



Stainland and District Parish Council 20th Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

Thursday 13th February 2020 at 7.00pm at Stainland Library

Present:

Cllr Fieldhouse (Chair, Cllr Mullany (minute taker), Cllr A Foster & Cllr Liddell.

Item	Item
19.P20.1	<p>Apologies and Reasons for Absence and Lateness To receive apologies and approve any reasons for absence presented to the Council <i>Apologies were received from Cllrs Lee & Dixon I</i></p> <p><i>It was resolved to note all apologies and approve all reasons for absence.</i></p>
19.P20.2	<p>Public Participation Session <i>No members of the public attended</i></p>
19.P20.3	<p>To receive Parish Councillors' declarations of interest <i>No declarations of interest were received</i></p>
19.P20.4	<p>Correspondence To discuss correspondence received and consider any necessary action <i>No correspondence had been received</i></p>
19.P20.5	<p>To :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) accept the minutes of the 19th Planning Committee meeting of Stainland and District Parish Council held on Tuesday 3rd December 2019. b) for the Chair to sign & date the previous minutes <p><i>It was resolved to accept the minutes and they were signed by the Chair.</i></p>
19.P20.6	<p>To discuss the following Planning Applications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 19/00048/HSE Two storey side and rear extensions - Sandy Moor Jagger Green Jagger Green Lane Holywell Green HX4 9DE <i>Already determined on 04/06/2019 (permit).</i> • 19/00705/FUL Fodder store/silage clamp - Benroyd Farm Jagger Green Lane Holywell Green HX4 9DB <p><i>It was resolved to submit the following comments: There was uncertainty as to whether the application involved an extension or a new building. The Design Statement referred to an extension but neither plans/elevations or the application form indicated an existing building. No existing building was identified in the location proposed on satellite images. As such it was not possible to assess whether the proposed extension was proportionate in relation to the existing building or its impact on the openness of the Green Belt.</i></p>

In relation to materials, the Parish Council supported the view that stone walling panels rather than concrete ones would be more in keeping with the character of local agricultural buildings, and also that grey rather than green roofing panels would be less visually intrusive when viewed from surrounding countryside.

The Parish Council supported the view expressed by the CMBC Highways in relation to the footpath (Elland 109) that the development should in no way obstruct the path either during construction or when in use, particularly as it was noted that the path would run between existing buildings and the one proposed for extension.

- **19/01492/FUL Conversion of outbuilding and redevelopment of storage shed to form new dwelling with associated parking - New Bailey Farm Broom Hill Road Sowood HX4 9LF**

It was resolved to submit the following comments:

The Parish Council objects to the proposals. The Council notes that a proposal for a similar development involving the same outbuilding and storage shed were refused in 2010 on the basis that they did not conform to policies on Extension and Alterations to other buildings in the Green Belt/Conversion and Change of Use in the Green Belt. The Council believes the current conversion proposals again involve disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building, much of which is unsuitable and would be effectively new. The Council also has concerns in relation to the suitability of Broom Hill Road, which is also a public bridleway (11/73/5), for increased vehicular traffic if such conversions are permitted.

- **19/01384/HSE Demolition of existing lean to extension at rear to facilitate single storey extension. First floor extension to side - East View Sowood Fold Sowood HX4 9JP**

Already determined on 20/01/2020 (permit).

- **19/01501/HSE Removal of existing conservatory to facilitate single storey rear extension with roof terrace over. - Grey Chimneys, 4 Pether Hill, Stainland HX4 9GA**

It was resolved that no comments were to be made

- **20/20006/TPO Prune trees (Tree Preservation Order) – Bankwood, 1 Southgate, Jagger Green HX4 9DE**

It was resolved that no comments were to be made

- **19/01156/FUL Redevelopment of site to form seven detached dwellings - 1 Jagger Green Hall, Jagger Green Lane, Holywell Green HX4 9DE**

These were amended proposals for a scheme which had been considered by the Council in October 2019. Amendments had been made to the scheme design, particularly at the site entrance where a different house type had been substituted, and there were other changes to the location of parking spaces. However, it was not felt that the design changes altered the concerns expressed by the Council in its original comments, which it was resolved to restate.

It was resolved to submit the following comments:

This is a significant development within the green belt and within setting of the listed Jagger Green Hall, a listed barn within its curtilage and two other listed buildings nearby. Proposals for demolition of the existing buildings and erection of 11 dwellings were previously granted outline approval and the Parish Council acknowledges that the existing site and agricultural buildings are unsympathetic to the listed buildings and their setting. However, given the location and topography of the site and the proximity of the listed buildings, the scale, design, materials and landscaping of the development will determine whether the development ultimately has a positive or negative impact, particularly in relation to the openness of the green belt and the setting of listed buildings. The parish Council is concerned regarding the potential scale of the proposed 4+ bed roomed houses. Given the site's topography, the impact on the openness of the green belt, the setting of the Hall and other listed buildings nearby and on views including on approach from Holywell Green and from open countryside/footpaths to the east, could be significant. Affordability of houses on this scale is also of concern. In relation to materials, the Parish Council is concerned that these are

	<p><i>unsympathetic in the context of the listed buildings, particularly in relation to proposed blue slate roofing materials and tarmac hardstanding for courtyards where stone setts would be more appropriate. We endorse the comments of the Council's Conservation in relation to previous development on the site, when recommending stone/drystone walls in place of timber fencing, as proposed here to 1.8m. Access roads are narrow, substandard and with very poor visibility. The location's access to the M62 is promoted in the site marketing. The Parish Council would like to see public transport contributions pursued from the proposed development despite the location being recognised as unsustainable in transport terms (ie very poor access to public transport and no community facilities). In relation to wildlife and biodiversity we support measures proposed by CMBC Countryside Services biodiversity mitigation and enhancement.</i></p>
19.P20.6	<p>To discuss making a comment on the Revised Local Plan proposal (deadline date 24th February 2020)</p> <p><i>It was explained that CMBC were currently consulting the public on revised proposals in relation to the amount of new housing development proposed in the emerging Local Plan. The revised proposals had arisen as a result of examination of the Council's submitted Plan by a Government Planning Inspector following an initial series of public hearings in June 2019.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspector had concluded that the number of houses originally proposed by the Council over the Plan period was insufficient to provide for the levels of employment growth the Council was planning for. Therefore it needed either to increase the number of dwellings proposed and identify additional sites on which to provide them, change its economic strategy to match the lower housing figure proposed.</i></p> <p><i>Having commissioned updated modelling evidence in relation to employment and housing growth, the Council had taken the former option, increasing the Plan's housing requirement from 840 dwellings per annum to 997 dwellings per annum over the 15 year plan period. In order to accommodate this increase the Council identified a significant number of additional housing sites, many of which were in the Green Belt.</i></p> <p><i>None of these additional sites were located within the Stainland Parish. However, 23.74 hectares of Green Belt land adjoining the parish at Greetland was included with a capacity for 543 homes. The Parish Council was aware of significant opposition to these proposals in the Greetland area which was likely to generate high levels of objection through the consultation. Consultation details – the consultation period had been six weeks and would end on at 5pm Monday 24th February when all comments needed to be submitted. A structured comments form was available both online and in paper copy, which encouraged respondents to justify objections and where appropriate provide alternative proposals. Full details of how to submit comments online or by other means were available on the CMBC website.</i></p> <p><i>The Revised housing proposals were supported by updated Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment which could also be commented on. The Sustainability Appraisal used the Council's sustainability objectives to assess all the sites proposed and also alternative strategies which could have been adopted. The Habitats Regulations Assessment updated evidence on the impact of the plan's policies and proposals on the South Pennines European nature conservation site in the west of the borough.</i></p> <p><i>Resolved: Submit comment</i></p> <p><i>The Parish Council recognises the importance of having a Local Plan adopted to meet the future needs of communities including housing and employment in a sustainable way. To this end it is understood that it is necessary for the Local Plan to be found 'sound' in terms of national planning guidance at its examination in public by the Planning Inspector.</i></p> <p><i>However, while the proposals do not impact directly on the Stainland Parish, the extent of Green Belt loss proposed for new housing at 4 sites in Greetland and Elland is considered excessive and unsustainable both in terms of loss of natural environment and landscape character and also in terms of the vastly increased burden it would place on local infrastructure, including the road network, local health services and schools.</i></p> <p><i>The road network which would serve these sites already suffers from long standing congestion problems with its attendant economic, social and environmental impacts for everyone in the area including people in the Stainland Parish needing to travel via West Vale to Halifax, or other locations.</i></p>

	<p><i>The Saddleworth Road area of Greetland where the 4 large additional housing sites are proposed is poorly served by public transport and while more housing could in theory increase viability of services, these will continue to be unattractive if congestion problems are exacerbated by large scale development.</i></p> <p><i>The Parish Council understands that the levels of employment growth projected by CMBC need to be matched by appropriate levels of housing provision. However, it is noted that CMBC has recognized the many uncertainties associated with long term economic projections and as a result has factored in a reduced level of provision over the last five years of the plan. The Parish Council would advocate this approach be extended further, such that further reductions in the housing figure could be made to reflect uncertainty beyond the first five year period at which point a review of the Plan will be due.</i></p>
	<p>Next meeting <i>Thursday 12th March 2020 at 7.00pm at Stainland Library</i></p>

Meeting closed at 8.30pm