

South Cave Parish Council
Planning Meeting 7th April 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 M. Turner (Chair), Barnett, L. Turner, Kelly, Bateman, Warren, Kingdom & Munby
Clerk - Mrs L Fielding
One Ward Councillor
Three members of the public

2004 Apologies for absence

Cllr L. Turner proposed apologies be accepted from Cllr Foley, seconded Cllr Warren, All in favour.

2005 Declarations of Interest

Cllr Bateman declared a non pecuniary interest in minute reference:

2006 Planning

(i)14/00564/VAR –

Proposal:	Variation of 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
Location:	42 West End South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire HU15 2EY
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Stow

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

(ii)14/00324/PLF –

Proposal:	Erection of single storey extension to rear, two storey extension to side, installation of bay window with pitched tiled roof extending over front door to create porch and construction of new vehicular access
Location:	5 West End South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire HU15 2EX
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Ellerker

Cllr Kingdom proposed the Parish Council raise no objection to the application as this has no adverse effect on the neighbouring properties or the streetscene, providing the brickwork matches the existing. Seconded Cllr Munby, Vote: 6 in favour, 2 Against

(iii) 14/00798/OUT –

Proposal:	Outline - Erection of two detached dwellings (All matters reserved)
Location:	Land South East Of 96 Beverley Road South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire HU15 2BB
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Stanley

The Meeting was closed at 7:3p.m for members of the public to make comment regarding the application. Concerns were raised for the Sustainable Urban Draining System proposals and it was noted that current SUDS in the area are unable sustain the levels of water runoff from the land behind. The access to the site which is access to the airfield, the detrimental impact on the

*high Landscape and the biodiversity with regards to the ancient Hedgerow
The meeting was re-opened at 7:30p.m.*

Cllr Kingdom proposed the Parish Council recommend refusal to the application:

The Parish Council would like to strongly recommend refusal to 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 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 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 ~~three~~ 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 5.6Participants 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.”

The access is also the access for the Airfield at Mount Airey, and Farm vehicle access at Steep Hill, which is also used by ramblers. The Parish Council are concerned for the safety of this access onto Beverley Road.

The Removal of the Chalk base land to the site would pose a detrimental impact as the site on two sides is the gardens of existing residential properties; the site is an integral part of the open countryside at the edge of the settlement. The site has a strong visual relationship with the agricultural land and countryside to the South-East. This relationship is apparent both locally and from further afield which can be viewed from across the valley on Little Wold Way.

The Proposal would have a adverse urbanising impact on the wider landscape and the setting of the village by extending the boundary of the Development area.

Seconded Cllr Kelly, All in Favour.

2007 Planning Decisions

(i) 14/00018/PLF -

Proposal:	Erection of single storey extensions to side and rear
Location:	41 Beverley Road South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire HU15 2AU
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs B Boswell

Approved (no comments made)

(ii) 14/00059/PLF –

Proposal:	Erection of a detached dwelling and garage
Location:	Land North Of 51 Little Wold Lane South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire HU15 2AZ
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs A Parker

Approved (No Obj)

(iii) 14/00128/PLF -

Proposal:	Erection of first floor side extension
Location:	15 The Meadows South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire HU15 2HR
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Singleton

Approved (No Obj)

(iv) 14/00082/PLF-

Proposal:	Erection of a single storey extension to side
Location:	Codd Hall Common Road South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire HU15 2EA
Applicant:	Mr Simon Legard

Approved (No Obj)

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

2008 Planning Appeals

(v) 13/03446/OUT – Appeal Case Number 14/00015/REFUSE

Proposal:	Outline - Erection of 24 dwellings (access to be considered)
Location:	Land To North Of The Stray South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire HU15 2AL
Applicant:	Mr David Watts

Refused (REF)

The Parish Council noted the Appeal and requested the approved response be included on the Agenda for Full Council on 14th April 2014.

2009 Trees – Applications

(i)14/00882/TCA - Description of Works: SOUTH CAVE CONSERVATION AREA - Fell Yew (T1) as tree has outgrown the garden and pruning not viable

Location; 11 West End South Cave East Riding of Yorkshire HU15 2EX

Applicant: Mrs Jo Bannister

Application Type: Tree Works in Conservation Areas

Cllr Kingdom proposed the Parish Council recommend refusal to the felling of this tree, but would recommend light pruning by a qualified tree surgeon be undertaken. Seconded Cllr Kelly, All in favour.

(ii) 14/00832/TPO - Description of Works: TREE PRESERVATION ORDER - SOUTH CAVE - 1971 (REF.268) AND SOUTH CAVE CONSERVATION AREA - Fell four Beech trees for safety reasons

Location: Meadowcroft, 9 Castle Drive, South Cave, East Riding Of Yorkshire, HU15 2ES,

Applicant: Mr Dewar

Application Type: Works to Protected Trees

Cllr Kingdom proposed the Parish Council Recommend removal of the Diseased Tree (T3) on the application, but refuses the felling of trees T1, T2 & T4. The Parish Council request a replacement tree by planted for T3.

These trees for the belt between the Castle Land and the residential development of Castle Drive. The loss of these trees would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area. It was noted that in the event of this application being accepted by the East Riding of Yorkshire Council, a total of 15 trees would be lost within the area of 5 properties. Seconded Cllr L. Turner, All in favour.

2010 Trees – Decisions

(i)DC/14/00102/TPO - Proposal: TPO SOUTH CAVE - 1971 (Ref 268) AND SOUTH CAVE CONSERVATION AREA - Remove large branch from Scots Pine (T9) which overhangs the public footpath and is potentially dangerous to the public. Prune lower branches of Sycamore tree (T12).

Remove two small branches from Maple tree (T14). Prune lower branches of Beech tree (T19) and three Oak trees (T24,T26,T28) to allow greater light penetration. Fell two Scots Pine trees (T48,T51) as represent a potential hazard in high winds and a potential health hazard to grandchildren.

Location: 17 Station Road South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire HU15 2AA

Applicant: Mr Hugh Marshall – Approved (Varied response for each tree specified by the Parish Council)

(ii) DC/14/00110/TPO- Proposal: TREE PRESERVATION ORDER - SOUTH CAVE NO.13 - 1998 (REF.500) AND SOUTH CAVE CONSERVATION AREA - Fell one Ash tree, leaving the stump intact

to support the beck bank as it drastically reduces the light to the rear of the property, creates a lot of mess to the conservatory roof and the patio and in Autumn the leaf fall creates a lot of work.

Location: 4 Appleton Gardens South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire HU15 2EN

Applicant: Mr David James Collinson – Approved (REF)

(iii) 14/00347/TPO - Proposal: TPO SOUTH CAVE 1971 (REF 268) AND SOUTH CAVE CONSERVATION AREA - Fell 4 Beech trees (T1-T4) due to previous fire damage, poor condition and high risk of snapping. Remove stem from one Beech (T5) over golf course back to main trunk to prevent splitting

Location: 15 Castle Drive South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire HU15 2ES

Applicant: Mr Tinker – Approved – REF

The Parish Council noted the decisions made by the East Riding of Yorkshire Council and requested Clerk makes contact with the East Riding of Yorkshire Council tree officer to implement the system for replacement of felled TPO trees.

Cllr Galbraith was requested by the Parish Council to highlight the concerns of the Parish Council to the loss of trees being felled with TPO's and within the Conservation Areas with the ERYC Tree Officer.

2011 Other Matters

(i)The Parish Council considered Article 4 – Tightening conservation area rules and requested further details be provided. The Matter to be placed on the June 2014, Planning Meeting.

2012 Recommendations to Council

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

Signed..... Chair

Dated.....