

# Cadney Cum Howsham Parish Council Meeting Minutes

Minutes of the meeting held on 28th January 2026 / 19:15 / Cadney Parish Hall

**Parish Clerk – James Truepenny**

Email - [clerk@cadneycumhowsham.org.uk](mailto:clerk@cadneycumhowsham.org.uk) Tel 0791920551

<http://www.CadneycumHowsham.org.uk>

## In attendance

Parish Councillors - Cllr. N James, Cllr P Hart, Cllr A. Ellis, Cllr. L. Mearns, & Cllr. F. Leahy.

Apologies

Cllr Heath had a personal commitment

Cllr Hackney was at work

## 2601/20      **Declarations of Interest**

None

At this point in the meeting and considering the numbers of residents present, Vice Chair of the Council, Cllr Tennant who was presiding over this meeting as Vice Chair suggested that the meeting should be closed for the public to speak.

Cllr Mearns proposed, Cllr James Seconded. All were in favour and an open forum was taken of the residence in attendance. The findings were used as part of the decision process and recorded when the meeting was reopened under the following minute.

Cllr Mearns proposed restarting the meeting, Cllr Leahy Seconded All were in favour.

## 2511/21      **Planning**

After a long discussion the council voted that this application will need prior approval for the following reasons:

As raised by Members of Public during an open session, residents are concerned that the application has not addressed the sewage and drainage concerns which have become a feature of the parish in recent years. The lack of an ecology report and effects on wildlife were also raised. There were also concerns about site access with all roads into the site being small, on blind corners and like to deteriorate quite quickly with heavy site traffic. As well as mud, and other driving hazards on roads that are already problematic to use. This led on to the concerns about ongoing traffic should the application be built.

When the council was voted back in session the main concerns raised by councillors were that the application had not addressed the cascade of issues caused by that much housing being placed in a setting that does not have the infrastructure to support it.

There were echoes of the concerns of residents about drainage; the placement of the development would require the new homeowners to have cars to access services and work as there are no employers or amenities in the village which will put stress on roads and traffic when there is only a small public transport provision. None of these issues have been addressed in this outline application.

The continuing development in the village that has been approved also causes a concern for the cumulative risk of flooding in a low lying area which has not had the drainage infrastructure support the expanding level of housing.

There were also concerns about the classification of the application, especially around infrastructure and access as this scheme operates as a coordinated housing development rather than a conversion.

Q1 Applications are for changing the use of existing buildings from agricultural to dwellings. Specifically buildings capable of conversion. The scale of alteration and reworking particularly to building 2, approaches reconstruction rather than genuine conversion.

Ten dwellings generate sustained residential traffic, relying on estate-style access geometry and passing places unsuitable for assessment under Class Q.

Extensive fenestration and residential detailing cause the building to read as purpose built dwellings not converted agricultural structures which contravenes Q.2(e) - Acceptable External Appearance. Engineered roads, parking courts, turning areas, and refuse provision go beyond what is reasonably necessary and instead facilitate an estate type development. There were also concerns about the plan's intended use of refuse recovery and access to refuse workers.

Councillors also raised concerns whether or not that building sits within the established building line.

This decision was proposed by Cllr James and seconded by Cllr Mearns. All were in favour.

Meeting Closed 19:47