

South Cave Parish Council
Planning Meeting 23rd July 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, Jamieson, Kelly & Barnett
Clerk - Mrs L Fielding
4 members of the public

2031 Apologies for absence

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

2032 Declarations of Interest

Cllr Kingdom declared a non pecuniary interest in item reference 2033 (i) & (ii)

2033 Planning

(i) DC/12/02455/STPLF/STRAT/HCOLD

Publicity on an Application for Strategic - Full Planning Permission

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 Market Place, (c) Demolition of buildings to the rear of 68 and 70 Market Place, (d) Full Application for an extension to number 68 Market Place, (e) Full Application for the erection of 4 no. dwellings and 4 no. detached garages on land to the rear of 68 and 70 Market Place, (f) Outline Application for the development of 56 homes on land including Local Plan allocation H1dj to the north of Middle Garth Drive (all matters reserved)

AMENDED DESCRIPTION AND PLANS

at Land South And East Of Old Priory Station Road South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire

Applicant: Messrs Watts, Usher And Lindley

Cllr Kingdom provided the Committee with details of the minor amendments to the planning application.

The meeting was closed at 7:30 for member of the public to speak:

Mr & Mrs West, 87 The Stray – Concerns were raised with the possible future access point from The Stray to the new development & also the SUDS drainage system. Information on drainage problems were provided.

Mr & Mrs Foster, 97 Market Place, South Cave – A number of concerns were raised regarding the development. The Barns behind the cottages have been gradually demolished, the increase in traffic and turning of heavy vehicles into the narrow access, the telegraph poles at Market Place and re location of cabling, the re-location of the island at Market Place.

The meeting was re-opened at 8:00p.m

Cllr Kingdom proposed the Parish Council respond to the both 12/02455/STPLF and 12/02456/PCC

As a combined response as follows:

On behalf of the village, the Parish would again wish to reiterate it's objection to this proposed development.

The minor changes submitted have not addressed the Parish's concerns and our substantial objections remain.

We feel the changes to the highway access, 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 spays 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.

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 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 applicant, having taken two years since submitting this application has clearly struggled with these issues and the harm caused by the access through the conservation area onto the busy A1034 by demolishing 70 Market Place is their solution.

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. 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 benefits the harm should be weighed against is the 15 affordable housing units which does meet the needs of the village, however the 45 market houses have no benefits for the village, and indeed as already pointed 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.

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 15 affordable housing units is meeting an identified local need in accordance with JSP H7 the same cannot be said for the 45 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 stand alone 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 120 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 60 houses, 56 of which are outside the conservation area 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.

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.

With regards to the inadequate assessment of public transport provided by the applicant. We point out that most of the site is outside of the recommended 400m travel distance to a bus stop and cannot be shortened. The bus timetable is regular but is still in the poor category and the time taken to reach various destinations was explained elsewhere which we have updated 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.
- To access the only general store at Pinfold 2 miles away in the village and allow 40mins to shop, takes 17 mins and 1 bus to get there at 9:06 however one would be obliged then to wait a further 20 mins before a return journey of 19 mins.

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.

Car parking is currently a constant problem within the village and therefore a larger area for public parking should be made available (10 to 12 Car minimum) within this last market Place plot.

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.

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 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 Warren, All in favour

(ii)12/02456/PCC

Demolition of number 70 Market Place and buildings to the rear of 68 and 70 Market Place at Land

South And East Of Old Priory, Station Road, South Cave East Riding Of Yorkshire

Applicant: Messrs Watts, Usher and Lindley

Application Type: Conservation Area Consent

The response to this application included in minute reference 2033 (i)

2034 Recommendations to Council

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

Signed..... Chair

Dated.....