



**Sherburn-in-Elmet Community Voice
Residents' Association**

siecv.co.uk

SIEcommunityvoice@outlook.com

Dear Sir or Madam,

RE: OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION ZG2026/0304/OUTM - Land Adjacent North Field Drive Finkle Hill Sherburn In Elmet North Yorkshire

We are writing as the Sherburn-Elmet Community Voice Residents' Association to object to the above planning application titled "*Outline application comprising the erection of up to 250 dwellings, with drainage, access, open space, landscaping and associated infrastructure, with all matters reserved except for access. Demolition of existing agricultural building at Land Adjacent North Field Drive Finkle Hill Sherburn In Elmet North Yorkshire*" based on the below material planning considerations.

1. Green Belt

The proposed site represents an important green space that contributes significantly to the character and setting of Sherburn-in-Elmet. The site is located wholly within the greenbelt, is not set within the town's development limits nor allocated for any use and is designated a locally important landscape area (LILA) under the Selby Local Plan.

The application's assertion that the site does not strongly contribute to Green Belt purposes (a) and (d) and should be classified as grey belt is misleading, as justified below:

- (a) Sherburn-in-Elmet is classed as a town and has experienced significant commercial and residential expansion in recent years. Sherburn now contains one of the largest industrial areas in North Yorkshire and has surpassed its former housing target (from 2011 – 2027) by 66% (Sherburn Town Council). It is fair to say that Sherburn now constitutes a large built-up area, where the site's location and openness form an important part in preventing Sherburn's unrestricted sprawl.
- (b) Irrespective of the applicant's claims, Sherburn constitutes a historic town, as supported by its historic occupation (throughout Roman and Medieval times) and the numerous heritage assets (both designated and non-designated) in the town. This is further supported by the active Sherburn History Group and groups of metal detectorists that regularly survey the fields surrounding Sherburn, including the proposed site itself.

The site plays a key role into preserving the setting and special character of Sherburn, with the approach framed by the site acting as a historic rural gateway into the town from the north-west. Sherburn's character will be significantly harmed by the lack of natural hard edge and the open field boundary of the development, destroying the gentle, rural transition into the village.

The proposed development will significantly harm the established vista, setting and key sightlines of All Saints Church (a building renowned for its prominent, visible position), particularly from Tadcaster Road (a busy pedestrian highway leading to Fields Garden Centre, White Rose Football Club and the tennis courts) where the development will completely block the sightlines from the north-east (please see photograph attached).

Granting permission for the development will continue the cumulative loss of historic character in Sherburn, as supported by the recent demolition of the

historic barn off Kirkgate and the replacement of the historic stone railway bridge at Barkston Ash.

As per the above, the site does contribute strongly to both purposes (a) and (d) of Green Belt, where it should not be considered grey belt and therefore not considered suitable for development. The applicant's claim that Very Special Circumstances are present based on the lack of sufficient housing land supply is weak and does not justify development of a site that makes an invaluable contribution to the setting and character of Sherburn. The applicant's intention to develop more of the site once a precedent has been set should also not be overlooked, which if permitted will further erode the identity and character of the town and lead to urban sprawl, contrary to preserving the purposes of the green belt.

2. Overdevelopment of Sherburn-in-Elmet

As set out by Sherburn Town Council in their open letter to North Yorkshire Council, Sherburn has experienced significant population and housing growth since 2011, growing in population by almost 40% and providing 1417 new homes (a 66% increase on its former target for the same period). This scale of growth is contrary to the principles of proportionate and sustainable growth set out in the Selby District Core Strategy Policies SP2, SP4 and SP5 and Chapter 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Various other large-scale developments have recently been applied for or approved within Sherburn (see Garden Lane, Bishops Quarter, Milford Road, Hodgsons Gate, Land at Tadcaster Road etc) with the cumulative total potentially exceeding 1122 new houses (Sherburn Town Council). The cumulative impact of this number of new houses cannot be understated, especially given the existing strain on services and infrastructure within the town and the lack of firm plans for expansion of these services and infrastructure to cope.

Despite capacity for service provision and infrastructure historically expanding to accommodate the significant growth of the town since 2011, Sherburn remains one of the largest conurbations within North Yorkshire without its own fire station, with published response times above the targets set by North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue service (with an average response time of 14 minutes to the centre of Sherburn compared to a target response time of 11 minutes). Sherburn is also one of the largest towns within North Yorkshire without its own indoor sports facility.

Local education and healthcare facilities are already at capacity and over-subscribed (as per the statutory consultees responses on the planning application at Land North of Prospect Farm, Milford Road), not considering the other large scale residential developments that have recently been approved or applied for. Residents have already reported facing long wait times for healthcare as well as not being able to secure local school spaces for children. Sherburn's facilities have not had the time to consolidate following the spate of recent residential development, and the creation of further houses will only exacerbate this issue.

The applicant's claim that the site is sustainable based on its proximity to existing services is therefore not justifiable, based on the strain on existing services and the lack of key services and infrastructure within the town. Utility infrastructure can also not keep pace with the amount of residential development within the town.

3. Impact on Highways

The applicant's transport assessment and proposed travel plan claims that most journeys from the development will be made via sustainable methods of transportation or via routes that do not transverse the town. The reality based on our residents' experiences differs significantly. Nearby train stations are too far to walk to from the development. Families will not be carrying their weekly shop back from the Aldi supermarket, and the existing bus provision is insufficient to offer a viable alternative to private vehicle movements.

The proposed development would generate approximately 1046 additional vehicle movements per day (based on TRICS Transport Assessment), significantly increasing traffic on local roads which are already experiencing congestion during peak hours. Notably, the traffic lights at the junction of Finkle Hill and Kirkgate frequently cause significant queues throughout the day causing traffic to form on the main thoroughfares through Sherburn.

The primary route to Leeds from Sherburn is via Sir John's Lane/Coldhill Lane (a country lane), where all traffic from the development will need to transverse the already congested traffic lights at the Finkle Hill/Kirkgate junction to access this route. Other key transport routes to the A1/M62 also traverse the village, where it is obtuse to suggest residents of the development will first travel north and east before returning south and west to join these key motorway junctions.

The above will only be exacerbated by the cumulative total of potential new homes, a factor that has not been adequately allowed for and considered by the applicant when preparing their proposed travel plan.

4. Biodiversity

There is a clear and significant inconsistency between the applicant's planning statement regarding biodiversity net gain and the quantitative evidence submitted within the biodiversity impact assessment.

The applicant's planning statement asserts that the development is capable of delivering a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain yet their own biodiversity impact assessment states the proposed development will result in an overall net loss of 6.98% area habitat units.

Under the Environment Act 2021, Schedule 14, Part 1 (2)(3)), developments are required to deliver a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain. The figures provided clearly demonstrate that the proposal not only fails to meet this requirement but results in a significant biodiversity deficit, contrary to the Selby District Core Strategy Policy SP18 and Chapter 15 of the NPPF.

The applicant suggests that this shortfall may be addressed at a later stage through on site, near site or off-site measures. This suggestion reinforces the lack of a clear site-specific strategy. Furthermore, the applicant's suggestion that biodiversity net gain could be delivered on the adjacent land to the north provides little reassurance, particularly as the applicant's own masterplan identifies that same land for a future Phase 2 development of approximately 250 additional homes.

The above raises serious concerns about the credibility of the proposed biodiversity mitigation strategy. Land that is intended for future residential development cannot reasonably be relied upon as secure long-term habitat creation. There is a clear conflict between using this land to deliver biodiversity net gain for the current application and the applicant's future intention to build on it, and a lack of clear site-specific strategy for the current proposal.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, which are all material planning considerations, we request that this application is refused.

The proposed site contributes strongly to the purposes of the green belt, is not sustainable based on existing service and infrastructure capacity, will cause significant strain on local highways and does not satisfactorily set out how it will meet biodiversity requirements. The development is also contrary to several policies within the Selby District Local Plan as well as principles for sustainable growth within the NPPF.

Ultimately, the development would cause significant harm to the character and setting of Sherburn-in-Elmet, its services and infrastructure, and the quality of life of its residents.

There are no significantly strong arguments presented that suggest that the site should be considered grey belt, and taken out of the green belt, and consequently, therefore, there are no strong arguments that the proposal has presented very special circumstances as to why the site should be considered to be an exception to green belt policy, and therefore, accordingly, should be refused, as inappropriate development in the green belt.

We respectfully request that this objection and the material planning considerations contained within it are taken into account when determining this application, and we would like to be notified of the decision.

Yours faithfully,

Sherburn-in-Elmet Community Voice Resident's Association