

PLANNING COMMITTEE
SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION
Thursday 25th July 2019

Agenda Item	Application number and Parish	Respondent	Comments
1	19/00774/FUL Aldwark	Agent	See attached document.
2	19/00791/FUL Dalton		None
3	18/00375/FUL Easingwold		None
4	19/00988/FUL Hackforth		None
5	19/00976/FUL Overton		None
6	19/01037/REM Sowerby	Agent	<p>Sowerby Primary: The agent requests that an application be formulated to capture the remarks of the NYCC Highways officer:</p> <p>Further to the latest information provided by the applicant regarding likely trip generation at the proposed school and potential on street parking demand I can confirm whilst this has not fully addressed the concerns the local highway authority (LHA) have previously raised, it is considered that solutions and appropriate mitigations are available and as such the LHA does not raise any objections to the proposals.</p> <p>It is accepted that the full school occupation will take several years and at least initially the parking demand from parents will be limited and unlikely to cause significant problems on the surrounding road network. However it is recommended that once the school has 3 class years enrolled that a review of the on-site parking provision and on street parking demand is undertaken. The applicant should submit this review, along with any proposed measures to reduce car trips to the site and manage parking in the immediate vicinity of the site to the local planning authority for approval.</p> <p>It is also recommended that the development shall not be brought into use until a surfaced footway link is provided from the piazza to the school entrance. This should include appropriate crossing facilities on the Sports Village access road and measure to prevent parking at this crossing point.</p>
7	19/00359/OUT <input type="checkbox"/> Stokesley	Planning Officer	NYCC County Archaeologist has confirmed that the report relating to trial trenching undertaken by the applicant is acceptable and that no further archaeological investigation is required.

		<p>Applicant/Agent</p> <p>Highways Officer</p>	<p>Notice was not served on one land owner "Northumbrian Land Ltd" prior to the submission of the application. The agent has confirmed that notice was subsequently served on 18.07.2019.</p> <p>In relation to objections/comments received from Northumbrian Land Ltd the Highways Officer gave the following comments:</p> <p>Firstly, the Local Highway Authority (LHA) gave it's advice in good faith with due regard to the information submitted at that time. If there are alterations and further submissions the advice will reflect the revised information.</p> <p>The initial submission proposed a single access to the site (SH2), through the adjoining current development to the west (SH1), with an emergency access onto The Stripe, for a proposed total of 105 units.</p> <p>The (LHA) agreed with the proposal of a primary access through SH1, but the preference was a secondary access from Hebron Court rather than the emergency access onto The Stripe.</p> <p>It is envisaged that vehicles will choose to access & egress SH2 through SH1 and the newly constructed roundabout on Westlands, this route giving an easier and more timely access to and from the main road, rather than via Hebron Road and the priority junction with Westlands.</p> <p>Regarding pedestrian provision for SH2. It is envisaged that the main pedestrian route from SH2 will be via the footpath link onto The Stripe, in the south east corner of SH2, this gives the shortest route to the services in and around the High Street. The short length of single sided footway on Hebron Court is unlikely to cause any issues of concern.</p>
8	19/00877/FUL Sutton on the Forest	Agent	The agent has provided an amended plan to reflect the changes to the external surface materials
9	18/02648/FUL Thimbleby	<p>Applicant</p> <p>Parish Council</p>	<p>See attached email</p> <p>Update: I can confirm that the we Support the above application as it complies with our local plan headline of supporting local businesses, particularly in tourism related properties</p>
10	18/02647/LBC Thimbleby	Applicant	See attached email
11	19/00766/ADV Thirsk		None



ROBERT BURNS

D E S I G N
A S S O C I A T E S
L T D

This proposal before you has been collectively informed and designed by myself along with our heritage consultant Clare Booth, who herself worked as Conservation Officer at Hambleton before joining ELG Planning as a consultant two years ago.

Clare met with Charlotte Cornforth at pre-application stage to walk through the Conservation Area, explaining how the character of Aldwark has changed during recent years with the infilling of open spaces and gaps between houses. The predominant built form now consists of large detached dwellings interspersed between the historic properties.

Aldwark was designed as an estate village, which consisted of a mixture of larger and smaller scale dwellings. This character has been eroded through large scale detached houses and the open area surrounding The Cottage is now considered at odds with the character of the Conservation Area, something agreed upon with Officers at a subsequent meeting. Our scheme aims to re-establish a building form which is actually characteristic of the village. This process of assessment informed my design for this site and in fact the design of the scheme is not questioned within the Officer's final committee report.

This, through discussion in a meeting with Tim Wood and Charlotte Cornforth resulted in a scheme which converts the original dwelling and provides two small scale homes which provide less expensive family homes within the village. No homes for young people on moderate to low incomes have been built in Aldwark and there is no balance between expensive and affordable homes.

We have worked very closely over a period on months with Hambleton's planning team to achieve this aim. Clare has produced a detailed Heritage Statement that shows clearly the enhancements to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the public benefits of the scheme which include:

- Enhancing the character and appearance of The Cottage through the insertion of appropriate windows and doors.
- Bringing The Cottage back into use and up to standard for modern-day-use and to meet the minimum space standard requirements (currently it falls below these standards).
- Bridging the gap between the large properties to the west and The Cottage, producing an appropriate streetscene which fits comfortably within the space and reducing the anomaly of a large gap site in this location.

- Provision of two (new) small three bed dwellings in a village which is dominated by large detached properties.

Further to this we would like to state that:

- The design allows a group of cottages to be built in the vernacular style of Victorian estate workers cottages, keeping the original ethos of Victorian architecture alive in the conservation area.
- No adverse impact to the amenity of any neighbour has been raised through the officer's report.
- An unused and uncared for village infill site is sympathetically brought to life with small cottages available to those on low incomes.
- The balance between large expensive houses only for the wealthy and smaller more affordable homes is to some small degree redressed.
- A run down dilapidated non designated heritage asset in The Old Cottage is renovated and brought back to life whilst keeping and reinstating its original features and charm.
- The area of land between the cottage and Old Woodholme is by agreed legal undertaking preserved in perpetuity as an open space.

Up to a week ago the close work between ourselves and Hambleton was to result in a recommendation for approval. However, it was brought to the attention of officers by a neighbour that Reliance Bus Services had decided to withdraw their service and that this now renders Aldwark - in the opinion of officers 'unsustainable'.

Reliance informs me that the service simply was not being used.

In general terms bus services in smaller villages are used predominantly by young families or older retirees on low to moderate incomes. The dominance of larger homes and wealthy families has led to the decline in the service in Aldwark. But this is a common feature through Hambleton and throughout rural areas; the reliance on the car is leading to public transport cuts throughout the district.

The existence of a bus service on its own is not a determining factor in considering whether Aldwark is a sustainable settlement. Aldwark also has a public house, church and hotel, all of which contribute to a level of sustainability. The former bus service as you know was limited to say the least and would not enable travel to and from a place of work for example. Children in Aldwark are still able to access the local school and this is a real benefit, enabling families to live within the village.

Planning Practice Guidance clarifies that: "A thriving rural community in a living, working countryside depends, in part, on retaining local services and community facilities such as schools, local shops, cultural venues, public houses and places of worship. Rural housing is essential to ensure viable use of these local facilities". It does not mention the need for bus service to connect various communities and it should be remembered that Aldwark needs small scale, incremental development to meet local needs in order to sustain the existing facilities that it has.

Indeed Paragraph 103 of the NPPF states that "opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will **vary** between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in decision making". It is clear that there is recognition that people drive in rural areas, they simply do not rely upon a bus service and cannot do so in the majority of villages in Hambleton. The ever reducing bus service throughout Hambleton means that it cannot be relied upon in order to consider the sustainability of our rural communities.

I would therefore conclude that Aldwark remains a sustainable settlement and that this proposal should be considered favourably in support of the existing facilities it will support and the community it will enhance.

This scheme will with its sympathetic vernacular estate workers cottage design complement and enhance the conservation area. It will ensure the continued existence for another 100 years one of the remaining original estate workers cottages. It will secure by legal means the open space between The Cottage and Old Woodhouse. It will for the first time provide low cost, affordable housing on the open market for young and old on moderate incomes.

I do not believe there is a negative side to this scheme and would urge members to support it.

To help view the new Cottages I will today produce an Artists Impression of the houses and their relationship to Beech House and Old Woodholme.

19/00359/OUT Application for Outline Planning Permission with Some Matters Reserved (considering access only) for Residential Development as amended by plan received on 31 May 2019.at OS Field 7272 Land North Of Hebron Court The Stripe Stokesley for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

Stokesley Town Council has already submitted comments on this application for the development of this site. However, the focus of the consideration by the Planning Committee today is primarily to consider access to the site.

The Council notes that in the course of this application that the applicant has changed two elements of the proposed access. However, the 'primary' access from Westlands via the recently constructed roundabout provided to service the current Stokesley Grange estate and the current application site has been retained

Firstly, the second point of access has been changed from The Stripe to an access from Hebron Road. Secondly, the nature of this second point of access has been changed from an emergency access only link to a second primary access route.

Whilst the Town Council would not object to an emergency only access via Hebron Road, it is this latter change to provide a 'second' primary access where the Town Council wishes to reinforce its objection to this application.

The Town Council does not consider that Hebron Road is suitable as a main access road for the proposed development. Hebron Road exits onto Westlands at a t-junction, which contrasts with the roundabout provided for access from Stokesley Grange on to Westlands. Additionally, Hebron Road is a relatively narrow estate road which services a significant number of bungalows where the residents are elderly.

Providing an access via Hebron Road would give a shorter route for the most well-used journeys to and from this development. These journeys include all routes coming west from the Town Centre, north via Thirsk Road and all journeys heading south from the Stockton and Middlesbrough areas and east from Great Ayton and Guisborough which would access Stokesley through the High Street. Importantly this would be true not only for dwellings on this proposed development but also those parts of the current Stokesley Grange development adjacent to this development.

On this basis the route through Hebron Road becomes not the second point of access but the main point of access, not just for this development but also parts of the Stokesley Grange development. This would be misuse of the current infrastructure and underutilisation of the recently provided infrastructure to service the development of this area of Stokesley.

Therefore, whilst it supports the development of this site for housing, the Town Council urges the Planning Committee to refuse the current application.

From: [Lynn Turnbull](#)
To: [Lynn Turnbull](#)
Subject: Committee Items 9 and 10
Date: 24 July 2019 11:27:19

From: Woodlands Farm [mailto:
Sent: 24 July 2019 09:50
To: Peter Jones; Helen Laws
Cc: Cllr David Hugill
Subject: RE: URGENT - Fire Safety Compliance for Escape Windows on Guest Accommodation

Dear Peter (and Helen)

I am writing in relation to your comment Peter at the Planning Committee Site Visit on Monday where you stated that a fire scape window would be sufficient to meet the fire safety requirements under the current Building Regulations.

Both Evolve Building Control and now Watch manager Andy Tipling of North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue have stated that an escape window is insufficient and would not meet the building Regulations 2010. Please feel free to contact North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue or Building Control to confirm this.

As a result, we would be grateful iff you could please inform Members that an escape window is insufficient and diodes not meet Building Regulations. We also feel that your comments in para 4.4 of the Planning Letter which states "*We feel that the applicant has not researched the options of an internal fire escape on the other side of the building*" are misleading.

If it were to be compliant on the other side of the building then the roof would need changing quite substantially in order to get sufficient headroom and you as an Authority have always stated absolute opposition to this and Members should be aware of this as well as the fact that a number of other options have been considered and professional advice sought (both in terms of heritage and building regs).

Your sincerely

Paul and Amy Callin

Woodlands Farm

Lynn Turnbull

Technical Support Officer

Planning

Ext. 7117

From: [Lynn Turnbull](#)
To: [Lynn Turnbull](#)
Subject: Committee Items 9 and 10
Date: 24 July 2019 17:42:42

Lynn Turnbull

Technical Support Officer

Planning

Ext. 7117

From: Woodlands Farm [mailto:]
Sent: 22 July 2019 13:43
To: Peter Jones; Helen Laws
Cc: Cllr David Hugill
Subject: RE: Planning Committee Meeting Today

Dear Peter (and Helen)

Thank you Peter for coming to visit us today for the Planning Committee Site Visit regarding Planning Application No. 18/02648/FUL.

We do wish to draw your attention to certain comments made by you (Peter) which we feel are not entirely accurate and 'may' have some bearing on the Members' outcome on Thursday. These are as follows:

1) You stated to the Planning Committee Members that this property was a 'Longhouse', however, you will be aware that Institute of Historic Building Conservation (IHBC) Member, Liz Humble (who's a nationally renowned expert on such matters), has stated that there is no historical evidence that Woodlands Farm (previously Town End Farm) was a Longhouse.

Please can you provide the evidence that you have to claim that it was a Longhouse e.g. common entrance, byre, etc(?).

If you cannot backup your claim with satisfactory historical evidence that this was Longhouse then please can you make us aware and inform Planning Committee Members.

2) In discussing the First Storey extension to the Main Property, you talked a lot about 'harm' to the Listed Building, but failed to disclose to Members that a number of original features would also be re-instated - we feel this wasn't as 'balanced' an opinion as it could have been.

3) We are disappointed that you did not disclose that the proposed designs had the input of Liz Humble, IHBC Member and nationally renowned 'expert' in Historic Buildings and Architecture.

In addition to this, you also didn't notify Members that you as a LPA specifically requested an IHBC Member to be involved in this Application and provide their independent views on heritage / Listed Building matters via their Heritage Statement, etc.

4) You also did not disclose to Members that the 'independent' Heritage Statement written by IHBC Member, Liz Humble, disagreed with the LPA's stated views that the proposed changes represent 'harm' to the Listed Building - therefore there are conflicting views on this (i.e. between an IHBC Member and the LPA), of which we believe the Members should be aware.

5) We noted that you omitted to mention that the sections of extended roof upon which the first storey extension to the main House is proposed are currently uninsurable - whilst we understand that this is not admittedly a Planning matter directly, we believe it is a Listed Building Consent matter as it impacts upon the ongoing conservation of the property and Members should be aware of the current insurance constraints.

6) One Member asked you about regulation regarding 'Staff Accommodation' - in fairness this is something that we possibly didn't make totally clear from the outset, however Janet from Environmental Health has paid us a visit and because our intentions are not to have Staff living here permanently (i.e. all year round and it becomes their main residential address) these regulations are not applicable. We want to allow for Staff to stay here and run the business in our absence and to facilitate the taking on of trainees / college students at peak periods e.g. summer holidays. Due to our location the latter would be extremely challenging without the provision of accommodation.

7) You stated that the LPA believed that there were better 'solutions' for emergency fire escape and including the potential of escape from a first storey window - we believe that this is not compliant with Buildings Regulations for Guest Accommodation as we are told that a staircase was needed [with maximum 9m escape distance].

* Given that you referenced first floor escape windows as a 'solution' (or alternative to the proposed stairs) we presume that North Yorkshire Building Control, etc are satisfied with this escape window solution and it is compliant for Guest Accommodation - assuming this is the case, please can you provide us with the evidence from NYBCP?

** We are happy to remove the staircase completely if escape windows are permissible for Guest Accommodation [we've always been told they are not] then we are obviously happy to remove the escape staircase entirely. FYI I've contacted Liam Lincoln at NYBCP regarding this matter.

*** We feel that this is in everyone's best interests to get this point over escape windows clarified once and for all - clearly it would be an easier solution for us as Applicants. We're not sure what can be done at this late stage, however we are very willing to agree to a condition that 'if' escape windows are permissible then the staircase won't be built - do you have any other suggestions?

8) You told Members that the proposed staircase would be used for 'access' by Guests staying here - this is not the case, it's emergency use only and in all likelihood we would alarm it.

[Obviously this becomes irrelevant if there is no need for the staircase).

9) A Member asked you (Peter) if there were any windows on the side of Orchard House - to which you replied that the extension was a porch / conservatory and potentially suggested some amenity use by our Neighbours. I did state that it was built as a porch and also housed a boiler. We feel that members should be aware of what it is and perhaps a copy of the plans for Orchard House relating to the recently built porch on Orchard House would assist Members on Thursday(?).

10) No reference was made to the fact that the proposed changes (particularly in respect of the first storey extension to the Main House) greatly improve building efficiency and help

us to lower our CO2 footprint - our understanding is that building efficiency / improved building efficiency and its environmental benefits is a material consideration under current Planning Policy (NPPF, etc).

11) Finally, we are extremely disappointed that it took David Hugill to intervene and talk about the tourism benefits and the fact that we are an Award Winning Accommodation business. We feel you as an LPA have really downplayed the public benefit(s) of this application and we feel that misrepresents our efforts as a business in bringing people to the area, using local suppliers and acting as strong advocates for tourism in North Yorkshire.

Many thanks

Paul and Amy Callin

Woodlands Farm

From: [Woodlands Farm](#)
To: [Helen Laws](#)
Cc: [GEN - Planning Emails](#); [Peter Jones](#); [Louise Hancock](#); [Lynn Turnbull](#)
Subject: RE: Updates List - Planning Ref. 18/02648/FUL
Date: 24 July 2019 23:09:01

Dear Helen

With regards to your document attached to your Officer Report - please note the following:

2.0 (2.8, etc) You do not mention the Enforcement Action threatened for the Window, French Window and Front Door on the front elevation as well as the fence - we feel that this should be added.

4.1 The comments made by the parish Council were on a previous Application - their concerns about the generator, etc have now been remedied and they have declined to comment.

4.3 HDC Environmental health Officer comments - this relate to live in staff who 'live-in' for significant periods and would give their 'accommodation' address as their primary residential address. This is not the case here as we have discussed with Janet and so these concerns are no longer valid as housing rules, etc do not apply.

4.4 Mr Read's comments - they do not have a "conservatory and back porch", they have a porch which also houses a boiler. There is no Conservatory.

5.8 We feel that this misleading it is not the Applicant's statement - it is a Heritage written by an independent IHBC Member who's a recognised expert in heritage building matters. The Heritage Statement is surely there to assess heritage value and she stated that it probably no longer meets the current listing criteria - we believe this to be relevant.

5.10 Please justify why 3 over 3 traditional timber sashes are harmful to the Listed Building? This opinion is contrary to Liz Humble's and this should be made clear to Members.

5.11 There is no evidence to suggest that the windows were ever the same throughout, however there is evidence that historically there was a difference between the window styles (and sizes) between the lower and higher sections of the main property - you fail to disclose this as well as the fact that your view in contradiction to Liz Humble's in the Heritage Statement.

5.19 We feel that we have demonstrated that alternative means of escape via escape windows, etc are not viable and in accordance with current Building Regulations - Liz Humble has supported the siting of the escape staircase and does not support it being moved to the other side (as you have agreed with this view previously).

5.25 We feel is inaccurate, the 1983 changes were far more than a simple Lean-to extension - in fact the whole of the gable end is 1980's 'new build' (hence the different stonework) and the building's footprint was also changed.

5.31 EHO comments - please see above in 4.3 as we do not believe these to be applicable.

5.32 We feel that you need to state that your view as an LPA on heritage 'harm' is directly contrary to the independent opinion of an IHBC Member who sees heritage benefits rather

than harm in the proposals.

Can you also please remove any references to it being a Longhouse (or even Longhouse style) as there is simply no evidence for this - again Liz Humble has confirmed this as there is no historical evidence e.g. common entrance, byre, etc.

Many thanks

Paul and Amy Callin

Woodlands Farm

This message and any attachments (the 'message') are intended solely for the addressees and are confidential. If you receive this message in error, please delete it and immediately notify the sender.

Any use not in accord with its purpose, and dissemination or disclosure, either whole or partial, is prohibited, except with formal approval. The internet cannot guarantee the integrity of this message. Woodlands Farm or the Business's Owners shall not, therefore, be liable for the message, if altered.