



# Kirk Smeaton Parish Council

Kate Bowden (Clerk) email: [kirksmeatonclerk@gmail.com](mailto:kirksmeatonclerk@gmail.com)

Bonita Cottage, Water Lane, Kirk Smeaton WF8 3LD

Tel: 01977 621628

Tricia Storey - Chair

11 June 2021

**MINUTES** of the Extra Ordinary Parish Council Meeting held on Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> June 2021 at 6pm in the Community Rooms at the Smeatons' Centre.

Present: Cllr Tricia Storey (Chair) Cllr Tony Lenc (Vice Chair)

Cllrs: Carl Vitty; Barney Byfield; James Stephenson

Kate Bowden – Clerk

There were 4 members of the public present

1. The Planning Application Ref 2021/0608/HPA – Side and rear extensions and increasing roof pitch and ridge to provide accommodation in loft space at 21 Springfield Crescent, KS was discussed. It was resolved that a notice go to the Planning Department indicating the PCs concerns that this development is not in keeping with the rest of the properties on Springfield Crescent.
  - 1.1. It was also resolved that an email be sent to Selby District Planning objecting to the fact that neighbours are not notified of new planning applications.
  - 1.2. It was resolved that increased information regarding Planning Applications be made available to residents. The Clerk to report each planning application on Facebook.
2. Planning Application Ref: NY/2019/0002/ENV – the proposed extension to Wentedge Quarry was discussed. The Chair outlined the historical movements of this Application which culminated in the PRFC meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup> May at which the application was approved 6 for – 3 against. There were a number of issues which caused concern regarding the process of the meeting. A number of bodies wrote to Richard Flinton the Chief Executive: Friends of Brockadale; Plantlife; LSPC; KSPC; YWT and other individuals. We subsequently asked Richard Flinton for a meeting to discuss our issues, as did LSPC. Cllr John McCarney also complained. We heard nothing for 2 weeks. An email was received from Richard Flinton as follows:

Dear Councillor Professor Tricia Storey

Thank you for your e-mail and a request to meet.

It may be helpful if I explain the current position with regard to the Planning application. As you are aware the legislation which allows for virtual meetings for Councils to make formal decisions had expired. Therefore the County Council had taken a decision that we would continue with virtual committee meetings as informal meetings of the Council where the views of Councillors (and the public) can be considered before a formal decision is made by myself as the Chief Executive. Therefore the recommendations of the meeting of the 18<sup>th</sup> May, along with all the representations and reports would then be reconsidered by myself before making a decision.

However there have now been a couple of developments which have happened that means I will not be making a decision at this stage. Firstly the Secretary of State has asked the Council not to make any decision on this application as he is now considering a request for a call in. It is usual for a decision to be made on a call in within a few weeks so we should be clearer on the position with the application in June. If the application is called in it will proceed to an Inquiry for determination and therefore is taken outside of the Council's hands and therefore your representations can be made directly to the Planning Inspectorate as the decision taker.

If the call in is refused, then it will be for the County Council to make the decision on the application. Upon reviewing the meeting, it is considered that if the County Council will ultimately be making the decision, we will ask the Planning and Regulatory Functions Committee to reconsider this application (either as a formal meeting or an informal meeting depending on the circumstances) and this will allow the opportunity for you and the Parish Council to raise the concerns and points you have raised directly with the Committee.

The reason we consider it would be helpful to refer the matter back to Committee is that during the meeting of the Planning and Regulatory Functions Committee when this item was considered, a Councillor asked for clarification from the officer presenting the report about the Landscape's Architects views on the impact on the openness of the green belt. In particular, he queried whether the final sentence of paragraph 7.62 of the report ( extract below with highlighted ) properly represented the Landscape Architects views, given that the consultation responses on file and presented to the meeting raised concerns regarding the impact on the greenbelt.

7.62 NYCC Principal Landscape Architect initially objected to the proposal and sought further clarification to determine whether the landscape and visual effects of the proposed development would be within acceptable limits with a suitable landscape restoration, maintenance / after care scheme. Whilst the Principal Landscape Architect considered the scope of the LVIA was acceptable he did not agree with the overall summary of adverse effects and considered them understated. He considered the proposal had potential to significantly affect and dramatically change local views, character and setting of the Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal and the openness of the Green Belt in the short term. However, following the submission of amended details relating to restoration including the provision of advanced planting, soil bunds etc. he now finds the **proposal to be acceptable and would maintain the openness of the Green Belt.**

Officers have now reviewed this position following the meeting . The Planning Officer and the Landscape Architect met prior to the finalisation of the report, and it was on that basis that this paragraph was written. At the time the Committee heard the item, the revised consultation response from the Landscape Architect had not been received.

*The final consultation response has now been received from the Landscape Architect, which is attached for your information [show link to the planning portal]. The consultation response is clear that with regard to restoration and long term management the Landscape Architect is satisfied these can be covered by the S106 and conditions so in the longer term the impacts on the green belt have been resolved, however his concerns regarding the impact on the green belt during the operational phase of development remain. Regrettably, this distinction was not clarified for Members elsewhere in the report or at the meeting. Therefore there will be another opportunity to consider this at a future meeting if the call-in is refused by the Secretary of State.*

*Given the above circumstances, it is considered that it would not be helpful to meet to discuss these concerns at this stage as the decision is either going to be made by the Planning Inspectorate or there will be another opportunity for the Parish's comments to be considered by members.*

*If you wish to raise a complaint about the conduct of councillors in the meeting, then please can you contact the Council's monitoring officer at [barry.khan@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:barry.khan@northyorks.gov.uk)*

*Best wishes  
Richard Flinton*

Much discussion took place with regard to potential costs and contributions and suggestions followed. The main focus would be to identify the appetite of the villagers for further work and future protection of the reserve. An on-line survey was suggested by Cllr Byfield and also to target the thousands of supporters on the online petition and the 240+ objectors who sent in emails.

#### Proposal 1

A flyer is prepared to each Village community; KS, LS, Womersley, Wentbridge etc. to inform the residents:

- 1 the position the Application is currently in
- 2 to see if there is an appetite across the villages to take some of the issues further
- 3 whether there is support for a Campaign Group.
- 4 whether financial support is forthcoming

#### Proposal 2

A flyer is prepared to each Village community; KS, LS, Womersley, Wentbridge etc. to inform residents:

- 1 A Campaign Group is to be formed
- 2 What level of support can the Campaign Group expect from residents?
- 3 What level of financial support can the Campaign Group expect from residents?

Proposal 2 was supported by the majority of the PC

The meeting closed at 1915 hrs.