

Officer Update Note

9 March 2016

Item 6.1

APPLICATION NUMBER:	2015/0289/COU 8/57/135T/PA	PARISH:	South Milford
APPLICANT:	Mr Liam Condon	VALID DATE:	12 June 2015
		EXPIRY DATE:	15 March 2016
PROPOSAL:	Retrospective change of use of land for residential and a function and events venue		
LOCATION:	Lumby Hall Butts Lane Lumby		

2.0 Updated consultation response from the Lead Officer – Environmental Health

Since the compilation of the Officer report, a scheme for foul water drainage has been submitted as part of the planning application. A response to consultation has been received on this scheme from the Environmental Health Officer, as follows:

The applicant has submitted a Foul Water Drainage Statement, reference 11435-5084 Revision B, prepared by Met Engineers on behalf of the Applicant. The assessment states that the existing system, The ASP 16P sewage treatment plant, "...is considered unsuitable to accommodate a social function of 150 guests"; and considers two options to accommodate this additional requirement.

The report recommends that an appropriate solution would be to install a primary septic tank with an airlift to the ASP 16P plant unit. A suggested unit, manufactured by Condor, namely Mill.6Air-6000Ltr Septic Tank c/w airlift, to the ASP 16 is considered appropriate for this proposal. The proposed layout of the works and siting of the apparatus is detailed in an appendix to the report, Plan No 11435-5084-01.

I would advise the applicant that the installation of a new drainage system will require Building Regulation Approval and that the additional discharge may require an amended consent to discharge from the Environment Agency.

In view of the above I can confirm that the issues raised relating to drainage can be dealt with by a suitably worded condition which ensures that should approval be granted satisfactory arrangements are made for the disposal of foul drainage.

2.0 Updated Recommendation

That the application be REFUSED for the first reason only as given on PP50-51 of the agenda; the second reason for refusal has now been removed.

Item 6.2

APPLICATION NUMBER:	8/19/1848A/PA 2014/1307/FUL	PARISH:	Hambleton Parish Council
APPLICANT:	R & B Hind	VALID DATE:	16 th January 2015
		EXPIRY DATE:	13 th March 2015
PROPOSAL:	Application for the erection, 25 year operation and subsequent decommissioning of a wind turbine measuring 77.9 m to blade tip		
LOCATION:	Oak Tree Farm, Selby Common, Selby		

The applicant's agent has requested that Members are made aware that the applicant would be willing to accept a planning condition with any permission granted to ensure the offer is 100% community owned. Officers would advise Members that the use of this condition would still not overcome concerns in relation to the WMS and this condition would not show that the proposals have the backing of the local community.

1.4 Consultations

It should be noted that since the compilation of the Officer Report an objection was received and has been logged as being from Wistow Parish Council. However, it was from an individual.

1.4.1 Selby Town Parish Council

The Town Council had a presentation on the Oak Tree Turbine at the meeting last night. The planning application had not been sent to the town council for consideration and as the local parish we would have expected to have had the application for consultation previously.

The Town Council have for this letter to be written to the Planning Department to express their support of the turbine.

The Parish Council are aware that this application is to be heard on 9 March 2016, and ask that the support of this application by the Town Council is included in the officers update report.

1.5 Publicity

Since the compilation of the Officer Report there are now 332 letters of representation on the proposal. Further letters of objection have raised concerns in regards to the following issues:

- The proposed wind turbine is so large it will dwarf all other structures in the vicinity. This is an industrial development from which any benefits are far outweighed by the negative impact it has on the countryside, on people who live in the area and on visitors.
- During construction it would cause nuisance to local people.
- The turbine is far too large and far too close to Thorpe Willoughby.
- Unacceptable visual impact of a large rotating object.
- Turbine out of scale with buildings in the area.

- The area around the farm is a very peaceful, tranquil one and would be visually ruined by such a large industrial rotating object.
- The size is totally out of scale with the existing buildings in the locality.
- The Bishop Wood area is very popular for recreation & used by people from Selby & Sherburn for walking, cycling & golfing. The visual impact would be substantial for all the people engaged in the above activities.
- Wind turbines are known to kill many birds & this very large turbine would also have this effect.
- This is yet another horrendous and unacceptable impact on our low-lying Vale of York, to be easily seen for miles and spoiling the landscape and tranquillity of this special area.
- The proposal is very distracting and upsetting to both local residents.
- Particularly distracting and highly dangerous to motorists and many regular walkers to an area of outstanding beauty.
- Residents we would all be left with this huge impact in their community to demolish when proven that the fake need to build it was driven by the greed of individuals rather than the saving the planet.
- These turbines are of absolutely no benefit to anyone except those that make profit from them. Far too many are required for them to make any significant impact on the UK's energy usage.
- Residents have moved to the Thorpe Willoughby area because of the country location and there was no proposal to erect this construction then - how is it that no questions asked or information been given to the affected areas and residents prior to now?
- The proposal would turn Green Belt area into industrial use.
- The Noise Assessment has not fully considered impacts on all affected neighbouring properties.
- The proposed area is a peaceful area offering a degree of calm & stillness in an otherwise busy world, this would be gone forever.
- Recreational pursuits in the area would be ruined by the industrial impact of the proposal.
- It is not part of the local authority plan, therefore should immediately be refused.
- When the wind speed record for this area is taken into account, there are too few days when such a turbine would be usable, making it a wholly uneconomic venture.
- The amount of concrete used to stabilise them will hinder drainage and is therefore, likely to increase the flood risk.
- Local residents do not want 'get rich quick schemes' based on minimal spurious reductions in CO2 production.
- The proposal would cause disruption to traffic on surrounding roads.
- It is not accepted that such a structure is cost effective.
- Recreational pursuits in the area would be ruined by the industrial impact of the proposal.
- The view of Bishop wood and fields will be completely ruined by this eye-sore which will tower over any electricity pylons and protrude massively over the trees.
- It is noted by the local residents, all of whom object to this scheme which benefits only the applicant to the detriment of the local environment, open landscape, local amenity and conflicts with the latest approach being taken by the National Government to only construct wind turbines offshore, that 90% of the support comments have been made after the consultation period. The local resident object very strongly to this scheme.
- It seems that although a previous application for Bishopwood was turned down, there seems to be many single turbines being thrust upon us in this area.

- The contribution from this proposed wind turbine to reducing CO₂ emissions would be very small compared to the damage to the scenery of one of the most attractive parts of Selby.
- Why should such an installation be subsidised by the government when the government is reducing the subsidy to more environmentally friendly green energy sources such as PV systems and biomass?
- It is felt that the proposed turbine would have a very negative effect on the local area, especially for Scalm Park Golf Club a busy establishment set in Bishopwoods, members of my family play golf at Scalm Park.
- The proposal would affect local residents who suffer migraines.
- The Planning Application states this is on Selby Coalfield Land. This will mislead those considering the application, as Selby Coalfield is in fact closed and the land in question is open farm land.
- It is felt that the application is nowhere near a "Community Scheme" nor is it a business proposition, to think it so would be naïve at best and as a local company Share Holding should be completely disregarded.
- The development will cause a hazardous distraction to motorists and motor cyclists on nearby routes, which constitute a main route to York which already has signs warning it is a dangerous road.
- A number of objections are from addresses which will be unaffected by this development.
- These turbines are of absolutely no benefit to anyone except those that make profit from them.
- Far too many are required for them to make any significant impact on the UK's energy usage.
- Having this 260 foot turbine stuck in the middle of this countryside which is higher than anything in the vicinity is unacceptable.
- The local roads are country lanes; they are not suitable for heavy construction traffic and would be severely disrupted during any construction works.

The letters of support have raised the following issues:

- The proposal would provide much needed renewable energy.
- This is a very exciting project.
- This represents an innovative and forward thinking project.
- This is the best way for local people to invest in their future.
- Excellent idea.
- Given the Government's emphasis on community projects this is a great idea.
- This proposal would have huge benefits to the local residents of Selby.
- The proposals are supported by technical assessments that demonstrate that the impacts are acceptable.
- Being a community owned scheme should be a material planning consideration.
- The proposal enables renewable generation of electricity in a landscape already dominated by power stations.
- It allows local people to invest and benefit from the existence and generation of the turbine.
- The turbine would pay community benefit to enable local projects, already suffering so much from government spending cuts.
- The resource of wind is a local one, therefore increasing security of supply. The turbine will pay significant local tax revenue in rates, supporting the local authority who has also had to face significant revenue reductions over the last 6 years.
- It supports a local farmer and it enables over £1m local investment over both construction and operation.

- It will provide a good economic return to the local economy and £10,000 per year contribution to local community projects.

Item 6.4

APPLICATION NUMBER:	8/23/2P/PA 2015/1405/OUT	PARISH:	Camblesforth Parish Council
APPLICANT:	Treadstone Holdings	VALID DATE:	11 th January 2016
		EXPIRY DATE:	11 th April 2016
PROPOSAL:	Outline application including access for the erection of up to 45 dwellings		
LOCATION:	Selby Road, Camblesforth, Selby		

1.4 Consultations

1.4.4 Environment Agency

Thank you for providing the additional information from AAH Planning Consultants regarding flood risk at the above site.

The EA's previous response RA/2015/133510/01-L01 dated 03 November 2015 still applies.

1.5 Publicity

Since the compilation of the Officer Report there have been 4 further letters of objection. Issues raised include:

- With reference to the revised plans, which are still felt to be unacceptable for the reasons stated and others who actually live in the area have also commented upon.
- The recent 'spate' of comments in favour of the development from people who don't live in the village has me perplexed, especially as their comments are ill informed, they speak of the excellent facilities and lack of affordable housing in the area (both questionable) they also discuss the excellent travel links. It is considered that 1 bus an hour that finishes at 1900 is hardly an excellent service.
- Finally on the revised plan, a grass hard standing parking area is planned for land behind Barn Elms for the users of the Chapel, given the demographic that use this facility this is a token gesture and a waste of time/money, cars will still park on the access road that is a blind junction into Barn Elms. It also begs the question of who will maintain this area, a walk of the local children's play area will verify that litter is not cleaned, the grass is not cut properly and current excellent 'sic' facilities are already not maintained to a satisfactory standard.
- What is going on, 6 or seven letters of support all starting with the same paragraph all from outside Camblesforth, just for this blatant attempt of fraud SDC should not even consider this planning application.
- Concerns that not enough is being done to mitigate the likelihood for accident on the A1041, and the speed and increased weight of traffic southbound through the village that a further 80 houses will cause.

- It is asked that the committee disregard the comments of those who have sent a standard letter in but who do not live in the locality - North Duffield is 10.9 miles from Camblesforth, and Eggborough is 8.4 miles away. If the residents of those villages are so keen for local development, perhaps they should back schemes in their villages?
- Concerns that this application should be considered alongside planning application 2015/1405/OUT for 45 dwellings within Camblesforth.

Since the compilation of the Officer Report there have been 2 further letters of support. Issues raised include:

- The application will provide much needed car parking for the Chapel which is used regularly for many local events. This application will help support the local shops and public houses and provide open space for recreation.
- Will provide much needed car parking for the use of those visiting the chapel, open space for public to walk and help support the shops in the village.

An email was received by the agent on 29th February, which provided an letter attached from the Environment Agency which stated:

“I can confirm that we consider this would seem a reasonable approach to take with regards to the Sequential Test, however as the application of the Sequential Test is the responsibility of Selby District Council, you will need to discuss and agree this approach with them.”

The agent’s interpreted of this letter was that:

“ According to the Environment Agency Flood Maps, the application site is formally located in Flood Zone 2 which has a medium probability of flooding and on this basis a sequential test has been submitted with the application. I recently copied you in to a letter and information including topographical information which suggested that the site was in fact flood zone 1 based on the actual probability of the site flooding. As per the attached letter the Environment Agency has accepted that this is a reasonable approach to take when considering the application of the sequential test. Given the site is considered to be in zone 1 based on the probability of the site flooding no sequential test would be required. This approach is in line with that of an application recently considered at Planning Committee under application reference 2015/0687/OUT.”

Officer have contacted the Environment Agency who haves stated that the additional information has not changed their view on the Flood Zone of the site which is Flood Zone 2 and the agent would need to make a formal challenge to the EA in order for the EA to look at the above issue.

Item 6.7

APPLICATION NUMBER:	2015/1145/FUL	PARISH:	Brayton
APPLICANT:	Holmefield Vet Clinic	VALID DATE:	12 th October 2015
		EXPIRY DATE:	7 th December 2015
PROPOSAL:	Proposed two storey extension to existing vets' clinic		
LOCATION:	Holmefield Veterinary Centre Brayton Lane Brayton Selby North Yorkshire YO8 9DZ		

--	--

Paragraph 1.2.4, the external cladding should read as cream white in colour and not light blue.