

POCKLINGTON TOWN COUNCIL
MINUTES

Meeting of the Town Council
Meeting Room Old Courthouse George Street Pocklington
Wednesday 27th March 2013 at 7pm

Present: Councillors Marron (Chairman), Cooper, Cox, Jones, Ratcliffe, Shepherd, Taylor, Winterton & West. Cllr Steve Lane, our district councillor, and thirty five members of the public, a member of the press & the clerk.

1. **To receive any apologies** for absence. Cllr Perry (on holiday) Cllr Spademan (another meeting), Cllr Sykes (business), Cllr Whittaker (holiday).

2. Declarations of Interest

To record declarations of interest by any member of the council in respect of the agenda items listed below. Members declaring interests should identify the agenda item and type of interest being declared. Cllr Taylor declared a personal & prejudicial interest in item 6 in relation to the allocation of land north of Mile End park. (POC4/POC24), Cllr Jones declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item 6 in relation to the allocations north of Sherbuttgate. (POC2 & 3)

3. Consider closing the meeting to allow the public to address the council

Cllr Cooper proposed the meeting be closed, 2nd Cllr West and agreed. Mr Dennis a resident of Sherbuttgate spoke about POC2 & POC3. He had been contacted by several Sherbuttgate estate residents who were all opposed to the development. (His notes are attached) The main points were:

- Increased traffic would cause increased danger, noise & pollution
- Sherbuttgate would be used as a 'rat-run' to avoid the already difficult junction of Barmby Road and George Street.
- The planned development is for 350houses which is too large being the equivalent of a good-sized village.
- The development is on good quality agricultural land which should be retained.
- Surface water flooding is a concern given the scale of the development.
- It would adversely affect the quality of the landscape.
- The majority of development should take place south of the town where there are better road links and less danger of flooding.

Richard Williman then spoke on behalf of residents of Mile End Park who oppose allocations POC4&POC24. His main points were:

- The two sites have already attracted 59 objections on the ERYC web-site – by far the greatest number in the town which shows the depth of opposition.
- Local people have given a variety of reasons to oppose the development including flood risk, road safety issues relating to extra traffic movements passing the three primary schools and its effect on the visual approach to the town. He urged that these points be given full consideration when the councillors debated their response. There was considerable resentment that the development sites had been linked to a proposed flood alleviation scheme which should be treated completely separately.

Bill Ayres said he has resided in Algarth Road since 1970. He felt the plans represent a total over development of the town and posed two questions:

1. Do we need this amount of development?

2. If so how is it to be controlled?

He thought it was plain to see that students would find it an attractive place to live being so close to the University of York. He wanted information on how the town had grown in recent years – this represents an increase of one third without the resulting infra-structure to accommodate it. He suggested the town pull together to oppose the allocations document.

Councillor Steve Lane, one of our District Councillors urged anyone with views to write to the forward planning unit of ERYC or to complete a response on the web-site. Such responses should be submitted by 5th April.

John Farmer from Yapham Road suggested more development should be encouraged south of the town.

Jonathan Atkinson a developer spoke about his current development of a new doctor's surgery and 99 houses off West Green. He is compiling a 'development brief' in conjunction with ERYC staff in which he will show connectivity of sites POC14, 17, 13, & 12. These plans will be subject of consultation with the Town Council.

Tony Petch from St Helens Road asked if there was sufficient capacity in the drains to accommodate all these homes?

Jo Green from Barmby Road said the long awaited infrastructure plan would have to cover increasing the town's services. She felt the town was being asked to provide too many new houses. POC22 was allocated to retail but she felt it should also become a car park for the town. POC18 should be retained as it is a valuable community facility. The town is currently attractive to visiting cyclists but development must incorporate cycle friendly initiatives.

Dianne Owen was pleased POC7 had been rejected but still had concerns about POC8 because of the extra traffic which will be generated on Burnby Lane.

Les Waby from Betterton Court said his priority was preventing Betterton Court from flooding. He therefore supported the alleviation schemes for north of the town.

Les Slow from Mile End Park said it was a mistake for the alleviation scheme to be linked to development POC4/24. This was clearly morally wrong.

4. Consider re-opening the meeting Cllr Cox proposed the meeting be reopened. 2nd Cllr West and agreed.

5. Discuss the allocations document. It was agreed to look at each site which had been recommended and make comments which will form the Town Council's response.

POC2 & POC3 North of Sherbuttgate. **17 letters and 'e' mails had been received by Pocklington Town Council about these sites.** There was concern about the effect this development would have on traffic congestion in the town. Because it is to the north of the town all traffic would have to travel into town to get to the A1079. This council feels there should be connectivity with Barmby Road by building a link road through POC1 which would ensure a route for traffic without extra journeys through the town.

The infrastructure should be of sufficient capacity to make sure surface water and sewers are capable of taking the extra volumes.

The scheme should include traffic calming measures on Yapham Road which will include cycle friendly initiatives.

POC4 & POC24 North of Mile End Park. **18 letters and 'e' mails had been received by Pocklington Town Council about these sites.** There was concern about the effect this development would have on traffic congestion around our three primary schools.

The infrastructure should be of sufficient capacity to make sure surface water and sewers are capable of taking the extra volumes. There is a real threat that such a development could contribute to added flooding of the town. The alleviation scheme planned further upstream should not be connected in any way with these development sites. This development is north of the town. The Town Council have consistently said the majority of the development should be to the south where there is little risk to flooding and would reduce the impact on congestion within the town.

POC8 Off Burnby Lane. **One 'e' mail had been received about this site.** There is concern that this development will involve further traffic movements on an essentially country road. The junction of New Street and Burnby Lane is particularly dangerous which will be put under further pressure. It is close to Primrose Wood and the cricket club so the development should be sympathetic to the existing environment.

POC12 There was general agreement that part of this development should be handed to the sports club to enlarge their facility.

POC14,17 &13. The development scheme planned for these areas is welcomed. The Town Council would like to be actively involved in this. It was thought it should include a safe walking to school plan. There was then a discussion about the rejected part of POC17r. Cllr Taylor proposed it be re-instated into the recommended allocations because it is nearer the town than other developments north of the town. 3 voted for & 6 against. The motion was not carried.

POC18 Youth Club **One 'e' mail had been received about this site.** This should be completely rejected. This is a well used community building and should not be in the recommended list. It is disappointing our initial recommendation to reject this was ignored. There is considerable resentment that this site should be developed.

POC 15, POC20 & POC21 are in the Barmby Moor parish but the added employment to be created is welcomed.

POC22 the bus station. It was felt the development of shops should be restricted to smaller outlets in keeping with the rest of the town and should include considerable further parking provision.

Generally it was felt all developments should take account of the housing needs of the town including bungalows and flats.

There was a general feeling that the 1250houses allocated to be provided in Pocklington was excessive as it amounts to growth of over 1/3 between now and 2029. Councillors would like an explanation of why the numbers are so high.

Cllr Marron thanked everyone for attending and making a contribution and said there should be a development scheme for each site.

6. **To authorise payments.** Cllr Cox proposed the following payments be authorised. 2nd Cllr Shepherd and agreed.

PTC			
DD	Plusnet	Broadband	16.33
	Eon	Gas supply	529.39
BP	ERYC	Salt Bin refills	74.40
	4021 Daisy Communications	Telephone charges	42.84
	4037 Harrison Tree Care	Primrose Wood	576.00
	4001 R Wood	March Salary	
	4002 J Farmer	March Salary	
	4004 S Knill	March Salary	
	4005 A Woodcock	March Salary	