be weighed against any benefits that may arise. In this case the Applicant states this is the 29 affordable housing units which do meet the needs of the village, however the 91 market houses have no benefits for the village, and indeed as already pointed South Cave Parish Council

out by the Parish, places strain on the infrastructure and as we have seen during the dispersed development policies of the past does not contribute to or sustain the services provided within the village. The only “public benefit” therefore is the contribution to the Council’s housing targets. Of the total of 120 dwellings comprising this development 25% as required by policy equates to 30 not 29 as quoted.

In relation to contributing to the Council’s targets, it is noteworthy both in the applicants submission and previous Officer reports that the Adopted Joint Structure Plan, which post dates the time expired Beverley Borough plan and takes precedence, is almost dismissed. NPPF clearly states up to date plans, of which the JSP addressing sustainability at the strategic level complies, can be afforded considerable weight as material considerations, which in this case should take precedence.

Saved policy DS4 states that limited development will be allowed in Smaller Settlements (which are not defined in the JSP but which South Cave forms part) if it meets local needs and contributes to sustaining the role of the settlement. In addition, housing development in existing settlements should conform to the requirements of JSP saved policy H7 “housing development should meet an identified local need, particularly for affordable housing but also to support existing village services. Development should be limited in scale, with preference given to previously developed sites, infill plots and conversions. Policy H7 goes on to state that development that would result in unacceptable long distance commuting will be resisted.

The Councils preferred options document determined the meaning of “limited scale” for the purposes of JSP policy DS4 as 5 or less dwellings. If the development is to exceed that figure, clear justification for development will be required.

The Councils interim guidance which assumed housing need and did not require developer to demonstrate local need under JSP H7, has been withdrawn by the Council, so while the applicant can show 29 affordable housing units is meeting an identified local need in accordance with JSP H7 the same cannot be said for the 91 market houses.

The JSP saved policies DS4 and H7 are not out of date and remain relevant and can be afforded significant weight under the NPPF.

The only public benefit we can identify for this development, that of satisfying Council housing targets which cuts across JSP DS4 which specifically states at Para 5.26 “ it is important to note that these villages are not regarded as being of strategic importance” Both DS4 and H7 identify meeting local need as the main criteria, not council wide strategic targets.

With regards to an optimum viable use referred to in NPPF 134, this can be achieved by refurbishing and extending both existing properties (as the applicant agrees it is not beyond economic repair) with potential demolition of the barns and inserting properties to the rear using the existing access to Nr 68. Indeed the applicant's own Planning, Heritage and Design and Access statements indicates the possibility of a standalone solution (albeit as per the submission with 70 Market place demolished) at section 9.34 page 49. This optimum solution therefore may provide the enhancement of the conservation area without the harm incurred by demolishing 70 Market Place and adding some 240 cars accessing the development. The enhancement to the conservation area the applicant claims are based solely on the deliberate neglect of the property which has brought about the current dereliction and cannot be used as an enhancement argument in support of demolition and development.

The proposals to demolish the cottage for vehicle access to 119 houses is contrary to policy E21 where proposals in the conservation area will only be approved where they; c) ensure that the character of the area is not harmed by unsympathetic development.

The planning Inspector at the recent Appeal on Land North of the Stray considered that little weight could be given to the emerging LDP. Therefore the Council cannot rely on the fact that the area allocated for housing in the time expired policy H1Dj is included in the proposed LDP allocations document which was vigorously opposed by this Parish. Further the inclusion of the small field west of Little Wold Lane has been objected to by the Parish and have we replied positively to the LDP Inquiry Inspector's question as to whether we have suffered disadvantage by not being able to discuss the late additional allocations in our village at the Inquiry. The Applicant places great reliance on and refers to the Councils new policy SCAV-A. We would remind the Council that this is not yet approved.

The existing village sewage and drainage system does not currently cope well with surface and fluvial flooding. The proposed development will aggravate the current situation. A development of this size will further exacerbate the current level of flash flooding and problems at Market Centre, Church Street and properties at the West End of the village.

The Flood Investigation Report published by the Council in December 2014 (see appendix 1 attached) clearly recommends "that the Council as LLFA continue to promote and develop the proposed major scheme for South Cave Flood Alleviation, programmed to commence in 2017/18". Given that the proposed scheme is not planned to commence until 2017/18 and given that ever increasing strains on public services mean funding is extremely problematic the Authority should ensure this scheme is in place prior to further approvals and ensure relevant contributions are conditioned.

The recent ERYC flood Report concluded that the South Cave Beck culvert along Church Street, at Westcott Farm and under the A63 were of insufficient capacity to deal with the intensity of the rainfall. However the data obtained indicates that the rainfall was greater than the current design standards. A more detailed study of the drainage system would be required in order to identify any areas for improvement.

The new extension field is located to a lower level and retains flood water throughout the winter periods. With regard to this smaller field West of Little Wold lane we provide photographic evidence of the persistent standing water during the winter months (attached)

The drain/dyke at Little Wold Lane adjacent to the site boundary is within the EA flood zone.

With regards to the inadequate assessment of public transport provided by the applicant. We point out that the vast majority of the site is outside of the recommended 400m travel distance to a bus stop and cannot be improved. The bus timetable is regular but is still in the poor category and the time taken to reach various destinations was explained in previous responses which we have updated below and still provides the point.

(using transport direct web site);

- it takes 1 hr 35mins by 3 buses and train to get to County Hall Beverley for just before 9am and leaving at 5pm it takes 2 trains and 1 bus 1 hour 52 mins.
- For Hull City Centre it's 2 buses and 1 hour 13 min to arrive 24 mins early if you work from 9am. leaving at 5pm 20 mins wait and its 2 buses and 1 hour 3 mins. This is compared with a car journey of 21 mins
- If you work in Sutton Fields a major employment zone in Hull say Malmo Road this takes 1 hr 32 mins and two buses compared with a car journey of 32 mins.

- Travelling to Melton which is zoned for employment, to get there by 9am takes 1 hour 7 mins with 1 bus and two walks over ten minutes compared by 12 mins in a car. Leaving at 5pm the return journey of 39 mins is better but requires a 44 min wait.
- To attend an evening event at South Hunsley School (the nearest secondary school) only practical route with a 20min walk is a journey of takes 53 mins on one bus the meeting/event must finish at 20:22 to take a 28 min journey back, compared to 14 mins in a car.
- To attend Castle Hill Hospital for 10 am for 1 hour it takes 1 Hour 49 mins with 2 buses getting in 23 mins early with a slightly shorter 1 hour 35 min return journey with two buses. compares with 21 mins each way in a car.

The new extension to include the smaller field to the West of Little Wold Lane is even further away from public transport connections with no possibility of improvements for this.

Despite the recent developments in South Cave There has been recent closures of the Bank and Newsagents at Market Place, South Cave with no plans to re-open.

The extended area is within the originally allocated land for Education purposes, the loss of this open space for this facility would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity and the quality of facilities provided for residents.

The affordable housing indicated on the proposals are unlikely to be completed, as many recent similar applications across the country have either reduced or reversed the inclusion of affordable housing at appeal on the grounds of financial viability at a later date and should not be regarded as a benefit at this stage

We note the Pupil Services Manager comments in his response that “The Secondary school serving South Cave is South Hunsley School. This school currently has a deficit of 200 places and the pupil projects indicate that the deficit of accommodation will increase to 321 by 2019/2020. The 100 (sic) new homes being proposed as part of this development would create an additional need for 17 secondary school places. At a cost of £15,000 per place, the capital costs of creating an extra 17 places would be £255,000”. This is an under estimate as the amount of homes within the scheme is 120 (1 property being brought back into use).

If the Council is minded to approve these applications we raise the further following issues;

We would be grateful if you can check that the area within the conservation area close to the proposed position of the soakaways has been sample tested and that you are satisfied. We are given to understand that there is a bed of clay nearby which of course is impervious. (see previous comments regarding the smaller field)

There should be a direct pedestrian access via this development from The Stray to the North, which is isolated for pedestrians to access Market Place.

Car parking is currently a constant problem which will be exacerbated by the increase of 115 properties and therefore a larger area for public parking should be made available (10 to 12 Car minimum) within this last Market Place Plot.

The three story properties would be inappropriate for the site and would not be in keeping with the area.

The repositioned bollard on the A1034 which is currently shown on the plan 11T602-100 P8 should be reviewed, to ensure traffic can safely pass, due to the narrower road at this new position. A means of visually slowing traffic is essential at this point.

The trees on the site are proven to be at risk and the Parish Council request TPOs be placed on the remaining trees with immediate effect.

An adequate and fully equipped play area should be installed.

The Parish Council request this application be referred to the Planning Committee for decision and inform the Parish Council of the meeting. Please inform the Parish Council of the meeting date.

Seconded Cllr Kelly Vote 9 in favour 1 abstention Cllr Kingdom

**(ii) 15/02954/PLF – Full Planning**

<b>Proposal:</b>	Erection of two-storey extension to rear, following removal of conservatory
<b>Location:</b>	48 Church Street South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire HU15 2EP
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr & Mrs C Austin

**The meeting was closed at 7:45p.m for member of the public (S. Mould) to speak**

The resident provided details of the application and raised awareness to concerns relating to the application including:

- The loss of light
- The impact of privacy
- The potential damage to property
- Design and Access Statement not being provided

**The meeting was re-opened at 8:15p.m**

Cllr Munby proposed the Parish Council recommend refusal to the application due to the size and massing of the proposals on the property with is within a conservation area and would be out of character with the existing cottage. The close proximity to the neighbouring property would pose a detrimental impact to the side and rear. If the ERYC are minded to approve the application opaque glass should be installed to the site escape window. Seconded Cllr Kelly, vote 8 in favour, 2 abstentions.

**(iii) 15/03281/PLF – Full Planning**

<b>Proposal:</b>	Erection of two storey extension to rear
<b>Location:</b>	South Holme 39 Beverley Road South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire HU15 2AU
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr And Mrs M Brooker

Cllr M. Turner proposed the Parish Council raise no objection to the application having no detrimental impact on the streetscene. If the ERYC are minded to approve the application, the Parish Council request the builders/contractors park vehicles within the site, not on the road and verge outside the property, Seconded Cllr Kelly, Vote 9 in favour, 1 abstention

**2147 Planning Decisions**

**(i) 15/01199/PLF**

<b>Proposal:</b>	Erection of a single storey extension to after-school club
<b>Location:</b>	South Cave Kids Club Church Street South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire HU15 2EP
<b>Applicant:</b>	South Cave Kids Club

Approved (No Obj )

**(ii) 15/02431/PLF**

<b>Proposal:</b>	Erection of two-storey and single storey extensions to rear, single storey
------------------	--

	extension to side, erection of a porch to front and relocation of existing garage at rear
<b>Location:</b>	49 Beverley Road South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire HU15 2BB
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr J Cooper

Approved (No Obj)  
(iii) 15/02230/CLE

<b>Proposal:</b>	Erection of a dwelling without planning permission
<b>Location:</b>	Pencoed Common Road South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire HU15 2EA
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr J And Mrs L Houseman

Approved (Deferred to ERYC)  
(iv) 15/02641/PLF

<b>Proposal:</b>	Erection of single storey extension to rear following demolition of existing conservatory
<b>Location:</b>	27 Beverley Road South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire HU15 2AU
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr Peter Mason

Approved (No Obj)  
(v) 15/02351/PLF

<b>Proposal:</b>	Replacement and upgrade of existing public telephone kiosk with kiosk combining public telephone service and ATM service
<b>Location:</b>	Telephone Call Box 01430422530 Market Place South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire
<b>Applicant:</b>	BT Payphones

Approved (No Obj)  
The Committee noted the decisions made by the ERYC

### 2157 Planning Updates

(i)The Committee noted the update relating to Planning Application: - 14/03376/STOUT. Clerk advised a new application had been submitted description for 82 dwellings, item placed on the next Full Council Agenda planned for Monday 16<sup>th</sup> November 2015

<b>Proposal:</b>	Residential developments for up to 119 dwellings with access, landscape, open space, and associated works.
<b>Location:</b>	Land East of Little Wold Lane
<b>Applicant:</b>	Gladman Developments

(ii)The Committee received an update relating to Planning Application: - 14/02281/STPLF/STRAT & consider letter to ERYC planning committee members. The Committee noted the Parish Councils Objections had been forwarded to the planning Committee members which had been placed on the ERYC Agenda for Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> November 2015

<b>Proposal:</b>	Erection of 23no. Dwellings following demolition of redundant farm buildings (AMENDED PLANS AND DOCUMENTS) at
<b>Location:</b>	Westcote Farm, 27 Water Lane, South Cave, HU15 2HJ
<b>Applicant:</b>	Risby Homes Ltd
<b>Application type:</b>	Full Planning Permission

### 2158 Recommendations to Council

To receive and where necessary adopt the resolutions from within the minutes of the above meeting.

Signed..... Chair



Dated.....