

06 August 2015

MS Cheryl Akinson

Plan SELBY Support Officer  
Civic Centre  
Doncaster Road  
Selby  
YO8 9FT

I wish to submit the following comments in response to the various documents referring to PLAN SELBY

STRATEGIC COUNTRYSIDE GAPS

Draft 3 / 22 June Document

Section 4.5 Church Fenton East/West

Pages 28 / 29 /30

- a) I object to this report referring to Church Fenton East and West – this does not exist and is an illusion created by the Planning Department. Church Fenton has always been referred to as one village.

Paragraph 2 on page 28

- b) The Church fenton East/West SCG passes between the two parts (east and west) of the village and was designated as a SCG within the Selby District Local Plan 2005.

**This SCG has not been identified within the Core Strategy (2013)**

The reason that this Strategic Gap was not identified in the Core Strategy 2013 was that it was the subject of a Church Fenton Parish Council Meeting in October 2011.

I attach a letter submitted to the Parish Council with regard to the Strategic Gap (Ref CFPC01 dated 13 October 2011)

hggy Hof the ...the gap SCG y

c) .ratment figmenants t n fento ,

Outline application to include access for a residential development on land south of Main Street, Church Fenton by Mr and Mrs Geoffrey and Dorothy Bradley and Florence Bradley.

I write in connection with the above planning application. I have examined the plans and I know the site well as a resident of Church Fenton for the past 34 years. I wish to object strongly to the request for an **Access Road** and **Development** of a significant number of houses in this location.

Church Fenton is a village which is fully described in the **Village Design Statement** created with input from many occupants of the village. The Village Design Statement is consistent with the Selby District Planning Process and reflects the views of persons resident in Church Fenton. The VDS describes Church Fenton as a village and not an urban town which this planning application will create.

The request to build a new Access Road is not consistent with the Planning Envelope. This site and access road are completely outside all documented Planning Envelopes for Church Fenton and is a Greenfield site.

I also object on the basis that this planning request impacts

- a number of public footpaths
  
- the proposed site surrounds St Mary's Church a Grade 1 listed building which has historic values in a picturesque setting
  
- the proposed design and layout is of a small housing estate not in keeping with the character of the village

In 2011 Church Fenton Parish Council held an open discussion (17<sup>th</sup> November – Meeting Minutes Attached item 86.b) attended by the local community to discuss the SITES ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT prepared by Selby District Council.

Following this meeting the Parish Council notified the Policy Officer of the village views and input. (Attached letter dated 30<sup>th</sup> November 2011).

Minute 2 of this letter clearly states – 'The village strongly opposes the extent of the development proposals, especially larger sites which will result in the further urbanisation of the village'.

This letter also outlines the village requirements to have small scale development on small infill type sites more in keeping with the character of the village.

In the Selby District Core Strategy (adopted 2013) – Church Fenton is identified as **Designated Service Village**. In conjunction with the Core Strategy document a 'Draft Growth options for Designated Service Villages' was produced. This document allocated between 24 and 39 dwellings as a planning target for Church Fenton. The proposed planning application is between a 300% and 500% increase over this planning target.

In addition this planning application would allocate all the dwelling growth to one group of beneficiaries and not be shared with multiple parties across the village community.

I would be pleased to speak if required at any Planning Committee Meetings

Yours faithfully,

P N Dowding

Attachment 1 – Church Fenton Parish Council Minutes November 17<sup>th</sup> 2011

Attachment 2 – Letter from Church Fenton Parish Council to Selby Planning November 30<sup>th</sup> 2011

13<sup>th</sup> October 2011

**Attention of  
Church Fenton Parish Council**

**Subject: Site Allocation Development Plan Document (SADPD) Preferred Options**

Dear Chairman & Council Members

First I would like to give my apologies for not being able to attend the Parish Council meeting. I am currently working abroad in Europe.

In submitting this letter I make the assumption that the above mentioned document is going to be discussed by the Church Fenton Parish Council and that the Parish Council will be submitting a response to Selby District Council in due course.

If the Parish Council intends to formulate a position and response on the Site Allocation Document I would wish for my comments and responses to be taken into consideration.

Overall I have no issue with the method in which Selby District Planning Department have calculated a potential of 42 houses for Church Fenton in the Site Allocation Development Plan.

I do however have three issues with the proposed site allocations for Church Fenton outlined in the above mentioned document.

My three issues cover:

- The Strategic Gap
- The merits of site CHFN002
- The proposed allocations in the Site Allocation Document

### **The Strategic Gap**

From the list of 9 sites originally nominated for consideration - three (3) have been eliminated on the basis of one single statement in the Site Allocation Preferred Options Document.

**“Responses from Church Fenton are varied, but a common issue was the retention of the strategic gap to maintain the separate identities of the two parts of the village” (Page 93)**

Based on this statement the Planning Department eliminated three (3) sites without and further consideration as far as I am aware (CHFN003, CHFN007 and CHFN002).

I contacted Selby District Council Planning Department with reference to this statement and requested the following information:

A) How many dwellings are there in Church Fenton?

**Response:** At March 2010 there were 525 dwellings with a further 21 awaiting completion.

B) How many replies were submitted by residents of Church Fenton in response to the original Site Allocation document?

**Response:** A handful, the actual number is not available because the responses are a mixture of letters and emails and are not stored in a database that can easily be searched. Probably no more than 10 of which maybe a half commented on the Strategic Gap.

Please note these responses were provided verbally over the telephone.

So if we consider there are 525 interested households in Church Fenton of which ten (10) expressed an opinion. Of these 10 responses probably a half made reference to the Strategic Gap. Then it seems to me the opinion of 1% of Church Fenton was used to support the decision to eliminate sites based on the criteria - **Strategic Gap**. Is this a fair and objective method to make a decision?

I assume for the rest of the village, some ninety nine percent (99%) the Strategic Gap is of no interest or was not a concern.

In my opinion the ‘Strategic Gap’ is an anomaly because in several representations to the Selby Planning Department I have asked for the definition of a ‘Strategic Gap’ and been informed there is no formal definition. It is something that has a clear meaning between two main villages for example Church Fenton and Barkston Ash. However within a village there are no formal criteria for a Strategic Gap, only a subjective opinion.

The actual physical gap between the two parts of Church Fenton village is a throwback from the days when Church Fenton was an active RAF station.

I therefore do not think sites CHFN003, CHFN007 and CHFN002 should be eliminated from the Site Allocations on the basis of a one percent opinion (1%) in the village.

### **Merits of Site CHFN002**

I openly declare that I have an interest in this site as the owner.

In my response to the original request from Selby District Council for comments on the potential sites I made the following proposals for this site:

- First the whole site of 3.7 acres should not be used for development. In the original document it was estimated that the site could deliver 47 houses potentially
- Second there is a need in Selby District housing requirements for Retirement Homes which I proposed to address
- I proposed a Main House and a number of supporting Retirement Bungalows to fit within a clear identified building line boundary aligned with existing houses to the west of the site
- The remainder of the site potentially two (2.0 acres) would be made available for the village as a potential park or any other suitable facility that would contribute to the welfare of the village. Maybe a new Village Hall with an ample car park would be worthy of consideration.

I believe the original proposals I submitted were constructive and of benefit to the increasing number of persons approaching retirement within our national population as well as adding some value back into the village.

I would like the Parish Council to reconsider site CHFN002.

### **The proposed allocations in the Site Allocation Document**

I have lived in Church Fenton 30 years, during this period most of the people living or visiting the village and even the Selby Planning office make reference to the 'Character' of the village and the different types and styles of houses.

In the past twenty years to my knowledge every application for a single dwelling has been rejected. However owners of commercial sites including farms have been able to

change the land designation and obtain permission to build multiple blocks of housing ranging from 6, 18, 56 to the conglomeration located at the railway station. Is it a village we are trying to retain and enhance or are we constructing an urban town?

There seems to be an obsession with building density as opposed to building to fit in with the 'character' of the village. We have expensive houses with no garage and no garden in the majority of recent developments.

Do we really need another 10 or 27 houses crammed into two locations just because that's the building density in the Planning Office rule book?

If we are going to have a potential for housing development within Church Fenton village can we make it possible to have a distribution that is equitable to all valid or potential sites in Church Fenton on the basis of merit, consistency to the character of the village and some added value and not some planning technical formula?

If the village does not speak and respond to the Site Allocation document then I assume Selby District will use the proposed allocations as a basis for implementing development decisions by default.

Finally in making these observations and comments I could submit them as an individual to the Planning Department at Selby. However I feel a village community response is more appropriate if there is to be any impact on amending or adjusting the proposed Site Allocation Document.

I thank the council members and public who are in attendance for taking the time and consideration given to my letter.

Yours sincerely

Phil Dowding

cc Chairman Church Fenton Parish Council  
cc Clerk of Church Fenton Parish Council

Email Attachment - Signed Copy of this Letter (pdf)  
Email Attachment – Email from Selby District Planning

## Church Fenton Parish Council

### Minutes of the Meeting of Church Fenton Parish Council held on Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> November 2011 at the Village Hall, Main Street, Church Fenton

Present: Cllr Stephen Johnson – Chair  
Cllr Chris Dibbs  
Cllr Andrew Mason  
Cllr Jo Mason  
Cllr Craig Blakey  
Jeremy Sherlock (Clerk)  
9 Members of the public

#### 81. Apologies and Declarations

None

#### 82. Public Session

Kenny Smith spoke about the work he is carrying out to support the use of local footpaths including:

- a. Putting walks on the website up to 3km from Church Fenton. He requested financial support of £47.50 plus VAT to cover OS royalties.
- b. Surveyed local footpaths with NYCC and Ramblers association – he has become a local footpaths officer from NYCC.

Cllr Chris Dibbs reported that he had written to NYCC regarding the path west of Oakwood Close. Kenny advised that he had contacted Selby DC regarding the overgrown hedge.

Kenny was thanked for his excellent work.

The Christmas tree/ carols was raised. Cllr Craig Blakey offered to buy a tree. The parish were asked to fund lights.

**Resolved that the Council fund the following from the miscellaneous budget:**

1. **The OS map royalties for the website at £47.50 plus VAT**
2. **Christmas Lights up to £200.00**

#### 83. Reports

An apology has been received from Cllr Cattanach and PC Caroline Ward

#### 84. Minutes of the Last Meeting

**Resolved that these represented a true record of the meeting.**

#### 85. Matters Arising

None

#### 86. For Discussion

- a. **Precept 2012-13-** the Clerk presented options for the 2012-13 precept. This included the following considerations:
  - i. The actual precept income was £15,500 - higher than budget.
  - ii. The budget made no allowance for projects - external funding is rightly ignored, but other things (such as the fencing) have been funded from reserves. Projects (e.g. Xmas lights in the 2012-13 proposal) are not included.



## Church Fenton Parish Council

- iii. The forecast for reserves at the end of 2011-12 is around £11K. A reserve of around £4-£5K would seem satisfactory, so further reserves could be used.
- iv. There is no contingency.

Options considered include:

- i. Set the precept at the same level as this year (£15,500) by utilising reserves - this would mean that the reserve would cover running costs as well as projects - not sustainable in the long-term.
- ii. An inflation based precept increase to £16,275 (based on 5% inflation).
- iii. A small precept increase to cover increased running costs to say £15,750.

It was felt that the reserves should be retained as a capital reserve to allow projects to be delivered in the village. An inflation based increase was preferred as this is more sustainable, and would only cost c£1.50 per year for each Council Tax payer.

**Resolved that a precept of £16,275 be approved**

- b. **Selby District Site Allocations Development Plan Document** – Councillors considered the discussions that had taken place regarding the SADPD at the public meeting that preceded the Council meeting. It was agreed that the Clerk will submit a response agreed at that meeting.

**Resolved that the Clerk submit a response to the SADPD consultation including the following:**

- **The proposed allocations are too high in light of the high level of development in the village in recent years.**
  - **Further urbanisation at the west end of the village should be resisted**
  - **Small scale infill type development that retains the village character is preferred**
  - **The retention of the “strategic gap” dividing the village is not a priority**
  - **The maintenance of the rural aspect of the Parish Church is welcomed**
  - **The individual site comments agreed at the public meeting are supported**
- c. **Additional Play Equipment** – Cllr Craig Blakey provided the Clerk with the quotes previously sought which he had received from a former Councillor. Section 106 funding is available for the scheme.

**Resolved that the Clerk progress the agreed scheme subject to the contractor agreeing to maintain the original quotation of £7,625 plus VAT**

- d. **Christmas Lights** – the previous commitment to future Christmas Lights was considered

**Resolved that the Council allocate £1,500 in 2012-13, and £1,000 per year for 2013-2015 to cover Christmas Lights and maintenance/ service charges**

- e. **Christmas Party** – a request has been agreed for a £100 contribution towards the pensioners' Christmas Party

**Resolved that a £100 contribution to the pensioners' Christmas Party be approved**

- f. **Street Lighting** – the Clerk reported on discussions he had been holding with NYCC including:

## Church Fenton Parish Council

- Inspection – a biannual inspection programme NYCC have quoted £20 per column plus VAT, a total cost of £520.
- Repairs – NYCC have quoted a repair cost of £14 plus VAT for repairs. However they would only charge for materials if repairs were undertaken at the same time as inspections.
- Reduced operating hours to reduce energy usage - NYCC have quoted £48 per column (£1248) to do the work now, or £25 per column (£650) if we wait until April.
- Energy cost – NYCC have quoted an estimated annual cost of £671.25 plus VAT, which even if over optimistic, is a massive reduction on the current cost of c £2.7K.
- Lanterns – NYCC have advised that 8 lanterns are likely to be outlawed within the next 2-3 years by EU legislation. Replacement would reduce energy consumption, provide more light, and reduce future maintenance costs. The cost of these new lanterns would be c£1,600.

It was agreed that the NYCC proposals would reduce costs, and improve the service.

### **Resolved that:**

- 1. NYCC be contracted to carry out inspections and any necessary repairs to the lamp columns at a cost of £520 plus materials plus VAT.**
- 2. NYCC be contracted to carry out future inspections on a 2 yearly cycle, subject to quotations being agreed prior to them undertaking the work.**
- 3. Residents close to Parish Council street lighting be consulted over reduced operating hours with a view to implementing this in April 2012 if there is overall support. This would include signs posted on lampposts, and information on the website.**
- 4. The Council change their electricity Contract to NYCC with immediate effect.**
- 5. The 8 obsolete lanterns be changed at a cost of £1,600.**

### 87. For Information

A Council representative on the Jubilee Celebrations Steering Group was requested

**Resolved that Cllr Chris Dibbs be the Council representative**

### 88. Planning

Applications for Consideration

None

Applications Approved by Selby DC:

2011/0843/FUL – single storey side and rear extension; external seating at the Fenton Flyer, Main Street, Church Fenton

2011/0461/COU – change of use of land to a nature reserve at sandwath lane, Church fenton

Applications Withdrawn/Refused

## Church Fenton Parish Council

None

### 89. Finance

#### a. Clerk's Finance Report

The Clerk circulated a financial report which showed the current balance at £16,652.72.

The balance of funding owed by the former Clerk has still not been received. It was agreed that the Clerk should send a recorded delivery letter advising of the intention of taking further action.

#### b. Payments

J Sherlock – September wage – £229.49

T Freeman – September wage £301.60

SLCC – Subscription - £7.20

Chapel Chat - £50.00

**Resolved that the above payments be approved**

#### c. Income

None

### 90. Representatives Reports

Cllr Jo Mason advised that the rail bridge was being painted grey, rather than the agreed green. She will contact them requesting the originally agreed colour.

Cllr Jo Mason reported that the sign on Common Lane will be erected shortly

Cllr Craig Blakey advised that the sign in the Park has been erected

Cllr Jo Mason advised that problems continue with the track alarms. She will raise this further with Network Rail

Councillor Andrew Mason reported that speed box monitors can be requested. It was agreed to discuss this further at the next meeting

### 91. Clerks Report

Pen portraits were requested

Yorkshire Water have agreed to repair the bollard oin the Park

### 92. Agenda Items for Next Meeting on Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> November at 7:30 pm:

Traffic calming

Meeting closed at 9:20 pm

Jeremy Sherlock; Clerk; [clerk@church-fenton.net](mailto:clerk@church-fenton.net); 07981 371937

## Church Fenton Parish Council

Andy McMillan,  
Policy Officer,  
Selby District Council,  
Doncaster Road,  
Selby,  
YO8 9FT

Jeremy Sherlock,  
Clerk, Church Fenton Parish Council,

30<sup>th</sup> November 2011

Dear Andy,

### SITE ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT

### COMMENTS FROM CHURCH FENTON PARISH

The comments in this letter are being submitted by Church Fenton Parish Council on behalf of the villagers of Church Fenton. The comments were agreed at a public meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> November 2011 which also included consideration of a number of written representations from people who were unable to attend.

1. The Parish recognises that the draft SADPD is an attempt to respond to comments made in the previous consultation. However further amendments are needed to make it satisfactory.
2. The village strongly opposes the extent of the development proposals, especially the larger sites which will result in further urbanisation of the village.
3. The village has received more than its fair share of development in recent years. According to figures included in planning documents the number of dwellings has increased from 325 to 525 since 1997, a 62% increase, which is higher than comparable areas. On this basis it would seem appropriate to limit development to less than the figures proposed in the SADPD.
4. Small scale development on small infill type sites is more in keeping with the character of the village than the large developments that have been allowed, particularly at the west end. In many cases this could be managed through the Development Control process without requiring a specific site allocation, especially when in the past this has led to site cramming. This could be achieved by identifying a village boundary within which small scale development (say up to 3 dwellings) could be permitted subject to meeting the village design statement and other development control criteria.
5. The village welcomes the protection of the Parish Church from development at the rear which would spoil; it's setting.
6. The 3 sites at the west end of the village would lead to further urbanisation and should be resisted. There also seems to be problems with foul drainage in this area. There is less concern about the "strategic gap" which is mainly a result of the stream and is not seen as vital to the overall character. Some development of an appropriate character in this area would be acceptable.

## Church Fenton Parish Council

7. The site at the rear of Northfield Lane was particularly opposed as it is a backland site with poor access.
  8. Comments on individual sites are:
    - 001 – oppose development on this site as it would further urbanise the west end of the village
    - 002 – some development may be acceptable, providing this matches the rear development line created by Northfield Lane. The owner has contacted the Parish Council stating that he wishes this site to be allocated for development.
    - 003 – some minor infill may be acceptable
    - 004 – oppose as a development site, though some minor infill may be acceptable
    - 005 – no objections
    - 006 – support the proposed designation
    - 007 – would be suitable for appropriately designed development
    - 008 – poor access, previous development, and intrusion into open countryside makes this an unsuitable site
    - 009 – unsuitable site in open countryside
- One potential additional site that could be considered is the site to the east of the Primary School.

Yours faithfully,

Jeremy Sherlock  
Clerk Church Fenton Parish Council