

**Minutes of a Planning/Finance Meeting held on Thursday, 6 April 2023**  
**At 8.00 pm in the Village Hall, Barmby Moor**

**Present:** Councillors Clark (SC – the Chair), Emmison (BE) Gregory (JG), Britton (JB), Robinson (KR), Wilkinson-Mudd (MWM), Dexter (GD), Haynes (CH), Shephard (GS), K. West (KW Pocklington Provincial) and PW (Pocklington Provincial). N. Spencer (Secretary to the VH) and 158 members of the public.

**Health & Safety** – due to the large number of people in the VH, Mr. Spencer gave H & S regulations for the Village Hall.

**Apologies:** All Parish Councillors are present, apologies received by several local residents of Barmby Moor.

**Declaration of Interest on any item to be discussed:** given by CH on planning application for Westfield House.

**Welcome and introduction by the Chair:** SC welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked so many local residents for attending.

**Finance:**

Stones4Homes (Ice Melt and Rock Salt for gritting) - £391.97.  
Steven King (move grit and salt into shed and top up salt bins) - £30.00.  
AV Etherington & Sons (Christmas tree for village) - £75.00.  
ERNLLCA (subscription 2023/2024) - £593.86.  
Barmby Moor Group of Parishes (parish update printing) - £325.00.  
RT Graphics (leaflets for Planning application Back Lane) – not received.  
Barmby Moor Village Hall (room hire & PlusNet) - £18.70.

Fast Signs (quotation for replacing Village Green “No parking” sign Beck Side) - £205.22 (Inc. VAT).

***Having previously been circulated, proposed for payment by GS, seconded by CH and motion carried.***

**Plans:**

**Montgomery Holdings (Yorkshire) Ltd, land SE of Back Lane** – change of use of land to site 95 caravan act compliant holiday lodges, creation of 2 new vehicular accesses, erection of a reception building, shop, café and petting zoo, together with the formation of associated roads, two lakes and landscaping (Ref: 23/00256/STPLF).

**Introduction and opening comments by the Chair on this planning application:**

1. The proposal is for a change of land use from arable land to a built development comprising 95 lodges, a reception building, a shop/café/bar amenity building, a petting zoo, two new vehicle accesses, and external works comprising site roads and hard pavings, two new lakes, landscaping and planting works, drainage and mains services works.
2. The Planning Application form states that it comprises of 95 market housing units.
3. Item 4.2 of the Planning Design and Access Statement (“PDAS”) states “The holiday lodges in this application would be restricted to holiday use only.” However, the PDAS makes no definition of what is meant by holiday use or states any restrictions on occupation. Are they holiday homes for sale? Are they holiday homes for long-term occupation? Or are they holiday homes for short-stay guests?

4. With one part of the application stating the proposal comprises market housing units and another part of the application stating the proposal comprises holiday use of an undefined nature, how can planning approval possibly be granted for a proposal of such uncertainty and where it is impossible to know for what permission is being sought?

5. The Planning Application form states that the number of bedrooms being provided is unknown. As the layout plans for the lodges clearly indicate each lodge to comprise 2 bedrooms, why is the applicant unable to state that the proposal comprises 95 2-bedroom housing types? Why the obfuscation?

6. Item 1.5 of the PDAS states "There is concern locally to prevent housing development to the east of Barmby Moor." The applicant has not submitted any evidence to indicate this to a true premise, and the Parish Council does not recognise this statement.

7. In the same item, the Applicant states "This holiday development would prevent housing being built in this area." To argue that the holiday development has some degree of worthiness because it prevents housing development is bizarre to the point of stupidity.

8. Item 2.3 of the PDAS states "The development of the site will not be prominent in the surrounding area." The lodges are 3.4m and 3.8m high; the reception building is 5m high; the amenity building is 6.9m high. Given the heights of the buildings, it is a nonsense to argue that site will not be prominent in the surrounding area.

9. In the same item, the Applicant states "development on the site will not be out of character with the area." The proposal is totally out of character with the area. It is a horrendous caravan park of little if any architectural merit and has no design connection whatsoever with the adjacent residential properties. It is a grotesque appendage to a much-loved village.

10. Item 3.4 of the PDAS states "A small petting zoo will be created in order to provide activities for visitors." Really? In this day and age, surely, we have moved on from using caged or penned animals for human entertainment. Where is the compassion for animal welfare?

11. Item 4.4 of the PDAS seeks to justify the proposal under Paragraph 84 of the NPPF. However, the proposal does not comply with the four items of Paragraph 84: i. Section a) refers to the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, through well-designed new buildings. The proposal does not include well-designed new buildings.

ii. Section b) refers to the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses. The proposal does not comprise any of these.

iii. Section c) refers to sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside. The proposal is not sustainable rural tourism and does not respect the character of the countryside.

iv. Section d) refers to the retention and development of accessible local services and community facilities, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship. The proposal does not comprise any of these.

NPPF Paragraph 84 does not therefore provide any support for the proposed development.

12. Item 4.5 of the PDAS seeks to justify the proposal under Paragraph 85 of the NPPF, but the Applicant ignores a key wording of the Framework. The beginning of Paragraph 85 states that *“Planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements”*. The proposal is not meeting any local business and community needs in rural areas; it is a development that is being imposed on Barmby Moor for the financial interests of the Applicant, not one that has been developed to satisfy any business and community needs in a rural area. The proposal is therefore not supported by NPPF Paragraph 85.

13. In addition to the above NPPF Paragraph 85 further states that where sites have to be found in rural areas to meet local business and community needs *“it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings and does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads.”* The proposal shows little sensitivity to its surroundings; it is a caravan park of little architectural merit immediately adjacent residential properties. It will also have an unacceptable impact on local roads. Back Lane is a narrow residential road. An additional 218 cars and heavy-duty goods vehicles servicing the site, loss of resident’s parking outside their homes on Back Lane, queuing traffic trying to access the A1079 will all have an unacceptable impact. This is further evidence that the proposal is not supported by NPPF Paragraph 85.

14. Item 4.6 of the PDAS makes a further attempt to justify the proposal under Paragraph 85 of the NPPF, by stating that the holiday lodges will provide support for local businesses. However, the Applicant provides no evidence for this other than stating the proposal will support the manufacture of holiday lodges some 23 miles away. Hardly a local business. With the proposal including its own shop, café, and bar, as the Applicant states in item 1.6, these provide visitors with their day-to-day needs. There is no evidence that the proposal will support local businesses. It is entirely possible that the shop, café, bar and holiday accommodation could well take away business from local established entities already providing these services.

15. The Planning Application form states that the proposal **will** provide 63 full time employees. Item 1.1 of the PDAS states that the development will employ **approximately** 63 people, which is further confused by item 4.6 stating that the development **could** provide 63 jobs once completed. The Applicant is therefore unclear how much employment is being created. The Application form states that employment will be full time. However, many of the listed jobs will be seasonal or only valid when the holiday park is open, and many of the services could be contracted out. The Applicant has provided no evidence that the proposal will create full-time employment for 63 people.

16. Much emphasis is made in PDAS items 4.5 to 4.9 that the proposal is a tourism development. However, it is difficult to see this as such. Two sides of the site are bordered by residential properties, one side by the heavy industrial concrete making plant with its constant daytime noise and dust, and one side by one of the busiest trunk roads in the country with its constant noise and pollution day and night from cars, vans and HGVs that thunder down the road. Although Barmby Moor is surrounded by countryside, none of it is accessible – it is all privately owned farmland. As the Applicant writes in PDAS items 1.1 and 4.10 the nearest tourist attractions are York, the Yorkshire Wolds, the Yorkshire coast, and Beverley. All these are many miles away from Barmby Moor.

17. Items 4.7 to 4.14 of the PDAS attempts to justify the proposal as being in accordance with East Riding Local Plan Policies S4, EC1, EC2, ENV1 and ENV2. This is disputed as detailed below.

18. The proposal is not one that is designed to or needed to support the vibrancy of Barmby Moor. The proposal therefore is not supported by Local Plan Policy S4 A.

19. The proposal is not within the development limits of Barmby Moor and therefore is not supported by Local Plan Policy S4 B.

20. The proposal is at odds with its surroundings therefore does not respect the intrinsic character of its surroundings. The proposal does not comprise any the items listed in section C items 1 to 10 and is not a tourism development referred to in item 11. The proposal therefore is not supported by Local Plan Policy S4 C.

21. The proposal does not comprise any items detailed in Local Plan Policy EC1. The proposal therefore is not supported by Local Plan Policy EC1.

22. Local Plan Policy EC2 A encourages tourism developments particularly those that help meet existing deficiencies. The Applicant has not provided any evidence that the proposal is required to meet any existing deficiency. Consequently, it is difficult to argue that the proposal is supported by Local Plan Policy EC2 A.

23. Local Plan Policy EC2 B supports tourism developments in the countryside where their scale and cumulative impact is appropriate for the location.

24. The scale of the development compared to Barmby Moor village is huge. The proposal covers some 6.6 hectares. Barmby Moor village within its development limits covers some 12 hectares. The proposal is over half the size of the existing village. The proposal will increase the number of properties of Barmby Moor from some 400 to nearly 500. The proposal will increase the number of people in the village from some 1200 (2021 census) to a potential 1600. The development incorporates 218 parking spaces, increasing the number of cars in the village from some 400 to some 600. The impact of the development on Barmby Moor will also be significant, a significant increase in traffic, noise, pollution, and stress on existing foul and surface water drainage services. The scale and impact of the proposed development is totally inappropriate for the location.

25. Furthermore, the proposed development does not utilise existing buildings, is not part of a farm diversification scheme, is not supporting an existing countryside attraction, nor has a functional need to be located in the Countryside.

26. The proposal therefore is not supported by Local Plan Policy EC2 B.

27. Local Plan Policy ENV1 A states that all development shall contribute to safeguarding and respecting the diverse character and appearance of the area and seek to reduce carbon emissions and make prudent and efficient use of natural resources. The proposal comprises none of these items and therefore is not supported by Local Plan Policy ENV1 A.

28. Local Plan Policy ENV1 B states that development will be supported where it achieves a high quality of design that optimises the potential of the site and contributes to a sense of place. The proposal does not achieve any of these requirements and therefore is not supported by Local Plan Policy ENV1 B.

29. Local Plan Policy ENV1 C supports innovative design incorporating new materials and technologies. The proposal is not of innovative design incorporating new materials and technologies and therefore is not supported by Local Plan Policy ENV1 C.

30. Local Plan Policy ENV1 D supports development that maximises the use of decentralised and renewable or very low carbon technologies. The proposal does not include these and therefore is not supported by Local Plan Policy ENV1 D.

31. Local Plan Policy ENV2 A states that development proposals should be sensitively integrated into the existing landscape. The proposal is not sensitively integrated into the existing landscape. It is imposed on the landscape and completely obliterates the existing landscape. Furthermore, the proposal does not protect the character and individual identity of settlements by maintaining their physical separation as required under item 1 of this policy. The proposal therefore is not supported by Local Plan Policy ENV2 A.

32. Local Plan Policy ENV2 B lists Important Landscape Areas to which Policy B applies. The proposal is not within these geographical areas and therefore is not supported by Local Plan Policy ENV2 B.

33. The access for the proposed development is from the narrow residential Back Lane. The proposed entrance/exit for the site is opposite driveways and resident parking of their vehicles outside their houses. This greatly reduces the turning ability of HGVs coming and going from the site. The proposed emergency exit for the site is onto a national speed limit road, at a bend, with no street lighting; this is not a safe exit.

34. The proposed development would intensify the use of the existing A1079 access and is likely to generate an increase of turning movements in and out of the site on the A1079 strategic route. Furthermore, the braking and slowing of traffic turning into Back Lane in this location could potentially lead to rear end shunts and interrupt the safe and free flow of traffic on this important strategic route. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Local Plan Policy ENV1 B9 and Paragraphs 110(b) and 111 of the NPPF.

35. Local Plan Policy A6 C 8 states "Plans, strategies and development decisions in the Vale of York sub area should maintain the physical separation of Pocklington and Barmby Moor."

36. Policy A6 C 8 is quite specific in its wording. It does not state "a physical separation" but "the physical separation". By definition it is therefore referring to the existing physical separation of Pocklington and Barmby Moor, not some future reduced separation. Any development in the existing gap between Pocklington and Barmby is therefore in direct contradiction to this policy. The proposal therefore is contrary to Local Plan Policy A6 C 8.

37. Local Plan Paragraph 10.130 states "The gaps between Pocklington and Barmby Moor, also serve an important role in maintaining the individual characters of the settlements by preventing coalescence."

38. Paragraph 10.130 is also specific in that coalescence between Pocklington and Barmby Moor shall be prevented. Any development in the gap between Pocklington and Barmby Moor would be the start of coalescence and is therefore in direct contradiction to this Paragraph. The proposal therefore is contrary to Local Plan Paragraph 10.130

39. Barmby Moor Neighbourhood Plan Policy A1 identifies a Key Open Area between the village and the Pocklington Industrial Estate (as shown on the Policies Map) and states that development proposals should retain the openness of the Key Open Area. It further states that development proposals which would have an unacceptable impact on the openness of the identified Area and/or which would result in the coalescence of Barmby Moor with the Pocklington Industrial Estate will not be supported.

40. The proposed development does not retain the openness of the Key Open Area, has an unacceptable impact on the openness of the identified Area and results in the coalescence of Barmby Moor with the Pocklington Industrial Estate. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Barmby Moor Neighbourhood Plan Policy A.

41. In his report "A report to East Riding of Yorkshire Council on the Barmby Moor Neighbourhood Development Plan" Andrew Ashcroft, the East Riding of Yorkshire Council's appointed Independent Examiner makes the following statement regarding the Barmby Moor Neighbourhood Plan Policy A and the Key Open Area: "This policy is an important element of the Plan. It identifies a Key Open Area to the east of the village. I looked at the proposed Area carefully during the visit. It is a critical component of the way in which the village relates to its wider surrounding landscape."

42. In his report he states that he has considered representations from the Ashcourt Group, James Richardson and E. Robinson and Sons (who all argued that development should be permitted in the Key Open Area) into account in assessing the policy. In effect the Examiner dismissed the arguments for development and advised the wording of Neighbourhood Plan Policy.

43. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the advice and recommendations of East Riding of Yorkshire Council's appointed Independent Examiner.

44. Neighbourhood Plan Policy B1 states that development proposals should protect the open, rural, and tranquil landscape character of the countryside surrounding Barmby Moor. The proposal does not protect these characters and is therefore contrary to Neighbourhood Plan Policy B1.

45. Item 5 of the PDAS seeks to provide local planning precedents to support the proposal. However, none of the three applications are for holiday parks immediately adjacent a village. All are located in the countryside situated well away from village settlements. None of the examples given by the Applicant provide a precedent for the current proposal.

46. The Applicant's Transport Statement highlights the importance of cycling accessibility to the proposed development. Yet the proposal makes no provision for any cycle parking or storage facilities.

47. The proposed development will have a detrimental impact on neighbouring residents who are in close proximity to the proposed holiday homes. The detrimental impact includes loss of privacy, an increase in noise, an increase in traffic and vehicle pollution, and an increase in light pollution. The proposal could also lead to a likely increase in anti-social behaviour particularly as the proposal incorporates a bar with outside drinking facilities.

48. The proposal removes a key open area that has been demonstrated as being important to the identity of Barmby Moor as an individual and distinct village. If the open area is taken away it is gone forever. Barmby Moor will no longer have its countryside boundary but will be linked to the Pocklington industrial estate. Something both the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan set out to avoid.

49. The proposal is not supported by NPPF Paragraphs 84 and 85 and is not supported by Local Plan Policies S4, EC1, EC2, ENV1 and ENV2. Furthermore, the proposal is contrary to NPPF Paragraphs 110(b) and 111, Local Plan Policy A6 C 8, Local Plan Paragraph 10.130, Neighbourhood Plan Policies

A1 and B1 and the Independent Examiner's advice and recommendations regarding the importance of maintaining the Key Open Area.

50. The granting of planning permission for the proposed development would render Local Plan Policy A6 C 8 and Local Plan Item 10.130 useless and set dangerous precedents of future development. How could these policies be upheld in the future if permission has been granted for a development that is contrary to these. How would the gap between Pocklington and Barmby Moor be maintained?

51. In addition, the granting of planning permission for the proposed development would be contrary to the key policies A1 and B1 of the Neighbourhood Plan, meaning that preparation of the Plan and the employment of the Independent Examiner has been a waste of time and resources.

52. Granting of planning permission would also mean that the Localism Act (2011) giving communities the right to shape their future development at a local level is being ignored; that the wishes, the health, and the wellbeing of the large number of Barmby Moor residents are of little or no relevance.

***Members of the public showed their appreciation of the speech and SC invited to them to speak.***

Questions asked and points raised:

- Points raised by SC, can they be put on the website so local residents can refer to when raising objections.
- Planning Officers on holiday, therefore complaints put on the Planning portal will not be recorded until the officer returns to work.
- The field floods during heavy rainfall and the winter months.
- It states on the planning application that the proposed development is sympathetic to wildlife. Where will all the foxes, birds, hedgehogs and tiny mammals go if developed?
- Concerns about the transport survey and the amount of traffic this will generate.
- A1079 is already congested with safety problems, no consideration to logistics.
- Applicant's history and reliability.
- Development is next to a concrete mixing plant and aggregate business, and the busy A1079.
- Where would the potential of over 400 on the site evacuate in an emergency.
- Light and noise pollution will be generated.
- Properties in Back Lane and Hodson Fields would lose value.
- Emergency access onto the B1246 in a 60 mph road and bend.
- Members of the public have no confidence in Planning Officers.
- Height of fencing on the perimeter of the development.

SC and members of the PC tried to answer questions submitted and have offered to help anyone having problems placing their observations on the Planning Portal, to go to the Boot & Slipper on Tuesday, 11 April between 6 to 8 pm, when they will help.

A petition at the rear of the Village Hall was available to sign during the evening, and will be available at the Boot & Slipper if anyone wants to sign.

SC asked if members of the public strongly objected to this planning application and recommended refusal. 158 show of hands with no one supporting the application.

The Chairman asked councillors if they had any further comments to contribute.

There being none, the chairman asked if any councillors supported the proposal. No councillors did.

The chairman asked if councillors objected to the proposal. Eight councillors did with one abstention.

That being the case, the chairman proposed that it should be stated that Barmby Moor Parish Council objects strongly to the development proposal and request that planning permission be refused. This was passed unanimously.

The Chairman then proposed that our comments on the proposal should comprise the items detailed in the chairman's presentation given earlier, plus the concern about the traffic data raised by a member of the public, plus that the proposal was objected to by all 158 members of the public who attended the meeting. This was passed unanimously.

The Chairman then thanked members of the public for attending the meeting and said that if they wished to leave now they could.

**Ashcourt Construction Ltd, Halifax Way , Industrial Estate** – erection of storage shed in association with existing concrete processing plant (Ref: 23/00688/CM) - *Barmby Moor Parish Council are concerned about the height of the storage shed and the visibility of this structure for the local residents in Back Lane and Hodsworth Fields. It should be sympathetic to the surrounding area and blend in with the nearby residential area.*

*Can this be called in for the Planning Committee to consider please?*

**Mr & Mrs. D. North, Oaklea, York Road** – re-siting of an agricultural building (Ref: 23/00837/PLF) - *no objections to this application.*

**Omrax UK Ltd, York Road (Allerthorpe PC)** – installation of an underground Package Treatment Plant to discharge to watercourse (Ref: 23/00605/PLF) – *no objections to this application.*

**Mr & Mrs Haynes, Westfield House** – erection of 3 dwellings, two detached garages with access and parking (Ref: 23/00741/PLF) - *1. The design of the houses does fit the Neighbourhood Plan and is in character with the area. Double garages and parking spaces should suffice for the size of the dwellings.*

*2. Concern about the access of House No. 1. Can the access be widened to encourage easy access for vehicles parking on this plot? Members do not want to encourage parking outside the development which is Village Green.*

*3. Concerns that Houses Nos. 2 & 3 are overlooking homes in Coach House Garth, will glazing rear windows be appropriate?*

*4. Members would like to draw attention to Yorkshire Water's comments they are concerned that the site layout is over the public sewer. This could seriously jeopardise Yorkshire Water's ability to maintain the public sewerage network which is not acceptable.*

*5. The Neighbourhood Plan suggests the village should consider smaller and more affordable housing*

**Date of next meeting:** – Annual Parish meeting, 20 April 2023, when members of the public invited to speak on issues relating to the parish.

**Any other business:** BE raised the increase in cars using the VG as a car park.

There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 9.32 pm.

Viv Cox  
Clerk to Barmby Moor Parish Council