



MINUTES OF PARISH COUNCIL

Held on Monday 15th May 2023 at 7pm

At Leeming Village Hall, Leeming

Present

Parish Councillors: Cllr M Curry; Cllr A Bowes; Cllr O Robinson; Cllr K Temple
County Councillor: Cllr J Weighell
Clerk / Others: S Nicholson (Clerk); 20 Resident

Item Ref

Detail

23/24

1.

Welcome and Apologies

The Chair opened this meeting and welcomed everyone.

Apologies accepted from:

- Cllr C Capel

The Chair stated that the extraordinary meeting had been called because a planning application had been received which needed a response from the Parish Council before the next ordinary meeting.

The Chair stated that everyone would be allowed time to speak and to express their views and requested that residents raised their hands to speak and she would invite individuals then to speak. Residents were also requested not to speak over each other so that everyone could hear and to be respectful within the meeting towards each other.

The chair also explained that the planning application was not a delegated decision for the Parish Council to make, but the parish was a consultee for consultation of the application. The parish intended to respond to the application but the Chair urged everyone as individuals to respond directly to the Planning Application which would give the North Yorkshire Council (NYC) a better understanding of the feeling and issues that the village feels regarding this application.

2.

Planning

ZB23/00923/FUL

Construction of 24 dwellings and associated highway works and alterations to existing dwelling. Land On The West And South West Side Of Sycamore Lane Leeming North Yorkshire

APPLICANT: Mulberry Homes Yorkshire

Open Session

1) Question statement raised:

Is the parish aware if NYC will honour the Hambleton Local Plan that was introduced? If they are then there are a number of issues that are within the application that does not comply with the local plan regarding traffic access limits or noise decibels?

Response by Cllr JW: confirmed that the NYC would be compliant with the Hambleton Local Plan until such time that NYC had compiled their own plan. Cllr JW also stated he would certainly look into those matters and bring them to the attention of the relevant people at NYC.

2) Question statement raised:

A resident wanted the meeting to be aware of some historical issues that are relevant to the application:

When the A1 was upgraded residents in areas of the village including Sycamore Lane were able to claim compensation for the additional noise and air pollution and devaluation to properties, the landowner included. Any new housing will not be able to do that! The site was previously offered for affordable housing through the Rural Housing Enabler (Amanda Madden) and was not taken up. Amenities have decreased. The site was refused in 1988 because of being an undesirable extension of the village beyond the existing recognised limits and would be detrimental to the amenities of the area.

The site in Exelby Lane was refused and dismissed on Appeal because of noise and air pollution from both the A1 and RAF Leeming. This site is even closer to the A1(M).

Over 65 years ago the village was a thriving place to live, with amenities and infrastructure. These have eroded since the A1 route was changed.

There was a natural pond behind the Chapel hence the flooding at the entrance to Newton Crescent today. Prospect Way was greenfield (majority now Broadacres) Argyle Terrace (greenfield half Broadacres), Roman Way (greenfield majority Broadacres). Broadacres have approx. 30 properties in the village. The loss of greenfield land when Millfield Close was built and the end of Sycamore Lane including Church Close has caused regular flooding the Yorkshire Water has never resolved. There has always been flooding at the end of Mill Lane which has gone into the old post office on Roman Road and quite a way back up Mill Lane together with flooding on Sycamore Lane.

All these additional developments (over 150 properties) plus infill properties and yet Yorkshire Water have made no changes to the sewerage system or surface water drainage! For over 30 years the Parish Council have had site meetings to discuss the problems in Water Lane, Sycamore Lane and Church Close. People have had to cope with raw sewerage coming to the top of toilets making them unusable. This happens on the west side of the village, i.e. Sycamore Lane area. The pipe over the beck needs to be replaced with a larger one but Yorkshire Water constantly state they do not have any money for maintenance or to resolve the issues.

Leeming is built on sand and the bungalow before the village hall had to have the foundations replaced under NHBC warranty. The surface water drains regularly collapse along the east side of Roman Road as is the case now at Leeming Bar. The additional houses will only add to the current situation.

3) Question / statement raised:

There is already an issue with vehicles in that area because it is a blind access and any constant use would surely mean there will be an accident waiting to happen?

4) Question / statement raised:

As previously stated there is an ongoing sewage issue with YW. The land that the village is built on is exactly sandy soil that Leeming Bar has. YW are having to repair sewage problems, due to collapsed drains, which are mounting daily. Will the village also have these same issues if YW tries to increase sewage into an already over capacity system?

Also can anyone explain what the pumping station will do, how big it will be because I have major concerns about this?

Response:

Cllr JW stated that the pumping station is designed to hold flood water or clean water as it is known (not sewage) and then disperse the water into the beck once flooding has subsided. I must confirm that the pump-out is not clear on the application.

In respect of sewage this will not be pumped along with clean water but taken away in separate sealed pipes. I do feel that the developer may need to rethink the sewage situation.

5) Question / statement raised by Cllr MC:

I also have issues with the attenuation tank which is to be maintained by YW especially as we are currently being advised they do not have funds to maintain the current system?

In respect of sewage I understand that YW has stated this will also be used for attenuation purposes when flooding occurs. However, the sewage disposal in the village does not correlate with flooding but it is an on-going issue due to a poor system. YW has stated they are unable to rectify due to lack of funds so how is an already over capacity system going to cope with the additional housing?

In 1989 the village was advised that the sewage was not fit for purpose and when YW took the over they informed residents that there was no funds to do any work in the village. 34 years later the village still has an inadequate sewage system so how can the system really cope with another 24 houses (40+ residents)?

We already know that YW have no intention of upgrading the sewage system in the village?

6) Question / statement raised by Cllr MC:

I also want to know how the application can be agreed regarding noise and emission readings when within their own findings by Dragonfly they have outlined that the levels for the site will be above the recommended levels. When questioned at a consultative meeting residents and the parish were informed that residents can keep their windows shut so that the noise and emissions did not then exceed the levels. How can residents not be expected to go outside, as this application appears to advise them, due to noise levels in the area?

7) Question / statement raised by Cllr KT:

My concern is regards to the amount of traffic that a site this size will generate? In Exelby we had had 6 new houses at the bottom of the village and those house generate vehicle movements of not 6 or 12 a day but probably in excess of 20 more movements, from new resident's cars, food deliveries, Amazon deliveries, post vans etc. Therefore the traffic movement is likely to be 4x24 making about another 100 vehicle movements per day. The access from the site and into the surrounding roads are not adequate in the plan to confirm how the traffic will be resolved?

8) Question / statement raised:

At present the village does not have a bus service. The bus that was in place was a 12.10 out of the village and a 5.30pm return. Any new residents who do not have their own vehicle will be isolated within the village with no shops or infrastructure?

9) Question / statement raised:

Can you advise how many house will be for affordable housing?

Response:

On the application as of today it states of the 24 houses:

- 6 will be private
- 18 for affordable housing either rent or rent /buy.

10)Question / statement raised:

Can anyone advise what the criteria for applying for a houses will be and does this mean the village will have residents who are not local to the area?

Response:

Cllr KT stated she had looked at this aspect and read out the current regulations regarding housing application. In effect anyone with the relevant qualifications can apply and you do not have to be local but have a qualifying conditions.

11)Question / statement raised:

I am also concerned about additional traffic especially around the school because it is already a nightmare around that area when pupils are arriving and leaving?

Response:

Surely that is a school / Highways / police matter not an issue with the application.

Cllr JW requested to respond to some issues raised and stated that he wanted to make it clear that he was neutral because he didn't know the area as well as residents. However, he wanted to play devil's advocate and state perhaps some good may come from this including his thoughts on public spaces, usual low cost part owned housing and the current need for social housing.

The Councillor continued by stating that in his view there were three issues that still needed to be resolved on the application:

1) Noise and Emissions

The developers appear to be expressing concerns about both the noise and emission levels within the application themselves and seems impossible to resolve with the houses being so close to the A1(M). It is clear with previous planning being refused due to noise and emissions this must be resolved before planning can go ahead.

2) Water

There are two issues:-

- Clean water and the attenuation tank, which details I think isn't clear or defined enough about where or how that will be adequate.
- Sewage is a much bigger issue and although the system now is to take it away in sealed pipes the current system in the village is already inadequate and there is concern about whether this plan has adequately addressed that question.

3) Access

This appears to be similar to the issue raised within the Aiskew parish when access had to be reviewed within an application and developers required to change the application and comply with regulatory access widths.

Response by a resident

If this goes ahead my bedroom window will be less than three feet away from the road and that's not including any pavement width.

Cllr AB stated that her concerns were over lack of infrastructure including:

- No shops
- No buses
- No doctors
- No dentist
- No Pub or eating facilities

Meeting closed at 7.45pm

Signed by Chair:

Dated:.....

Parish Response:

Planning Application - ZB23/00923/FUL

Construction of 24 dwellings and associated highway works and alterations to existing dwelling.
Land on the West and South West Side of Sycamore Lane Leeming North Yorkshire
APPLICANT: Mulberry Homes Yorkshire

The Parish Council recently met and discussed the above Planning Application and it strongly feels that it cannot support the application on the following grounds:

1) **Noise and Emissions**

Within this application it states that the noise and emission readings outlined for the site will be above the recommended levels? When questioned at a consultative meeting residents and the Parish Councillors were informed that residents can keep their windows shut so that the noise and emissions did not then exceed the levels. How can residents not be expected to go outside or open their windows, as this application appears to advise them, due to noise and emission levels in the area being as high as stated in their own documentation.

2) **Access, Quantity of Traffic and Public Transport**

It appears on the plan that the access to the site is completely inadequate due to the specified width required for a vehicle to access a site notwithstanding the lack of width for pavements. The other concern is regards to the amount of traffic that a site this size will generate. In Exelby there have been 6 new houses at the bottom of that village and those house now generate vehicle movements of not 6 or 12 a day but probably in excess of 20 more movements, from new resident's cars, food deliveries, Amazon deliveries, post vans etc. Therefore the traffic movement is likely to be 4x24 making about another 100 vehicle movements per day. The access from that site and into the surrounding roads are not adequate and the plan fails to confirm how that traffic situation will be resolved. There is no public transport from the village and the one bus that did run was completely at the wrong times of the day. New residents will have to have their own transport which again confirms figures suggested that the roads will be inadequate for this amount of vehicles.

3) **Water – Sewage & Clean Water**

Originally there was a natural pond behind the Chapel in the village hence the flooding at the entrance to Newton Crescent today. For over 30 years the Parish Council have had site meetings to discuss the problems in Water Lane, Sycamore Lane and Church Close. Residents have had to cope with raw sewerage coming to the top of toilets making them unusable and this is still happening at present. In 1989 the village was advised that the sewage was not fit for purpose and when YW took the over they informed residents that there was no funds to do any work in the village. 34 years later the village still has an inadequate sewage system so how can the system really cope with another 24 houses (40+ residents)? The parish has been previously informed that YW have no intention of upgrading the sewage system in the village.

The parish has major concerns and issues with the attenuation tank which is stated in the application which is to be maintained by YW, especially as we are currently being advised by them that they do not have funds to maintain the current system, so how will they maintain it with additional usage. In respect of the tank the parish understand that YW has stated this will also be used when flooding occurs. YW has stated they are unable to rectify the drainage system in the village due to lack of funds and personnel, so how is an already over capacity system going to cope with the additional housing?

The Parish Council also wants to highlight that the sewage disposal in the village does not correlate with flooding but it is an on-going issue due to a poor system.

The other consideration is that Leeming is built on sand and the bungalow before the village hall had to have the foundations replaced under NHBC warranty due to this and water problems. The surface water drains regularly collapse along the east side of Roman Road as is the case now at Leeming Bar. The additional houses will only add to the current situation and this plan does not address any of the problems highlighted.

The parish also wants to bring to the NYC that a number of issues stated in the application are incorrect including:

- There are no amenities
- There is no pub
- There is no Public transport
- There is only one church not two

DRAFT