



Sutton-in-Craven Parish Council

Minutes of an Extraordinary Meeting of Sutton-in-Craven Parish Council held in the Village Hall, 7.00pm on Friday 6th January 2012

Present

Chairman Cllr. Whitaker, Vice-Chairman Cllr. Morrell, Cllr. Joy, Cllr. Hawkins, Cllr. Smith, Cllr Hart, Cllr Marchant, and Cllr. Bretan.
In Attendance: Mrs D Emmott - Clerk, Cllr Stephen Place and approximately 140 residents

Apologies for Absence

Cllr. Herpe and Cllr. Wilkinson

Declarations of Member's Interest in Matters on the Agenda

Cllr. Hart abstained due to being on the Planning Committee at Craven District Council.

Extraordinary Meeting 06/01/2012 – Land to the West of Holme Lane

The Chairman welcomed everyone for attending the meeting to discuss the Planning Application which was received over the Christmas period.

The Chairman made everyone aware that Cllr. Hart and Cllr. Place were here to listen and could not comment on the application as they are on the Planning Committee and subject to a Code of Conduct.

66/2011/12210

Proposal: Outline Planning Application For The Erection of 54 No. Dwellings (Maximum), A Car Parking Area, Landscaped Riverside Walk, Wild Flower Meadow And Structural Planting.

Location: Land To The West of Holme Lane, Sutton-in-Craven

Applicant: Barratt And David Wilson Homes

**"I am aware that residents located near the site received notice from Craven District Council and also a letter was circulated around the village by residents to bring the application to everyone's attention.
Thank you to those residents."**

Cllr. Morrell then read out the following Parish Council objections to the application.

The application site falls outside the allocated development limits of the settlement of Sutton-in-Craven, in open countryside, where national planning guidance contained in PPS7 and Saved Policy ENV1 and ENV2 from the adopted Craven District (Outside the Yorkshire Dales National Park) Local Plan places strict control over new development and seeks to **protect the character and quality of the open countryside.**

The land to the West of Holme Lane known locally as 'Thompson's Field' is designated as a Green Wedge. Development within the Green Wedge between Sutton-in-Craven and Glusburn and Crosshills is restricted by Policy BE3 of the Local Plan. Saved Policy BE3 states that the Council will resist development where it would comprise the gap between Sutton-in-Craven, Glusburn, Crosshills, Farnhill, Kildwick and up the County boundary near Eastburn. The intention behind Policy BE3 is to strengthen and enhance the spaces between those settlements which are in relatively close proximity to each other, in order to maintain their individual character and identity. The proposed application on this site would close the gap substantially and as such the development is not considered to accord with saved policy.

Sutton-in-Craven is a separate Village. It is not a "Service Centre" (Town) as the applicants appear to be implying. The District Council identified Sutton-in-Craven, Crosshills and Glusburn as being merged together and classed as a "Service Centre" for the failed Leeds City Region Growth Point bid, this was strongly rejected by residents in 2008 and abandoned.

The land is labelled 'Red Constraint' (those sectors where development should not be permitted under any circumstances) and land lies within the setting or the boundaries of designated Conservation Areas. The Appropriate Assessment Screening Report recommends that in order to ensure that there are no potential

adverse effects on any designated Natura 2000 (SAC/SPA) wildlife protection sites, several sectors should be identified in the 'Red Constraints' column. These are locations that would extend the existing built up areas of Sutton-in-Craven closer to SAC/SPA site boundaries that are already within 3k and could potentially cause damage to the special biodiversity of such sites.

Bats roost in trees to the north and to the south of the field. The plans submitted claim to include proposals to help boost the bat population. The bat population feed on insects which live and thrive in the greenfield site around which they roost, which is effectively their hunting ground. Development of the field would result in the removal of the bats main hunting ground and food source. This will surely have a significant negative impact on the bat population at the site. The Parish Council is not convinced that adequate evidence has been supplied by the developers to support their claim to the contrary in this regard.

'Orange' Constraints (those sectors where development should not be permitted unless there is exceptional over-riding justification and adequate mitigation measures are in place eg. Zones 2 and 3 Flood Risk) The Environment Agency identifies land in terms of the probability of flooding. Flood Risk Zone 3b is described as the functional floodplain: Zone 3a is land assessed as having a 1 in 100 greater chance of river flooding; Zone 2 between 1 in 100 and a 1 in 1000 chance of river flooding. Bearing in mind the recent disastrous floods and the increasing potential for extreme weather events, it was decided to include all land within Zones 2 and 3 within this category.

The site is classed as a Flood Zone 3 RFI14832 – Map. It has been noted that a member of ARP Associates on behalf of David Wilson Homes and Barrett Housing stated on attending a Parish Council Meeting that regards the issue of flooding, the plans include measures to address this but that 'the measures will not resolve the flooding but merely not make it any worse.'

Steeply sloping land is also considered to be unsuitable for development, not just because of construction difficulties but also because such land tends to be highly visible in the local landscape.

The Land To The West of Holme Lane is steeply sloping land and would adversely effect the "skyline", being highly visible in the local landscape.

The Regional Spatial Strategy currently forms part of the development plan (yet to be formally abolished by the Localism Bill) but does not supersede the saved policy of the local plan. The Regional Spatial Strategy is not site-specific and does not allocate the land for development.

Under the Localism Act 2011 which received Royal Assent on the 15th November 2011 with some of its provisions still making its way through parliament. Significant weight should be given to the fact that the RSS will shortly be abolished. Abolishing the RSS will remove housing targets and in principle allow Councils to set their own based on robust evidence.

The Sutton-in-Craven Parish Council undertook its own comprehensive Housing Survey in January 2011, submitted to Craven District Council on 9th June 2011 and a copy forwarded to MP Julian Smith. This showed the type and number of houses required which are not considered in the proposed application.

The proposed development is for the erection of 54 No. Residential Dwellings: Number of Houses:

1 bedroom – 6, 2 bedroom – 12, 3 bedroom – 4, 4 bedroom – 29, 5 bedroom – 3

22 of the units will be Affordable Units: 1 bedroom – 6, 2 bedroom – 12, 3 bedroom – 4

The plans submitted do not reflect the local need as identified in our Housing Survey undertaken in January 2011 as the majority of the dwellings proposed are 3, 4, or 5 bedroomed homes which we do not need.

The recent developments of Greenroyd Mill, Woodturners and land near the Black Bull Inn provided 94 affordable homes out of the 156 developed.

The evidence from the housing survey we prepared shows quite categorically that we do not need any further development at this time because local need has been adequately met by these recent and on-going developments.

Please note that private housing on the Greenroyd site could not be sold and was passed on for affordable housing. These were on the market a long time and were not subject to the process for local residents. This supports the information in the housing survey that further affordable housing is not needed in this village.

Sutton-in-Craven currently has 324 Affordable/Social homes already. This constitutes 20% of the total housing. We have more than our fair share.

The proposed application is considered to be detrimental to preserving the individual identity of the village.

The increased traffic flow generated by the development will exacerbate the current serious problem with traffic flow at Crosshills and Sutton Lane. It will also exacerbate rat run problems on Ellers Road.

Traffic assessments have only been completed at the junction of Hazel Grove Road. Peak times at entering/exiting Crosshills, Sutton Lane and Ellers Road have not been assessed.

Although a small number of parking places are being provided within this development the re-siting of the bus shelter towards the Baptist Church will result in residents opposite not being able to park outside homes and shops. So in effect no extra parking is being provided.

With regard to the two primary schools, we have been informed there are no places available for Key Stage One children and limited places for Key Stage 2.

The Parish Council is not convinced that the sewer capacity will support the addition effluent produced by this development or any further development in the catchment area of the Aire Valley Trunk Sewer. Evidence has been gathered that the sewer regularly over flows.

The site has been used as a tip in the past and may potentially contain hazardous materials: also it has been reported to us that the site may have been used as a burial ground.

There has been much development in the village of Sutton-in-Craven, which includes Woodturners, Greenroyd Mill, land near the Black Bull Inn and the Old Silent Night site. These developments have been more acceptable as they were old factory sites.

Should further development be required in the village in the future, there are alternative sites as identified in the village survey carried out by the Parish Council, which would be preferable to the villagers. In Particular, the use of brown-field sites should be considered before any consideration is given to the development of Greenfield sites.

Should the Planning Committee be mindful to pass this application funds for community facilities should be secured.

The Council would like clarification of when payment under the Section 106 agreement would be made and what the trigger points are that would release the funds agreed. Should any of the funds not be met for specified items/projects for any reason, it should be noted that the funds will be used in another area and not lost.

The Chairman thanked Cllr. Morrell and informed that the Clerk having discussed the timing of the application with Mark Moore, Principal Planning Officer at Craven District Council agreed to extend the deadline for comments until the end of January 2012.

The Parish Council is acquiring the services of a Planning Consultant to act on its behalf.

Residents were informed that there is still time to comment on the application and should do so and to also write to local MP Julian Smith.

Thanks were given to the Village Hall Committee for the use of the Hall and for arranging the seating.

The floor was then open for comments and debate.

What about the impact of traffic that the 54 households will add

Roads at peak times are already congested.

Most of the traffic will be using Bridge Road where a Primary School is sited.

What about a crossing?

It was stated at the meeting on the 5th September by Barratt Housing representatives that a crossing would be considered.

Is it a good idea to have a crossing and a roundabout close together?

Will there be only one entry/exit?

At the meeting on the 5th September representatives of Barratt Housing and David Wilson Homes confirmed they would only be one entry/exit.

If the field is Greenfield protected in the Local Plan as a Green Wedge why are developers allowed to put an application forward?

It depends on the Government and the politics at the time.

If we have any more development we won't be able to tell where Sutton begins or ends. We will lose our individual identity.

We do not need any more housing? There is enough homes for sale in Sutton why don't Craven buy those?

The Affordable Housing on Woodturners and Greenroyd has not all gone to local people?

What about sewerage the system it is already at full capacity?

Local Parish Councillors are working together to try and slow or even halt further development.

What about the Health Centre and the Hospital they are both at capacity. Over the Christmas period no beds where available in the children's ward.

If the land is not owned by the developer why are they allowed to put in a planning application when I cannot?

With the recent weather the bottom of the field is still flooding?

Cllr. Morrell explained what the developers intended to do with regard to water storage tanks. It has been noted that representatives of Barratt Housing have stated that "it will not resolve the flooding but merely not make it any worse."

What about effluent flowing into Holme Beck this is stated in the report point 8.10?

'Foul drainage will discharge to the existing foul sewers in Bridge Road, subject to improvements of the main trunk sewer thorough Keighley Valley by Yorkshire Water. If this is not in place by the time the development proceeds, then a connection will be made direct to the WWTW or a treatment package works will be considered for introduction on the site to treat foul drainage and allow effluent discharge into Holme Beck under an Environment Permit with the Environment Agency.

Cllr. Morrell stated he would take the matter up with the Environment Agency.

I worked for a major Sewage works over 50 years ago and there were problems with Aire Valley sewage system then.

Can the field not be claimed as a Village Green?

In the past an application was put in to make Alvic Field a Village Green this did not reach fruition. The process is very complicated and based on the criteria required it would have a very low chance of success.

North Yorkshire County Council and Craven District Council need to wake up to the realisation of the traffic situation in the area and the non-existing parking in Sutton-in-Craven. Cars are parked on both sides of the streets. It is becoming more and more dangerous to manoeuvre.

If this development goes ahead it reduces our amenities. Is Craven District Council willing to reduce our rates for loss of those amenities?

Will the Planning Meeting be held in Sutton?

Cllr. Hart responded "that due to the significant interest he will try and get the meeting brought to the area. It will probably be held in March."

Will it be held in an evening?

Cllr. Hart could not promise this but will try his best.

Will Cllr. Hart be representing the residents here tonight by voting against the application.

Cllr Hart informed that Cllr. Place and he could not comment as this will put them in a position of breach of the Code of Conduct but did inform all comments and views have been noted and will be taken into account.

What can we do to help stop this development?

Write to Craven District Council and to Julian Smith MP. It is best to write in your own words and not use a standard/duplicate letter. More weight will be given to individual comments even if it is just a few lines.

Julian Smith MP stated at a meeting held at Glusburn to Parish Councillors with regard to the Localism Bill and Planning that 'if Parish Councils come across any stumbling blocks at council level or hit any brick walls he would offer his support'

He will not be able to comment on any planning application individually but could be mindful of the way it is being processed and developed and may look into the way it is being handled with a view to support us as a village.

The Chairman thanked everyone for attending.

The meeting closed approximately 8.10pm.