

**South Cave Parish Council**  
**Planning Meeting 1<sup>st</sup> September 2014**

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), M. Turner, Kingdom, Bateman, Warren, Foley, Franks, Kelly & Barnett  
Clerk - Mrs L Fielding  
1 Ward Councillor – Cllr Galbraith  
10 Members of the public

**2044 Apologies for absence**

Cllr L. Turner proposed apologies is accepted from Cllr Jamieson & Munby, seconded Cllr M. Turner, All in favour.

**2045 Declarations of Interest**

Cllr Bateman declared a non pecuniary interest in minute reference: 2049 (ii)  
Cllr Kingdom declared a non pecuniary interest in minute reference: 2047 (i)

**2046 Tree Applications**

(i)14/02606/TCA Description of Works: SOUTH CAVE (EAST) CONSERVATION AREA - Fell Beech tree (T3) due to being overbearing.  
Location; 1 Hedley Close South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire HU15 2HP  
Applicant: Mrs Diane Wilson  
Application Type: Tree Works in Conservation Areas  
Cllr Kingdom proposed the Parish Council recommend refusal to the application as the loss of this healthy tree would have a detrimental impact on the streetscene in this conservation area and the Parish Council request a immediate TPO be placed on the tree to protect these trees which are under threat, Seconded Cllr Barnett, All in favour.

**2047 Planning**

(i)The Committee noted Gladman Developments Ltd re-application consultation for Land off Little Wold Lane, South Cave. Cllr Kingdom proposed the Parish Council request Gladman Developments Ltd hold a public meeting to consult with residents and invite Gladman Developments Ltd to a Parish Council meeting to discuss the proposals. Seconded Cllr Barnett, vote 8 in favour, 1 against.

**2048 Planning Applications**

*Cllr M. Turner left the meeting at 7:25p.m*  
*Cllr M. Turner returned to the meeting at 7:40p.m at minute reference 2048 (iii)*  
(i)14/02377/PLF

<b>Proposal:</b>	Erection of single storey extension to side and pitched roof over existing flat roof extension
<b>Location:</b>	Orchard Cottage, Drewton Manor, Drewton Lane, HU15 2AG
<b>Applicant:</b>	D. Hill

Cllr Kingdom proposed the Parish Council raise no objection to the application, having no adverse effect on neighbouring properties or the streetscene, Seconded Cllr Kelly, All in favour.

(ii)14/02530/PLF

<b>Proposal:</b>	Erection of 1.8 brick wall to front
<b>Location:</b>	25 Station Road, South Cave
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr Stephen Hogarth

Cllr Kingdom proposed the Parish Council recommend refusal to the application having a detrimental visual impact on the streetscene within this conservation area. The Parish Council have requested if ERYC are minded to approve the application the wall be no higher than 1.2 metres using materials in keeping with the area. The Parish Council would prefer the existing hedge as replacement for the wall. Seconded Cllr Kelly, All in favour.

(iii)14/02281/STPLF

<b>Proposal:</b>	Erection of 25 no. Dwellings following demolition of redundant far buildings
<b>Location:</b>	Westcote Farm, 27 Water Lane, South Cave
<b>Applicant:</b>	Risby Homes Ltd

*The meeting was closed at 7:40p.m for members of the public to speak:*

Resident – 15 Thornham Close raised concerns with the water holding facilities on site potentially causing more problems with flooding to properties further down West End.

Resident – Barnards Close raised concerns with additional flooding possibilities and additional amounts of water being distributed to the drainage system of South Cave which has not been upgraded since 1968.

Cllr Kingdom advised the ERYC would take advice from the Environment Agency regarding flooding

Resident – 22 Water Lane raised concerns with the Water being distributed into the blocked dyke at Water Lane, which is overgrown and has insufficient culverts to disperse the water. Concerns were also raised for the lack of infrastructure ie: Doctors, School, Dentists

Cllr M. Turner advised the ERYC are using the Beverley Borough Plan as the new Plan had not yet been approved and three previous applications for this site had been refused by the Planning Inspectorate.

Resident 14 Thornham Close raised concerns with the run off levels, Cllr Kingdom advised this would be checked and included in the response.

Resident – Barnards Drive raised concerns with Hydro Fuel tanks being located within the area and the land could possibly be contaminated.

Cllr Galbraith explained his position with the Planning Committee and the Code of conduct and explained a report would be submitted to the committee with a summary and details Parish Council response together with the Environment Agency Comments.

*The meeting was re-opened at 8:30p.m*

Cllr M. Turner proposed the Parish Council recommend refusal to the application as per the following:

The South Cave Parish Council Objects to the development on the following grounds;

While the site is within the Development Boundary for South Cave it has not been identified as a housing allocation either in the saved Policies or in the proposed Local Plan.

The proposal does not comply with the local plan in respect of affordable housing which is unacceptable.

Under the saved policies of the Local Plan the applicant has not addressed meeting the local need through small scale development (i.e. less than 5 dwellings) as required under Joint Structure policy DS4 and H7

The proposals detrimentally impacts on the approved Conservation Area which has been subject to recent re-appraisal, and which identified this specific site for inclusion in the area due to the rural character which this space brings to the Conservation Area. We broadly agree with the Conservation Officers detailed comments on the design aspects. The three storey dwellings in an area predominately occupied by bungalows is out of keeping with the character of the area.

South Cave is an unsustainable location and is totally reliant on private motor cars for transport. As noted by the Appeal inspectors reasons for dismissing this site (APP/E2001/A/04/1149296 refers )

While the applicant is allowing for a Suds scheme for surface water, A further 25 dwellings connected to the overburdened foul drainage will still impact on the surcharging sewers down Church Street and West end. This is in addition to the 24 new dwellings recently approved North of the Stray and 60 Dwellings pending consideration. The fact the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) seems to accept that sewage surcharging in Water Lane is better than surcharging in the site is of little comfort to the existing residents. Indeed we wonder if the application is capable of meeting the proposed National Standards and Specified Criteria for sustainable drainage when the outflow terminates at a land drain which itself is not fit for purpose.

The Parish is very concerned over the flooding issues and considering the number of large sites approved or pending consideration is 84, when added to the 130 recently mooted brings the total to 214 and with the other infill sites South Cave is looking at a housing pressure of approximately 264 new dwellings in the pipeline.

The FRA is incorrect in designating the land as previously developed land which has been suis generis farming /market gardening use, as the appeal Inspector agreed. The run off rates used in the calculations required in the FRA should therefore be Greenfield run off rates.

The FRA makes no case under the exception test for wider sustainability benefits as opposed to the detriment it causes.

If ERYC is minded to approve the application,

We note there is insufficient parking for visitors on site.

A Local Equipped Area of Play should be provided on site.

Affordable housing should be provided. The only housing need in the village is for affordable housing. S106 contributions for affordable housing are unacceptable.

Semi mature trees are replanted at suitable locations, especially along Water Lane boundary in lieu of the approximately 27 of those to be lost.

The Suds should be capable of being adopted at a later stage by conforming to the DEFRA draft National Standards and Specified criteria for Sustainable Drainage June 2014 and a suitable maintenance regime and s106 agreement for the SUDs landscaped area should be agreed. Notwithstanding our objection the Parish may be amenable to entering into discussions on how that may be best achieved.

Boundary treatments should be completed prior to construction.

Other observations:

We understand from previous discussions with ERYC regarding the drain along Water Lane that the applicant's red line boundary indicating ownership of the site may be incorrectly drawn at this boundary. The site boundary at both the water lane ditch and the south end of the development is also not owned by the applicant so the red lines to both the west Water Lane ditch side and to the South public footpath is not owned by the applicant as indicated with the red line on the site plan.

We also understand that there may exist contaminated land on the Northern half of the site due to two underground fuel storage containers  
Seconded Cllr Franks, All in favour.

## 2049 Planning Decisions

(i) To consider comments for Appeal Case Number 14/00052/REFUSE

<b>Proposal:</b>	Erection of two detached dwellings (all Matters reserved)
<b>Location:</b>	Land South East of 96 Beverley Road, South Cave
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr Stanley

The East Riding of Yorkshire Council Planning Inspectorate Refused this application (REF) Cllr L. Turner proposed the Parish Council send the following to the Planning Inspectorate for the appeal:

The Parish Council would like to strongly support the East Riding of Yorkshire Council's decision to refuse this application. The development is wholly outside the development limit of South Cave. These limits clarify where development would be acceptable in principle. The proposed East Riding local Plan does not consider amending the development limits around the application site and therefore full weight can be given to the existing development limit. The Parish supports this stance.

Land outside the development limits will be treated as Open Countryside under Policy H11 and development will not be approved unless it is essential to the needs of agriculture or forestry. This is consistent with JSP Policy DS5 which also includes as reasons for development, rural diversification, infrastructure and sport/recreation and/or tourism. The effect of these policies is to severely restrict the housing development in the rural environment to specific categories.

The Appeal Site falls within the category of High landscape value under Beverley Borough Local Plan (BBLP) policy E10 which highlights particularly important local countryside features that should be taken into account in planning decisions and where proposals within this area will only be approved if they are of an appropriately high standard and will not adversely affect to any material extent the special character, appearance or nature conservation value of the landscape. Policy ENV5 of the JSP Development which states developments adversely affecting these sites will not be allowed unless it can be clearly demonstrated that there is either a reason for the proposal that outweighs the need to safeguard the intrinsic nature conservation value of the site or appropriate mitigation and/or compensation measures.

This protection is also set out in the proposed Local Plan at ENV2, B which identifies the area of the Yorkshire Wolds as an Important Landscape Area and states "Proposals should respect and enhance existing landscape character" and "with special attention to ensuring developments are of an appropriately high quality and will not adversely affect the historic and special character," The site is within the area identified as of the Highest quality. The Appeal site is on a very prominent steep hill and substantial terracing will be required to allow siting of buildings and creation of gardens which will create a major impact on the visual amenity of the area and be highly visible from the village and the nationally important long distance Wolds Way footpath which both runs alongside the boundary and on the other side of the Dale. It would therefore have a detrimental impact on the quiet enjoyment of the Countryside and introduce an urban edge to an area of special character. It can be seen that there is a clear and consistent policy of seriously restricting development outside of the

development limits and the applicant has made no claims that the application falls within any exception that those policies taken together, allow.

The Appeal Site is also backland development and is out of character with the local area which has low density substantial housing fronting Beverley Road with large gardens /paddocks to the rear South East, which softens the village /countryside boundary. The clumping of two dwellings will produce a hard edge to the village having a detrimental impact on the Character, appearance and visual amenity of the locality. Para 4.43 of the BBLP states that "Only where the Borough Council is satisfied that an improvement to the amenity and character of the particular area and the settlement would be secured and there would be no strain on public services, would it normally approve proposals...." The development does not offer any improvement and is quite to the contrary and this policy does not contradict the policies of the NPPF and should be afforded appropriate weight

South Cave does not meet the sustainability criteria for further development in either the JSP or NPPF. The appeal Inspector in APP/E2001/A/02/1097297 Application for 44 dwellings 27 Water Lane, South Cave, in his summary agreed that South Cave was unsustainable as a location for housing development due to the reliance on the private motor car. The Government EIP Inspector for the JSP in his report in chapter 5 noted that;

para 5.5 “.... *Given the limited scope for rural employment the rural settlements of all sizes provide, in the main, homes for those who earn their living in larger settlements. Because of the lack of local services, this past residential development has stimulated long distance trips, not only to and from work, but also to gain access to secondary education, shops, entertainment and most other day to day needs.*

Para 5.6 .....*Participants at the EIP argued that the location of a rural settlement within a proposed strategic public transport corridor would reduce the need for car based journeys. Given the very low levels of local facilities in such settlements, and consequently the range of destinations that must be reached to gain access to the wide variety of necessary services, residential development, even in the transport corridors, could not avoid reliance on the private car for most trips.*”

The Development will rely on the use of private motor cars to access the majority of shopping, employment and education facilities. 73% of South Cave workers travel by driving a car or van whilst only 1% use the bus and 1.5% use the train (NOMIS based on 2001 census). The local public transport is TRICS rated as poor and the application site is located outside the recommended distance to the bus stop in Market Place. The development is therefore contrary to JSP Housing Policy H7 which states “Development that would result in unacceptable long distance commuting will be resisted.”

Lastly, the appeal deliberations should not include supply of housing arguments. The NPPF still gives substantial weight to the JSP policies which clearly states in DS4 that villages outside DS3 are non-strategic by nature therefore any consideration on housing figures and 5 year supply in this context is irrelevant.

The Parish Council requests that the inspector rejects the appeal.

Seconded Cllr Barnett, All in favour

(ii) 14/00564/VAR

<b>Proposal:</b>	Variation of Condition 17.4 (finished floor levels should relate to plot 3) and Condition 18 (Approved Plans) for amended design details on plot 3 and re-positioning of brick wall to east side of plot 1 of planning permission 12/00950/PLF
<b>Location:</b>	42 West End South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire HU15 2EY
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr & Mrs Stow

Approved (No Obj)

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

**2050 Recommendations to Council**

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

Signed..... Chair

Dated.....