

BARLOW PARISH COUNCIL: COMMENTS ON MORELLO GARTH: PLANNING APPLICATION REF: 2018/0016/FULM

Barlow Parish Council has carefully considered the documents relating to the application and held a consultative meeting with local residents on Tuesday 23 January.

The land subject to this application received outline planning approval in Autumn 2015 despite the strong objections of this council and the strength of public opinion within the village against the planned development. The Parish Council fully understands and respects the reasons for the decision at that time, given the legal challenges the Council's planning strategy then faced preventing the adoption of a five-year housing target.

Following the decision, the primary concern of the Parish Council was the precedent set for future applications. The concern is now clearly crystallized by the current application which seeks to increase the number of dwellings from 15 (in the original application) to 49. We believe such a large increase represents such a fundamental change to the nature of the development that, at the very least, the planning decision on the 16th to 49th dwellings should be made in light of the current framework of planning policies in place. In the Parish Council's view, it would be inappropriate to rely solely on the precedent set by the previous decision.

We wish lodge our objection to the application on the following grounds:

- The application fails various criteria set out in the document **Selby District Core Strategy**. Under the definitions included in this document, Barlow is classified as a secondary village. In particular, we would draw your attention to Policy SP10 (Rural Housing Exceptions Sites). SP10 states,

In the Designated Service Villages and the Secondary Villages, planning permission will be granted for small scale 'rural affordable housing' as an exception to normal planning policy provided all of the following criteria are met:

1) The site is within or adjoining Development Limits in the case of Secondary Villages, and adjoining Development Limits in the case of Designated Service Villages;

2) A local need has been identified by a local housing needs survey, the nature of which is met by the proposed development; and

3) The development is sympathetic to the form and character and landscape setting of the village and in accordance with normal development management criteria.

We believe the application fails comprehensively to address any or all aspects of this policy.

- Policy SP2 (Spatial Development Strategy), Section A (b) & (c) states

(b) Limited amounts of residential development may be absorbed inside Development Limits of Secondary Villages where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities...

(c) Development of countryside (outside Development Limits) will be limited to the replacement or extension of existing buildings, the re-use of buildings preferably for employment purposes, and well-designed new buildings of an appropriate scale, which would contribute towards and improve the local economy and where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities...

Even allowing for the previous outline planning decision approving development outside the Development Limits of Barlow, this application seeks to transgress even further outside the agreed development limits. **We strongly believe the proposal is entirely inappropriate in scale and has failed to demonstrate how it will enhance or maintain the vitality of the village.**

- Policy SP4 (Management of Residential Development in Settlements), paragraphs (c) & (d) state

(c) In all cases proposals will be expected to protect local amenity, to preserve and enhance the character of the local area, and to comply with normal planning considerations, with full regard take of the principles contained in Design Codes (e.g. Village Design Statements), where available.

(d) Appropriate scale will be assessed in relation to the density, character and form of the local area and should be appropriate to the role and function of the settlement within the hierarchy

We have read all the documents accompanying this application and can find **no evidence that the applicant has taken any account of the Barlow Village Design Statement whatsoever.** We believe the density of dwellings proposed (26 per hectare) is c.30% higher than guidelines used by Selby District Council to assess developments in Secondary Villages.

- Policy SP13 (Scale and Distribution of Economic Growth), section D states,

In all cases, development should be sustainable and by appropriate in scale and type to its location, not harm the character of the area, and seek a good standard of amenity.

The current application represents a 20% increase in the size of Barlow village. We also note that the planned road layout implies further development of the site in the future, and this intention is explicitly mentioned in the applicant's documentation. **In our view, this is neither sustainable nor appropriate in scale and will bring significant harm to the character of the area.**

- Policy SP15 (Sustainable Development and Climate Change), section B (f) states,

Minimise traffic growth by providing a range of sustainable travel options (including walking, cycling and public transport) through Travel Plans and Transport Assessments and facilitate advances in travel technology such as Electric Vehicle charging points;

We believe the transport statement accompanying this application fails to address this policy adequately, In particular, traffic growth from the development is likely to severely impact the A1041 Bawtry Road. Planning Committee members will be aware that traffic safety on this road was an issue raised and heavily criticised by the Planning Inspector in his recent appeal decision regarding "Brickyard Farm."

- Policy SP18 (Protecting and Enhancing the Environment), section 3 (b) states

Ensuring developments retain, protect and enhance features of biological and geological interest and provide appropriate management of these features and that unavoidable impacts are appropriately mitigated and compensated for, on or off-site

We believe the ecology impact statement submitted by the applicant is fundamentally flawed and contains a number of factual errors concerning the impact of the development on wildlife at or near the site. This includes an adverse impact on bats, badgers and potentially Great-crested Newts.

- The application fails various criteria set out in the document **Selby District Local Plan** and not superseded by subsequent policy documents. In particular, the policy ENV1 states

1) The effect upon the character of the area or the amenity of adjoining occupiers;

2) The relationship of the proposal to the highway network, the proposed means of access, the need for road/junction improvements in the vicinity of the site, and the arrangements to be made for car parking;

3) The capacity of local services and infrastructure to serve the proposal, or the arrangements to be made for upgrading, or providing services and infrastructure;

4) Paragraph (5): The potential loss, or adverse effect upon significant buildings, related spaces, trees, wildlife habitats, archaeological or other features important to the character of the area.

We believe the application fails to adequately address any of these criteria. In particular we are concerned about the road safety aspects of the proposed entry/exit to the development given the recent traffic speed survey undertaken by North Yorkshire Police on the Parish Council's behalf. In addition, we believe the lack of local services and inadequate infrastructure makes a development on this scale wholly unsustainable.

On behalf of Barlow Parish Council.

T. M. THRALL – VICE CHAIRMAN