Planning Application Consultation Response

REPRESENTATION FORM TO BE RETURNED TO SELBY DISTRICT COUNCIL AND CITY OF YORK COUNCIL ON OR BEFORE: RECONSULTATION BY 23 OCTOBER 2019 + agreed extension

DATE :

Planning App. Ref	2019/0045/EIA (Selby DC)
Alt Ref:	19/00078/OUTM (York CC)
Proposal	Redevelopment of former mine to leisure development comprising a range of touring and glamping uses, static caravans and self contained lodges with associated facilities Reconsultation on reduced development area and EIA issues. <u>Outline application for redevelopment of the former North Selby</u> <u>Mine site to a leisure development comprising of a range of</u> <u>touring caravan and glamping uses, static caravans and self</u> <u>contained lodges with associated facilities.</u> North Selby Mine New Road Deighton York YO19 6EZ Ref. No: 19/00078/OUTM Received: Fri 11 Jan 2019 Validated: Thu 17 Jan 2019 Status: Awaiting decision Reconsultation on reduced development area and EIA issues.
Address	North Selby Mine / Land between New Road and Wheldrake
	Lane, Wheldrake Lane, Escrick

PARISH COUNCIL RESPONSE BY THE CLERK

Signed :	Date :
Reviewed at Parish Council meetings held on	Date: 4 November 2019

COMMENTS ON PLANNING APPLICATION

Escrick Parish Council has now again examined the responses of other consultees received by both Selby District Council and City of York Council and generally support the detailed comments and concerns, including planning policy, green belt, environmental and highways issues. We welcome the working together of both Councils' planning officers, due to the cross border application and 'duty to cooperate', to achieve the optimum appropriate development for the site.

We would refer you to the issues and concerns raised more fully in our previous representations and would again ask you to consider this local knowledge perspective in your consideration of the application. We simply wish to ensure that, if the proposed development is to be approved, then there are various practical issues that we would wish to have conditioned to ensure the smooth operation of the proposals and to mitigate the effects on the environment and our residents and local businesses, given that we will have to live with the consequences for the foreseeable future.

Planning Application Consultation Response

We remain supportive of the principle of the proposed use but still object to some specific details of the proposed application and feel that there are genuine issues that still need to be satisfactory addressed to make the proposals work. We provide updated comment on the key amendments previously requested to the proposals <u>before</u> any consent could be granted, including:

- Reduction of the scale of the development to delete those areas of accommodation located within the SINC and established woodland. We welcome the reduced scale of the proposals, limited now to the reduced woodland area and bowl. We would request that you check that this now satisfies both Councils' Ecologist and Landscape Architects as well as Planning Development Control and Policy officers before the final developable area is agreed with the applicant, but EPC welcomes the proposed reduction to what we understand is now only the 'brownfield' area of the site, with the consequent reduction in pitches from 434 no to 323 no. Given this reduction, we believe that any planning consent should be carefully worded to ensure that this developable area and number of pitches cannot be increased in the future. As the applicant has offered a S106 Agreement to secure other works, we believe that the final approved Masterplan (and other plans) should form part of the S106 to ensure that the reduced area and number of pitches that may be approved cannot be changed in due course, and that the landscape improvements offered are implemented in full.
- The highways impact of the development on the A19 needs to be more thoroughly understood and mitigated as appropriate. We note that highways officers and Highways England now appear to have withdrawn their objections to the application subject to various works being delivered. This is based on the reduced number of pitches proposed. Therefore, as above, this must be controlled against future possible increases by stating the maximum number of pitches approved in the description of development in the S106 and decision notice. We would not object to variations in the future as to the type of accommodation being proposed (the applicant states that the market may, for example, demand lodges) so long as the total numbers remains the same (as increased numbers would invalidate the highways impact agreed as acceptable now between consultees and the applicant).
- Improvements to the A19/New Road junction may be required to ensure that cars pulling caravans do not overhang the A19 central reservation when waiting to turn and cause a safety hazard. We would still like to see a tracking drawing showing that there would be no overhang, to minimise the potential for accidents in the future. Examination of accident data is only a small part of the picture as the former mine has been shut for a considerable period and traffic levels have substantially increased since then. Detailed drawings of the junction area are needed at this stage to ascertain whether the development would be safe to access and egress by all vehicles and not cause an accident hazard. Whilst a flashing sign may be useful to warn of slowing vehicles, it will not mitigate the hazard of overhanging vehicles, so this evidence is still requested, including allowing for queuing vehicles at peak arrival and

Planning Application Consultation Response

departure times.

• To encourage sustainable travel, a footpath/cycleway should be installed from the site along the length of New Road and within the A19 verge from its junction to the BP garage/Spar shop on the edge of Escrick. We note that the applicant has now agreed to improve the footpath on the A19 from the access point to New Road to the petrol station / shop, to be widened to enable bicycles to use it to connect to the National Cycle Route. This is to be welcomed, but only covers a section of the required provision.

We also note that the applicant states that CYC has required an informal crossing facility just north of the petrol station to enable users to cross the A19 and join the path on the western side of the A19 and safely access NCR 65. Signage is required to mark the link to the Sustrans route. This is to be secured by a S278 Agreement. We cannot find any drawings of the proposed works, in particular the proposed 'informal' crossing over the A19, to be able to assess where and how this would work. The A19 is already extremely dangerous to cross and we are concerned that accidents to cyclists and pedestrians also trying to reach local bus stops, the Parsonage Hotel, its leisure facilities including Spa (day use is frequent and membership is not required) and Gastropub, the Sangthai restaurant, doctor's surgery and other facilities in the village and located on the west side of the A19 will occur. As stated above, crashmap data of previous accidents when the site was mainly vacant cannot create an accurate picture of the junction's use, and traffic levels have increased substantially in the last 18 years since the mine closed. EPC would like to see further information of the proposed crossing improvements before it will withdraw its concerns in this regard.

Furthermore, as previously stated by CYC Highways, the application documents purport to encourage visitors to walk and cycle in the area, and for staff and visitors to also use public transport. The site access road / New Road is already regularly used by local people for exercise, dog walking, cycling and with horses. A local smallholding adjoining the mine site state they also walk their alpacas here. These existing users are totally ignored. It is therefore surprising that the applicant now says that the leisure development residents / visitors will use their cars to travel to the petrol station / shop (to purchase fuel), and therefore there will be no safety conflict of pedestrians or cyclists sharing the access road with large numbers of cars, including many with trailers / caravans. They say that the small building for the proposed reception area, including on-site shop and toilet / shower block, will be used for any local purchases, yet there is no guarantee that a shop of a reasonable scale and choice of goods will be provided at an early date - we would refer you to the nearby Hollicarrs holiday park where a shop has been granted permission on various occasions yet never implemented for viability reasons; therefore residents of the proposed holiday accommodation here should be encouraged to access the local (relatively recently) enlarged shop at the petrol station by walking and cycling to buy newspapers, local provisions etc, as well as the other local facilities cited. We strongly believe that the area of grass verge adjoining the length of the access road should be suitably set out to provide a

Planning Application Consultation Response

shared surface footpath / cycleway / bridleway that would provide a safe access away from the roadway and its cars and caravans. Otherwise existing users will no longer be able to safely use this route and future safe sustainable travel by the proposed residents of and visitors to the holiday park will be discouraged. If there are other routes to Escrick village that the applicants believe will also be used to access local facilities and for leisure walking, then improvements to these PROWs may also be required.

We still consider that the noise implications of the development have not vet been assessed or mitigated. Realistically, a development designed to accommodate 323 no households in a mainly outdoor setting must result in noise spilling out into the surrounding countryside. Families will sit out during the day and in evenings, especially in the summer, socialising and relaxing. The cumulative noise impact will be heard over a large surrounding area. Currently houses in the village can hear birdsong, dogs barking and sheep baaing from fields outside the village from their properties, especially in the peaceful evenings. Events within the village at The Parsonage, the Village Hall and Club, Queen Margaret's School and Escrick Estate are carefully programmed to ensure that residents are not disturbed and suitable residential amenity is preserved. The proposed leisure development is effectively a 'new settlement' (with occupancy conditions needing to be imposed to preclude permanent occupation) that effectively doubles the size of households in Escrick Village; particularly in this mainly external environment, this could have serious detrimental amenity impacts for local residents.

We suggest that this could be suitably mitigated by careful consideration of the contouring of the redevelopment works, which will be needed to remove the existing brownfield hardstandings etc and the provision of the new ecological areas surrounding the proposed development area which is centred on the 'bowl'. Surrounding landscaped areas could be built up to contain the noise within the site; some of the proposed cross sections may therefore require reconsideration. We recommend that a condition be imposed requiring further details of landscape design / noise attenuation / cross sections to ensure that suitable noise buffering can be achieved. These works would need to be implemented prior to operation / occupation of the holiday accommodation.

Escrick Parish Council hopes that this local perspective will again be of assistance to both Selby District Council and City of York Council in considering the application, given the close proximity of the development site and its likely affect on our residents and businesses within the Parish. We would request that we be consulted on any further changes to the proposals, any mitigation works submitted and the actual conditions to be applied in order to ensure that the amenity of our Parishioners is preserved. Please keep us informed of progress of this major application, and contact us if you have any queries or require any clarification.

Planning Application Consultation Response