

Wistow Parish Council

Minutes of the Wistow Parish Council meeting held on Tuesday 11th October 2022. Held in the Chapel Hall, Wistow.

Present: Councillors M Hewan (Chair), R Harrison (Vice Chair), M Gouton, A Kendal, E Pownall, H Binham and C Richardson

Also present: Hugh Roberts (Developer) + Charlotte, and 31 members of the public.

98. To receive apologies for absence and consider the reasons for absence.

Apologies were received from the clerk. Accepted.

99. To receive declarations of interest from Parish Councillors.

Cllr. Richardson declared as district councillor he may be on the planning committee which would be making decisions on the development at Plantation House.

100. To consider approval of the meeting of the Parish Council minutes held on 21st June and 22nd July.

Both minutes were accepted. Proposer Cllr Harrison, Seconded Cllr Kendal for both - approved.

101. To consider the planning application 2022/0945/FUL development of 32 houses at Plantation House.

Representatives Hugh and Charlotte introduced from the development company. Cllr Hewan explained that the Parish Council submits comments on proposals. After discussion and agreement, one comment will be submitted for the council as a whole. Further advised the online deadline for comments had been extended to the end of the month.

Cllr Richardson: Asked what the timeline was going forward with the development?

Hugh responded that statutory consultee responses were still outstanding. These will be discussed with the case officer upon return. All concerns will be examined and addressed as required. They are currently waiting for all responses to be returned to address a whole. After this, it will be dependant on the case officers and can often take several months to reach a determination. Following this there will be further consultation, any required changes will be made, then the plans will be submitted for reassessment.

Member of the Public (referred hereafter as MoP): Having read the biodiversity report, there was a significant loss of hedgerow but not much information had been provided on the mitigation of loss of habitat for wildlife.

Hugh: Assured that they will be looking at ways both on and offsite ways to offset the loss, such as funds or onsite boxes. However, they are waiting for all, full reports to be returned before fully investigating and deciding on how to do this.

MoP: Query raised that there was conflicting information submitted on plans for 30 and 32 houses. Stated more first time buyer houses would be better suited for the area due to multiple generations within the village.

MoP: Asked if there is a legal obligation for first time buyer provisions?

Hugh: Advised 30% would be affordable housing comprising of social rental/interim rental/private rental. Unsure of which particular houses these would be, but would be split across different house types on the development. Noted that there was a mixed consultation response on the potential housing mix but that there is a policy in the Selby district to adhere to.

Cllr Pownall: Asked to clarify if it was to be 30 or 32 houses.

Hugh: Advised the plan submitted for 32 houses was the accurate plan to reference.

Cllr Harrison: Regarding the affordable housing; is the Housing Association involved? Are there any constraints, eg. Whitby has restrictions regarding holiday lets, buy to let over first time buyers?

Hugh: Housing Association will be in consultation, there will be shared ownerships options along with the earlier mentioned rental options. There are no restrictions in the Selby regarding second home ownership etc, but this can be raised when the reports are returned with the case officer.

Point of Action: clarify if there are any restrictions or conditions that could be/will be placed on properties.

Cllr Richardson: Is there any community monies likely to come from this application?

Hugh: Referred to the Community Infrastructure Levy that is £35pm², how that is divided up by the authorities isn't known at this stage, but some does usually come to the Parish Council. There could also be other payments eg open space contributions to be made.

MoP: Raised drainage issues on Cawood Road where properties back on to the proposed development site. Will there be better provisions made to include them?

Hugh: Explains they calculate a Greefield run off rate - points to the drainage strategy. Not sure what the numbers are at this stage. However, understands that the drainage rate cannot be worse than it is now. Reference made to increasing the impermeable areas would lead to increased discharge/surface which inevitably affects surrounding areas and properties - acknowledges work will be needed to meet Yorkshire Water's conditions.

Point of Action: investigate what the needs of specific properties are.

Cllr Hewan: Advises that we would want to improve the situation, not keep the status quo as we already have flooding.

Hugh: They have had the same conversations with other villages. They understand the frustration with Yorkshire Water but they can't fix existing problems, however, they are working to avoid exacerbating the situation and can only work with Yorkshire Water and their infrastructure.

MoP: The reports show contaminated land. How are they dealing with this, eg the sunken tank, asbestos in the workshop etc. How are they ensuring it does not affect the surrounding area?

Hugh: Cites the Remediation Strategy; if they were to gain consent they would have to have things like wheel washing, site hours, PPE, correct contractors in place. They are required to report and demonstrate practices to Environmental Health through regular testing etc. They will be required to regularly test the soil and most likely replace the top soil and continue testing to ensure there is no contamination in addition to removing the sunken tanker.

MoP: Asks what the minimum number of housing they would accept on the build? The buildings are going to exacerbate the sewerage problem especially as sewerage is returning.

Hugh: Pre development enquiry with Yorkshire Water, propose to use existing system. Issues people are currently facing are connected to surface water entering the combined sewage system not fouled water. The main point is they will not make the situation worse, they will at least keep the status quo. Regarding the minimum numbers, they are here to get feedback on what the public thinks is acceptable. Draws attention to the fact that as the number of houses is reduced, so too is the number of affordable houses. There is also a minimum density per hectare policy that they are working to.

MoP: Raises the issues of numbers of cars per house to be expected.

Cllr Pownall: States they are not against a reasonable number of houses, however, 32 is not reasonable when considered with only one entrance/exit road. Thinks that the number of cars suggested is not realistic (16/18 cars per day in and out) - how was that number reached?

Hugh: National metric was used to calculate this - NYCC highways uses this and asks for the figures based on this. They have not yet received a response from Highways regarding the traffic density numbers etc The response may affect the current plans.

MoP: Why is there only 1 entrance/exit? The proposed road is not safe and is very close to their drive. Highlights that the buses currently cut across their drive - what will the new traffic do? There is poor visibility for traffic and pedestrians, especially children. Large agricultural vehicles, lorries and the speed of traffic that passes is increasing. Have they thought of double yellow lines? Moving the road?

Hugh: They have used NYCC highways design guides. There is not a requirement for the number of dwellings proposed - they can be served from a single carriageway. A topographical survey has been undertaken and considered. Unfortunately traffic calming measures are a NYCC highways issue.

Cllr Hewan: Refers to the fact that NYCC have not returned a response yet and advises people to submit their objections online.

Cllr Harrison: Asks whether they would consider suggesting traffic signals to NYCC Highways Agency?

MoP: Furthers this by illustrating the speeding through the bend, the damage sustained by the pub after being struck by farming machinery.

Cllr Harrison: Adds that there are a lot of families with young children, schoolchildren walking alone to consider.

Hugh: Raises Point of Action, to look at this as it is a point of delivery. Unsure where NYCC sit on this. Will look into and return with firmer answers.

Cllr Pownall: Will you only deliver the bare minimum of what NYCC say regarding the highways?

Hugh: Yes.

MoP: Will they make changes if they are given permission?

Hugh: They will work to the changes/conditions recommended by the planning committee.

MoP: Has the land been purchased?

Hugh: An agreement to purchase has been made.

MoP: Regarding the parking - have they been working to NYCC design statement for sufficient parking?

Hugh: PoA double check whether this is correct.

MoP: Highlights the difficulty bin wagons and emergency service vehicles may have negotiating the roads if there isn't sufficient parking.

Cllr Richardson: States that the design is not as sympathetic as it could be. What's the best way for residents to let the developers know their thoughts?

Hugh: Will provide an email to send questions/information to. However, the consultation portal is the best way as that is regularly reviewed. Regarding the design - anything put forward by the public will be taken into consideration.

PoA email to be passed to Parish Council and distributed on FB, website etc.

MoP: States they are part owner of the land but was unaware of the purchase.

Hugh: Directs the individual to the land registry and advises they speak to their solicitor.

Chair advises this is not the most appropriate forum for this discussion.

MoP: Asks if the development is going to increase the number of children in the village, has there been an assessment for the impact on the education provisions?

Hugh: NYCC education directorate has examined this - there will be reports in the consultation that have addressed this and highlight the effect on the school.

Cllr Pownall: Has any information been distributed as a hard copy for the people who do not have access to the information online? If not could that be done - like a consultation leaflet?

Hugh: They are waiting for consultation results. Changes will be made and information can be distributed.

PoA Provide hard copy information.

MoP: They are disappointed they are not continuing the standard building practise. Would they also be able to provide a proposal of the lowest number of properties they would be willing to build to satisfy the concerns of the public, eg schools, increased traffic etc? Will they show another plan based on the actual lowest number of houses they are willing to build?

Hugh: Wouldn't be able to provide that number at the meeting. On receipt of all reports and after consultation there will be another plan and the number will inevitably drop.

MoP: How solvent is the company? Are they the exclusive builders?

Hugh: There are no concerns. It will be just them on site, building.

Cllr Harrison: The tree provision is a positive point on the development. Will they be maintained by NYCC or the Parish Council? What eco measures are they planning on the houses - ground source heat pumps, solar panels installed for example?

Hugh: No gas boilers, not ground sourced, using air sourced heating would be the preferred method. They would like to incorporate solar where possible but can be tricky with the management of it. The tree maintenance would need to be agreed, however it is normally maintained by a landscape management company. This would need to be approved by the local authority. Can be taken on by the Parish Council.

Cllr Pownall: Would they consider a playground in the plans?

Hugh: Yes, if people would want it.

MoP: A lot of trees were removed at the start of the process. Will they be replaced?

Hugh: More biodiversity enhancements will be made after the consultations are returned.

MoP: Made a request for native species of trees, plants etc.

MoP: Referenced the fir trees at the back of their property which are not on the plans - are they planning on removing them? Can they guarantee this isn't the case?

Hugh: They will not be removed.

PoA confirm trees on existing properties will not be removed.

MoP: Query about how to encourage birds back since the removal of the trees etc.

Suggestions made about owl boxes being put on sites as there appears to be quite a displacement of owls since the trees were removed.

Hugh: Advised that a variety of trees, at various stages of maturity will be planted on the site. This will be specified on revised land plans.

PoA investigate option of bat and owl boxes

Cllr Harrison: Trees are to be looked after by a management company. Thinking about the roads in the plans they are to be half block paving, will that be up to NYCC standards or will this be an adopted road?

Hugh: The block paving will be private - it would be maintained by a management company or a shared contribution of houses living off it. Pavement, tarmac etc will be the responsibility of NYCC.

MoP: How long will the build take?

Hugh: Estimated 1.5 - 2 years on the build.

MoP: Are there any finished sites in the area that they have developed?

Hugh: Osgodby, Ricall and some in the Leeds area.

MoP: Requests that the Parish Council goes to have a look at some sites.

PoA Locations to be supplied to Parish Council to be sighted.

MoP: Can they guarantee no 3 stories to be built?

Hugh: Yes

Chairman summarises that the general consensus is against the development until concerns are satisfied. 0 MoP were happy with the plans as they stand. All MoP are in agreement that they would be happy to proceed with satisfactory answers to the concerns and changes to the development.

Cllrs invited to comment.

Cllr Goulton - no objections

Cllr Richardson - no comment/abstain
Cllr Binham - against
Cllr Pownall - against
Cllr Kendal - against
Cllr Harrison – against
Cllr Hewan - against

Chairman - summarises that the villagers and council are against the development as it stands. More consultation is required and we would like to have questions answered and concerns addressed, such as affordable housing, drainage, highways etc. Would be willing to revisit the decision.

Resolved that the Council will submit they are against the development as it stands.

Chairman urges people to submit their comments.

Thanks given to the public and Hugh for attending.

At this point Hugh, Charlotte and approximately 15 members of the public left the meeting.

101. To discuss Selby Local Plan

Cllr Musgrave (Selby District Council) addressed the meeting:

- urges MoP to make comments to the council regarding development.
- Explains the Local plan as a planning strategy which takes us up to 2040 in order to understand how much land is required for development etc.
- As we are coming to the end of the process after 3 years, it is the final opportunity to have your say on the Local plan
- Addresses proposal at Heronby. This development will provide 1200 homes, but could go to 4000 houses. Advises any comments to be made on this need to be done ASAP and to consider the impact of the development on the village. Cllr Musgrave offers to help people if they require assistance in raising any objections.
- These plans will be handed forward to the new Yorkshire council and it does not appear that the plans will change.

MoP asked if the information can be disseminated in ways that aren't on Facebook etc.

Cllr Musgrave: disappointing to hear that people haven't been informed. This is a plan to show that Selby understands how much growth is needed and whether that need can be met. Selby is allocating land to meet the demands, however, this is over a 20 year period. Advises people take action themselves through the portal and by contacting Selby offices for further information.

MoP: Requests links to the Local Plan etc to be put on social media.

PoA provide links on Parish Council facebook page.

It was asked if the plan includes other developments outside of Heronby? Cllr Musgrave confirmed yes, sites in Selby, Eggborough etc. Cllr Richardson proposes we comment as a council on the Heronby site. Cllr Hewan advised we received a comment from a MoP that although there is no proposal for Wistow/Cawood there will be factors that affect the village such as traffic. Propose that the clerk puts forward a comment from the council on the consultation.

Cllr Pownall proposes that there are no objections.
Seconded by Cllr Harrison

Cllr Richardson proposes that WPC formally object to Heronby and Crosshills site.
Seconded by Cllr Binham.

Chairman takes vote on Cllr Richardson's proposal. 4 cllrs vote for the proposal. Proposal carried.
Resolved that clerk submits comment objecting to sites at Heronby and Crosshills.

102. To consider planning applications.

2022/1081/COU Lodge Farm - No comments

2022/0838/FUL Westacre - No comments

103. Approve and Determine a tender for the cemetery works (papers submitted)

Tenders obtained for phase 1 of the cemetery development. Four responses were received and three quotes provided. It was indicated that the quote obtained from Company 4 was the best submitted as they were proactive and provided competitive rates and services. Cllr Binham asked if they are able to meet the timeframe? Assured they can. Chairman informed the Council that the clerk had obtained an extension to the grant deadline until March 2023. Company 4 was proposed to be awarded the tender. All councillors in favour.
Resolved to accept Company 4's tender. Thanks given to Robin Poskitt for his work.

104. To provide update on the pond fencing at the village green.

Timber had been acquired by Cllr Harrison to fix it. Date to be arranged before next meeting for it to be fixed.

105. To receive update on playground and footpaths.

No sizable changes to be reported at the playground. Monitoring the current issues in the wet pour etc. Cllr Kendal sought agreement from the Council to pursue grant/funding for upgrades. Will provide site report as progress is made. Litter bins were discussed as they are frequently over filled. Cllr Harrison to investigate what changes could be made to the bins to improve this. Footpaths are being monitored - weekly walking group is inspecting and maintaining them. Advised the footpath from Field Lane to the Gas Works has hedging that needs to be reported to NYCC and there are some missing signs.

Proposed that Cllr Harrison writes to inform NYCC of this. All in favour. Resolved that Cllr Harrison will email NYCC.

106. To receive update on website.

Proposed that the Parish Council agendas are published on the website. All cllrs in favour – resolved.

A request to show the 42 bus timetable had been addressed by providing a link to the Aviva website.

107. To receive update on the meeting with Jubilee Hall Committee in respect of the request to progress the Trustee position. Their Chairman said that this would be done following their forthcoming AGM.

The Jubilee Hall Committee had made a posting on Facebook to ask for new members and inviting people to an open day. An update will be provided after the AGM.

108. To consider a request for a social media policy.

Cllr Harrison proposes we set out a policy what we will post about, that we will have a page instead of a profile to publish agendas, meeting information, relevant links (eg planning hub). Proposes a working group to develop policy and page direction.

Cllr Hewan proposes that the policy working group look into this.

All in agreement.

109. To consider GE views on planting spaces.

All were in agreement that no response was required to email received.

110. Financial matters

As clerk was absent, deferred until next meeting.

111. To consider the request from Quickline regarding a Wayleave on the village green.

Cllr Richardson changed his previous comments. Quickline had advised they were looking at other sites which would have no bearing on speed etc. Would rather they placed in another location than the prominent position in Wistow. Proposed we decline the wayleave. Cllr Binham seconded. 5 councillors in agreement. Resolved that clerk will notify Quickline to decline their proposal.

112. Members of the public issues.

i. Willow tree on Pinfold Hill

It has been raised with the Parish Council that the tree is impeding the pavement. It is an unsafe junction to walk on and is restricting vehicles' view at the junction. Can the Parish Council help? It was discussed that NYCC should take action if there is a danger present. It was discussed that the owners should be responsible for the maintenance of tree. A MoP stated they felt strongly about the tree and would not want it removed. It was clarified the tree was not to be removed, just reasonably maintained. Cllr Hewan proposed the Council writes to NYC again. All agreed. Resolved that Cllr Harrison would draft a letter.

ii. 20 is plenty signage.

Cllr Harrison proposed we pursue information on the campaign including possible road strips to monitor the traffic entering the village. All in agreement. Cllr Binham to assist. It was raised that the traffic and speed on Station Road is a danger and any help in the form of signs etc would be of benefit. Cllr Richardson proposed we make Station Road a priority. All in agreement.

iii. Noise and disturbance from Chevinside dog kennels.

Noise complaint was raised by MoP. Advised that this had already been taken to court and changes were instructed, however, it was unclear if this had happened. Highlighted the noise is from 07300 - 2030hrs and that there is a noticeable amount of traffic connected to the kennels. Proposed that the clerk writes to SDC to express concerns on behalf of the residents. All agreed.

iv. Letter to residents backing onto the village green.

Clerk had sent a letter advising that the trees/hedges were to be cut back.

113. To seek Councillors views on having a meeting in August from next year.

It was discussed that some councils have August meetings but no December meetings. It was raised that the August meeting wasn't needed but that if necessary to be able to efficiently call an extraordinary meeting and that the priority of such meetings should be carefully considered. Cllr Binham proposed we schedule meetings in August henceforth. Seconded by Cllr Richardson. 4 in agreement. Proposal carried.

Meeting closed 09.15pm

Date of next meeting Tuesday 8th November 2022