

Escrick Parish Council

Minutes of Escrick Parish Council extraordinary meeting held by video conference at 7.30pm on
MONDAY 22nd MARCH 2021.

21100: **Welcome: Chair welcomed Councillors and member of public to the meeting.**

21101: **Apologies/Attendance:**

- a. Present: Cllr Chambers, Cllr Coulson, Cllr Hawes, Cllr Rees and Cllr Rowson. Clerk; S Look.
- b. Apologies: Cllr Bartle, Cllr Cunningham, Cllr J Reader.

21102: **Declarations of Interests:**

Cllr Rowson declared an interest in the conservation area appraisal as a resident within the conservation area.

Cllr Chambers declared an interest in item 3.3 (page 13) of the Conservation Appraisal document.

21103: **Public session:**

- a. No members of the public present.

21104: **Conservation Area Review:**

Councillors made the following amendment requests to send to Selby District Council:

1.2 Escrick is largely a cul-de-sac village off the A19.

Requested change: *Escrick is a village settlement on the edge of the A19.*

Justification: Escrick is not a cul-de-sac village. Councillors feel that this is phrased negatively.

There is a regular bus between Selby and York but the bus stop is on the A19 and those wishing to travel to York have to cross the busy A19 in order to reach the bus stop.

Request: Removal of the above statement.

Justification: This is a conservation review and not a transport review.

The key aspect of the village is the historic Escrick Hall.

Request: The historic Escrick Hall is a significant building in Escrick Parish.

Justification: This is 2021, this is a better reflection of reality. The private school building is independent of the village with very little community involvement.

1.4 Amend: *District Councillors* to *Parish Councillor*. Request made to clarify if a District Councillor was present at the meeting.

2.0 (page 6) – *‘Old Road Plantation’*

Request: Remove this comment, unless a map is used with it on.

Justification: This is not visible on the included on the page.

The more recent developments such as Carrs Meadow pay some regard to historic character although the overall effect is contrary to the original estate village concept.

Remove: *although the overall effect is contrary to the original estate village concept.*

Request: remove last line comment at the bottom of page '*and reflect suburban cul-de-sac themes*'.

Justification: As earlier, unnecessary negative comment.

Request: removal of complete paragraph '*There is no traffic calming and the bus between Selby and York does not detour into the village. Now the village is principally a commuter settlement but the surviving Black Bull Public House and the village hall continue to provide a community focal point*'.

Justification: Why should a Conservation Review comment on village policy in relation to traffic calming and Bus Routes? The Black Bull is mostly closed now (even prior to COVID).

Page 8 - Remove the '*large front gardens*' comment.

Justification: not a true statement and confirmed in adjacent pictures on page 8.

'Looking south along Main Street showing early twentieth century properties to the north of Carr Lane' – please could you clarify the age of these properties as councillors understand that they are older than early 20th century but were refaced in the early 20th century.

Page 9 - *There is a significant amount of late twentieth-century and early twenty-first-century development around the peripheries of the conservation area and some infilling of large plots which are exceptions to the historic character of the village.*

Request: Remove '*and some infilling of large plots which are exceptions to the historic character of the village*'.

Request: Remove unnecessary negative comment about '*suburban forms and cul-de-sac road systems*'

Page 10 - '*Limited on-street parking – parking principally to the rear of Main Street properties.*' Not sure about this observation. There is usually a lot of on-street parking on Main St.

Page 10 - '*There are few street lights but those that do exist are a mix of concrete columns and short metal columns.*' - Not strictly true. A true observation would be that all adopted streets in the village have streetlights. The newer developments (Dowers, EPG, Woodlands, Carrs Meadow) to adopted urban standards. The older areas of the village (Main St, Skipwith Rd, Carr Lane) have basic footway lighting, at approximately 40% of the density of urban standards. Almost all streetlights are led lanterns on metal columns, with a handful on wooden utility poles. (Concrete posts were removed ~ 2015).

Page 11 - '*Negative: Gates to the main house are a barrier to movement but have been there since the early twentieth century.*' – why is this comment in a Conservation area review? It implies there is an issue with the gates to the school. The gates are actually listed and have historical and architectural significance to the village.

Request: Remove the term '*acting as a barrier*' and replace with '*located*'.

Page 11 - '*On Escrick Park Gardens, Google Street View records low concrete lighting columns that have been recently replaced with tall slender columns supporting LED lanterns. These are out of scale for the village and not suitable for low traffic movement rural roads.*' Concrete posts were replaced in many locations in the village ~ 2015 in line with County Council recommendations on safety/maintenance of aging concrete posts. Councillors do not feel that 1980s concrete street lamps should be recognised as a key feature of the conservation area. The low concrete posts, with significant 'arm' overhang were quite imposing on the streetscape,

cutting into the views down the streets. Whereas the simple dark steel posts with no arm overhang are far less imposing on the streetscape and do not cut into the views down the streets.

Page 13 - Please remove all text and pictures shown on page 13 entirely.

Justification:

Design comment: This is an ill-informed personal opinion by the contributors to this document, a direct accusation against a private property built to conform with the latest energy saving design features & heating systems promoted by government, the properties in this private road were passed by local planning as acceptable to build in this location. Conservation reviews must move with the times and form future policy with relation to carbon footprint / environment / sustainable design issues. The detrimental impact on these factors and the pollution created by existing coal fired heating systems in the adjacent original main street properties that are larded in this review are in stark contrast to the environmental impact of the three new properties built behind Nos. 48 to 52.

Block paving comment: surrounding all three new houses are SUDS systems, the entrance road /splay uses permeable non sealed systems of block paving design, providing adequate drainage solutions. Given there are negative comments about asphalt parking at the Parsonage & the asphalt drive of the page 16 private house, if a SUDS system & non-sealed Block paving that allows for drainage is not suitable, then what is? We no longer drive in country tracks on horses & carts, this is not a film set or museum, the village has to evolve and be lived in to modern standards with appropriate environmental protection.

Respect for Nos 48 to 52 Main Street comment: The entrance splay is for the convenience of the tenants of 48 to 52 for the comings and goings via their back gates of their caravans/cars that they park in their gardens. This splay was a concession by the land owner who sold off the large back gardens of the tenants, who were then as they are now using them for this storage purpose, so hardly a loss from a conservation perspective. The implication from the author is that the entrance splay is detrimental to those properties & for the imposed advantage for the owners of the new properties in Lawley Gardens – plainly not true, we have our own drives leading to the splay.

What do bullet points 2 & 3 attempt to convey in relation to present day life? I would suggest these bullet points add nothing to the document and should be removed.

Page 16 - Negative unfair use of a specific property with picture and commenting on asphalt drive. This should be removed and replaced with a street view (there are many houses of this design in the village) and a general comment, if deemed necessary to make this point at all.

4.2.7 (Page 23) *Village Hall tennis Courts and green* – put comma after village hall. *'Part of the historic grounds of the village hall (former institute) built in the early twentieth century.'* – factually incorrect. The club was the former institute, not the village hall, and the Alms Houses pre-date the village hall – not part of its historic grounds.

4.2.8 (Page 24) Poor design of parking spaces for the Parsonage Hotel which has increased the amount of asphalt. Please refer to the Conservation Officers consultation response to the current retrospective planning application regarding The Parsonage car park.

Page 27 - Transpose descriptions under pictures, incorrect at the moment. Please could you clarify the location described.

Page 28 - Allotment Gardens: More clarity required on the location of this.

Page 30 - Could you use a better photo of the church rather than one so far away?

6.1.1 (page 31) Slaughterhouse site

Request to reconsider support: Praising the buildings at a facility that is out of place in the heart of a village in the twenty first century is a little bizarre, stating the building should be incorporated in a local list of 'assets' as they make a significant contribution. Their HGV traffic, noise and above all smell make far more of contribution to present & future village life, all negative, so why praise this establishment in its present location? Comments need to be balanced with the present impact on the village. You could cause detrimental harm to the viability of the site by praising it and the Escrick Neighbourhood Plan consultation has found that there is large public support for redevelopment due to its negative impact.

Page 32-- Recommendations: Councillors will await the public consultation to comment further on recommendations 3 and 5 but concerns were raised.

Selby District Council in partnership with North Yorkshire Highways Authority, Historic England and the Appleton Roebuck Parish Council and neighbourhood planning group.

Amend 'Appleton Roebuck' to 'Escrick'.

Councillors highlighted that Escrick Parish Council are in the latter stages of their Neighbourhood Plan and Design Codes document which will also be going out for public consultation shortly. Councillors requested that SDC keep the Parish Council up-to-date with their timescales so that parishioners do not get all the consultations at the same time.

Finance and Governance

21105: **Design Codes work for Escrick Neighbourhood Development Plan:**
Councillors approved the payment of the invoice for phase 2 of the Design Codes work; £6,165.00 to be made payable to Cultural Industries Quarter Agency.

Meeting closed at 21.05hrs.

Signed: Richard Rowson

Chair, Escrick Parish Council

Date: 12th April 2021