

Minutes of a virtual meeting of Cherry Burton Parish Council held on Tuesday 10<sup>th</sup> November 2020 at 7.30pm.

Present:- Parish Councillors Peirson (in the Chair), Arandle (participation by text), Baker, Dickinson, Huntsman, Jeffrey, Lindsey, Sutcliffe, and Wardale.

Clerk - J.Wardale

Two members of the public

ERY Cllr Greenwood initially

11/20/213     Apologies for absence  
None

11/20/214     Declarations of Interest  
Cllr Peirson and Cllr Wardale for allotments  
Cllr Baker for Tennis Club.

11/20/215     Minutes of the meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> October 2020 were agreed and signed as a complete record with the following amendment:-

10/20/208d     Cllr Sutcliffe agreed to begin to pull together the Terms of Reference for the Communications Committee .....

The Clerk enquired about the redacted minutes and whether they could be published yet.

**Resolved** – to wait for the court case to be completed.

11/20/216     Matters Arising not covered on the Agenda  
**Lions commemorative bench**  
Still awaiting a response from ERYC.  
**Resolved** – to await confirmation from ERYC.

### **Community Engagement**

The Chair stressed the need to get some information from the residents before the precept needs to be set at the beginning of next year. He has pulled together a newsletter and a survey per household and would be sending this out for comment shortly. There was a discussion about the best way to consult.

**Resolved** – to agree to have one survey per household.

Cllr Lindsey brought up the Local Council Award and how the different ways of public consultation could be used. There was a discussion. Cllr Dickinson suggested that it would be easier to utilise the Church Newsletter which comes out every two months and this was agreed.

**Resolved** – the following means of communication were agreed.

Annual report and a quarterly update, possibly using the Church Newsletter.  
Facebook and other social media - but being aware that not all residents may not use this.

Public meetings - such as Annual Parish Meeting

Face to face contact – this happens regularly.

Focus groups were also discussed but discounted.

11/20/217

ERYC Matters

**(a) Highway Matters**

Community Speed Watch

Two training sessions have taken place and eleven volunteers had been trained up. Cllr Peirson reported on the first session, but the scheme has been put on hold until after the second lockdown has finished at the beginning of December.

**(b) Position of HGV signs**

Cllr Greenwood had forwarded a response from ERYC following the correspondence from Mr Ford about the positioning of the HGV signs.

Mr Bellotti (Director of Communications and Environment) had commented that it was felt that a south facing sign ahead of the crossroads was considered to be of lesser importance as HGV's were unlikely to cut through the village to access the A1079.

Mr Ford had responded disputing this and offering to buy a sign himself.

**Resolved** – to inform Cllr Greenwood of Mr Ford's response.

**(c) Rough Sleeper Survey**

This was due to take place on the evening of Wednesday 11<sup>th</sup> to Thursday 12<sup>th</sup> November.

**Resolved** – to report any sitings to the Clerk.

**(d) Code of Conduct online training**

ERYC were offering two-hour sessions online on 9<sup>th</sup> December. The session would be recorded and be available after that date.

**Resolved** – to inform the Clerk if interested.

11/20/218

Correspondence received

**Facebook enquiry**

Following the recent publicity about continuing free school meals over the school holidays, a resident had asked whether the PC had funds to support families at this time. They had since added that they understand that ERYC will be making provision.

11/20/219

Finance

**(a) Accounts for payment**

The following payments were agreed:-

Exclusive Leisure	Replacement MUGA lights	£ 528.00
JNE Electrical	Installing lights	£ 330.00
Rollits	Legal fees	£1980.00
Village Hall	Hire x 2 hours	£ 19.00
J.Wardale	Salary and expenses October	£ 361.99
ERYC	Streetlight Maintenance contract	£ 136.18
Business Stream	Allotment Water	£ 294.12
PFK Littlejohn	Annual Audit	£ 480.00

**(b) Annual Audit**

The audit return has been received with no comments for action.

11/20/220

Village Infrastructure

**(a) Planning applications**

**Application 20/03258/PLF Erection of dwelling on land north of Limber Lodge, 12 Highgate.**

**Standing Orders were suspended.**

Mr Howe addressed the meeting with his concerns about the proposed development. He felt that several things would impact on the Conservation Area. He had concerns about the design of the building. The drainage side did not seem to have sorted properly and a septic tank was being considered, which also caused concern. His main issue is access which would be opposite his drive. It is already difficult to exit from his property and this would add to that. There would also be some trees affected in the Conservation Area and disruption from contractor's vehicles and access.

**Standing Orders were re-instated.**

A document had been distributed from an anonymous group of residents outlining their opposition to the development and all the Parish Councillors indicated that they had read it.

**Parish Council Comments**

See attached sheet.

**Resolved** – the Parish Council recommend that the application be refused and request that, if the planning officer is recommending a different decision, it should be referred to the appropriate Committee.

**Application 20/03666/TCA Tree work The Croft, 11 Highgate**

No comments

**Notice of Decision by ERYC**

**Application 19/00008/PLF**

Erection of 4 dwellings with associated access on land NW Hagnaby House 30 Highgate – planning permission refused.

**(b) Sportsfield**

Cllr Baker reported that funding of £1000 has been granted from Sancton Wind Farm for the Nature Trail. The acceptance form has been signed and returned.

He had also sourced replacement hawthorn whips free of charge to replace the ones that had died in the fence. Cllr Peirson also had some spares that he had potted up after the last planting.

The final contract from FCC (previously WREN) was due, to unlock the changing room refurbishment funding and then the orders can be placed.

The work should begin in the new year, as well as the work on the lounge area. Tennis Club is currently doing a five-year review and considering putting floodlights on the courts.

The MUGA and outdoor gym have been locked during the second lockdown and notices erected at the Pavilion.

One of the pieces of gym equipment may need re-fixing and the suppliers have agreed to do the work.

**(c) TROD**

ERYC had been and removed the larger stones and highlighted the drain cover to prevent tripping. They have offered to roll the surface annually at an estimated cost of £350 to £400. It was suggested that they may be able to top up areas with chippings.

**Resolved** – this was agreed.

**(d) Allotment Trees**

Cllr Peirson had looked at the trees and felt it would be better to wait until the leaves had fallen and the mark the trees that needed removing. Estimates can then be sought for the work.

**Allotment rules and rent**

These had been circulated to be discussed. The possibility of allowing small sheds was discussed and ERYC planning had been contacted for advice. The rents were also discussed to make sure that they cover the water charges.

**Resolved** – to discuss the rules and rent at the December meeting ready to send out the invoices in the New Year.

**(e) Play Area Equipment**

A meeting has taken place with ERYC and looked at the site. Any play equipment must be at least 30m from a dwelling. They will be suggesting types of equipment that they think would be suitable.

11/20/221 Community Issues

**(a) Pond**

Cllr Peirson had sourced a Christmas tree and suggested the 5<sup>th</sup> December 2020 as a date to switch the light on. This would be once the lockdown was over.

**Pond boundary**

Still to be resolved.

**Area at back of pond**

This is due to be cleared when the Christmas Lights were being erected. The residents had forwarded the details of her gardener.

**Resolved** – to contact the gardener with a view of asking them to maintain the area once the growing season begins next year.

11/20/222 Local Councils Award Scheme

Covered earlier in the agenda.

The group agreed to meet shortly.

11/20/223 Personnel Issues

None

11/20/224 Agreed items for publication

Finalise newsletter and survey.

The meeting ended at 9pm.



Comments to ERYC re Application 20/03258/PLF  
Erection of dwelling on land North of Limber Lodge, 12 Highgate, Cherry Burton

At their meeting held on Tuesday 10<sup>th</sup> November 2020, Cherry Burton Parish Council resolved to object to the above application for the following reasons:-

The proposed 5-bedroom dwelling would represent over-development of a small garden site and would cause harm to the open character and appearance of this part of the village and the Conservation Area.

The proposed contemporary design of the dwelling, and the proposal to “shoe horn” a large dwelling of this nature into a small site, are not compatible with the well-spaced and traditionally constructed buildings surrounding the site. These important elements of the existing setting form the context of the Conservation Area. The area of land on which the proposed dwelling would be sited is currently open and undeveloped and the development would erode that spacious character and detract from the appeal of this part of the village. This scheme would result in over-development of the application site and a cramped development which would erode the “open” character of this part of the village.

The proposed development would result in a poor relationship with the host dwelling at No 12 Highgate by severely restricting the amenity spaces allocated to each of the properties. The application effectively fails to provide adequate amenity space to serve each of the properties.

The proposed property would have the potential for overlooking adjacent dwellings, loss of privacy and an undue sense of enclosure and dominance on the proposed new dwelling resulting from the elevated locations of adjoining properties on both Main Street and The Orchard (to the North).

The Parish Council is aware that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that all applications will be dealt with on the basis of a presumption in favour of sustainable development, but notes that paragraph 8 (of the NPPF) outlines that there are three dimensions to sustainable development. Applications should, it is understood, be able to demonstrate how the proposal complies with each of these requirements. This proposal could fulfil an economic role in creating jobs during construction of the dwelling, but it does not address an identified social requirement for smaller, two bed-roomed dwellings in Cherry Burton, and the proposal does not fulfil an environmental role because the development would be detrimental to the rural characteristics of the surrounding area.

The setting of Conservation Area is recognised as forming part of the significance of heritage assets and Paragraph 196 of the NPPF outlines that developments, resulting in less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset, should demonstrate that the harm would be outweighed by public benefit. This objective is also reflected in policy ENV3 of the adopted East Riding Local Plan Strategy Document (ER LPSD). The application relates to the erection of a single dwelling which would not provide any obvious public benefit to outweigh the harm imposed on the setting of the Conservation Area. It does not even address an identified social need for smaller dwellings.

The Parish Council also notes that the application for a large dwelling is not compatible with ER LPSD Policy H1, which requires that new residential developments should contribute to the overall mix of housing in the locality, taking into account the current need, particularly for older people and first time buyers, current demand and existing housing stock. Specifically, the application does not address an established under supply of smaller, two bedroom properties in Cherry Burton that has been identified by the ERYC Rural Housing Enabling

Officer and, it is understood, this under supply was also recognised in the East Riding Strategic Housing Market Assessment. This proposal does not attempt to address this need despite the obvious circumstances that a smaller dwelling would be much more appropriate for such a constrained site, if the site is to be developed for residential use.

The Design and Access Statement shows that the Applicants have not taken any account of the local housing requirements in Cherry Burton because it refers to housing demand in other areas, such as Patrington, which are clearly not relevant to Cherry Burton.

The Parish Council has concerns about inadequate parking provisions and the safety of vehicular access. The proposal for two parking spaces is inadequate for a five-bedroom dwelling, and particularly so because the long access drive is likely to lead to delivery vans/vehicles attempting to access the property rather than stopping on the road side. In terms of access, there is very limited visibility “up” Highgate to the West, because there is effectively a bend where the existing development line steps outwards or southwards at No 16 Highgate. Visibility is further restricted by parked cars on the western stretch of Highgate. Roadside parking in this location during construction and subsequently would adversely affect visibility for traffic emerging from Highcroft and other driveways.

Significant concerns have been raised by neighbouring residents about the planned and/or recent removal of a number of mature trees on the site. Residents have suggested that trees subject to TPOs have been removed, but the Parish council has not been notified of any applications for tree work at this site.

Overall the proposed development of a large, five bedrooms dwelling of a modern and unsympathetic design on this small site would have a negative impact on the setting of the Conservation Area and it would significantly affect the amenity of surrounding dwellings.

Cherry Burton Parish Council recommend that the application be refused and request that, if the planning officer is recommending a different decision, it should be referred to the appropriate Committee.