

PLANNING COMMITTEE
SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION
Thursday 19th September 2019

Agenda Item	Application number and Parish	Respondent	Comments
1	18/02748/REM Aiskew	Local Resident	See attached correspondence.
		Neighbour	See attached correspondence.
		Officer Note	Note that the description of development in the report refers to 120 dwellings and should refer to 116 dwellings as per the latest amendment.
2	19/01511/FUL Bedale	Applicant	See attached correspondence.
3	19/01110/FUL Brompton		None
4	19/01306/FUL East Harlsey	Officer Note	<p>Para 5.13 of the report incorrectly sets out the levels difference between the finished floor level of the existing house opposite and that of the proposed dwelling as being 'approximately a 3m height difference between the two dwellings with a horizontal separation of 28 metres.' Drawing numbered 120:19/01C indicates that the difference in height between the floor levels of the two dwellings is 1.9m and the distance between the two primary elevations of the Dwellings is 29.5m.</p>
		Agent Note	<p>The gradient of the entrance, along with the parking spaces and the turning areas will all be laid at 1 in 15. The parking spaces extend 21.0m from the edge of the highway to the rear of the main body of the Dwelling, which equates to a rise of 1.4m. The Site Layout Plan on the submitted plans indicate a level on the highway at the entrance of the site as being 110.700 AOD, with a level at the end of the parking spaces of 112.100 AOD.</p> <p>To accommodate the Utility Room door on the North Elevation, a path and stepped approach along that Elevation is need and so the Dwelling has been moved 1.0m further south within the site along</p>

			with a stepped approach up to the front garden area. Amended Drawing numbered 120:19/01D - Site Layout Plan, Ground & First Floor Layout Plans & Elevations as Proposed and attach a copy.
5	19/01139/FUL Husthwaite		None
6	19/00175/FUL Hutton Rudby		None
7	19/01022/OUT Hutton Sessay	Agent	Revised indicative plan showing access to the east side of the site
8	19/01358/REM Huby		None
9	18/02130/FUL Kirklington-cum- Upsland		None
10	19/01037/REM Sowerby	Agent	Portakabin data and warranty information sheet submitted (see attached)
11	19/01568/FUL Stokesley		None

16 SEP 2019

Cttee Item 1

Mr Malcolm McGowan
Bingley House
67 Bedale Road
Aiskew
North Yorkshire
DL8 1DF

15 September 2019

My Ref: 18/02748/REM
Planning Ref: 15/01240/OUT

Dear Ms O'Driscoll

Please find below my feedback and concerns on the above planning application.

- Access from the proposed dwellings should be via the back lane because:
 - Monies were taken from our taxes/rates in order to fund the Bedale bypass to relieve the pressure and preserve the A684 between Aiskew and Bedale. If the residents of the proposed dwellings were allowed to access the A684 through Sandhill lane or a road directly onto the A684 at another location, this would defeat the purpose of developing the bypass and the A6055 service road.
 - Prior to the extension of the A1 motorway, cars were able to access the A1 directly from the back lane, and there is sufficient infrastructure to enable the road to be opened out onto the A6055 service road. Vehicular access to the A6055 from the back lane should be reinstated.

- The footpath up the side of the proposed dwellings should remain a footpath, with the exception of those owners vehicles who have permitted right of access to their property (as of 1986) on the lane leading up to the footpath. No other vehicles or bicycles etc. should be permitted to be allowed up that footpath.

I would be grateful if the above information could be provided for the planning meeting, which I will be attending, on Thursday 19 September 2019.

Regards
Malcolm E. McGowan

Check item 1.

Development Management
Section 48
Hambleton District Council
Civic Centre
Stone Cross
Rotary Way
Northallerton
North Yorkshire
DL6 2UU

HAMBLETON D.C.		
REC'D 17 SEP 2019		
PES	RES	CX
		ACK

20 Sandhill Lane
Aiskew
Bedale
North Yorkshire
DL8 1DA

13th September 2019

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: Your Ref: 18/02748/REM (Wilbert Farm development by Barratt Homes on Sandhill Lane, Aiskew, North Yorkshire)

Thank you for your letter, dated 11th September 2019, regarding the above planning matter. I am unable to attend the meeting of the Planning Committee scheduled for Thursday 19th September, since it is scheduled for 1.30pm on a workday. I am therefore writing to express my views, in the expectation that these points constitute my addressing of the Committee.

1. The Planning Application for the Wilbert Farm development does not appear to include an additional access road onto Bedale Road, which suggests the intention is to have Sandhill Lane stand as the only route onto this proposed new estate. Sandhill Lane is a no-through road, and is not fit for this additional traffic burden. It is narrow, and often congested with parked cars, so any attempt to force the vehicles associated with an additional 120 dwellings (not to mention works traffic associated with the build) through this bottle neck will cause chaos and problematic delays – particularly on approach to the already dangerous Bedale Road/Sandhill Lane mini-roundabout. Moreover, higher population on this estate will increase the likelihood of emergency vehicles needing to get through Sandhill Lane – something that will be incredibly difficult with such increases to traffic. Quite simply, if you want to develop the Wilbert Farm site for housing, an additional access road is required. If this is not possible due to restrictions on surrounding land-use (or even an inability to re-open the end of Back Lane, onto what is now the A1 slip road), then the site is not suitable for residential development. The Highways Department may have decided this is not an issue, but the people who live on the road and use it every day disagree.
2. The ratio of “affordable housing” to housing outside of that criteria in the original application for 105 dwellings on the site was already woefully insufficient at 25%. The application has since been increased to 120 dwellings, while the amount of “affordable housing” has apparently been reduced to 14%. In this, I respectfully draw the attention of the Committee to the *Hambleton Today* article by Stuart Minting, dated September 12th 2019 (“*Cut To Affordable Homes Allocation For Aiskew Development*”) – a copy of which is attached. Such a move on the part of Barratt Homes – citing “higher than expected costs” and a need to increase its own profit margin – is wholly disqualifying in the eyes of this long-term Sandhill Lane resident.
 - a) These property developments are entirely pointless if young adults from the area cannot afford to stay. Such a housing policy leads to the decimation of community and a leeching of skills and talent, as qualified young people are forced to move away from the town to find affordable space.

- b) If a property developer such as Barratt Homes is incapable of correctly estimating the cost of a development the size of this one prior to making their initial planning application, then their competency to complete the build to any standard of quality is questionable at best. Residents of Bedale and Aiskew are already forced to tolerate the regular digging up of Bedale Road following the build of new houses beside the petrol station and its apparent utility/drainage issues.
 - c) If Barratt Homes has discovered, upon closer inspection, that the development of the site will incur such high "unexpected costs" as to cause them to breach the terms upon which planning approval was initially granted, then the site is unsuitable for them.
3. It is clearly the intention of Hambleton District Council to continue to approve the building of new property in Bedale and Aiskew, which is a positive response to the national housing shortage. However, I would expect the council to be visibly working with other agencies to address urgent issues surrounding local schools and healthcare, in conjunction with such developments. It is frankly nonsensical to rapidly expand the population of a town while schools and health services are already under severe strain. Most notably, one would expect the extreme reduction in services at the Friarage Hospital to be a major consideration in any local property development Planning Application.

To be clear, there is a housing crisis in the U.K, and I am all in favour of people having somewhere to live. Further, I welcome those that wish to live in our wonderful town. Our own MP, Rishi Sunak, argued that local residents should embrace Planning Applications because there is a national housing shortage, and people need homes in which to live. This is true, but this current Planning Application for the Wilbert Farm site in Aiskew – with its ridiculously low proportion of affordable housing - manifestly fails to fit that bill.

I would expect our District Council to prioritise the need for affordable housing for its residents over the need for a national property developer to increase its profit margins, and to therefore reject dishonest proposals that have clearly been made in bad faith. I would also expect our District Council to understand the impact of such increased traffic on a no-through road with a dangerous mini-roundabout at its end. Fundamentally, I would expect our District Council to heed the reasonable and legitimate warnings and concerns of those who live here.

It is not the responsibility of Hambleton District Council to ensure the profit margins of a national property developer. It is the obligation of Hambleton District Council to service the needs of the community.

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to this discussion. I look forward to hearing your decision.

Yours sincerely,

Sarah Ivies

Sandhill Lane resident

Cut to affordable homes allocation for Aiskew development



🕒 September 12, 2019 👤 Stuart Minting, Local Democracy Reporter 📄 News 💬 0



Hambleton To
on Friday

Health campaigners he
after NHS bosses unve
to “secure the future” o
at a general hospital w
include an option to ret
and emergency depart



HAMBLETONTODAY.CO.UK
Campaigners hit



we
love
sleep



The location of the proposed development at Wilbert Farm, Aiskew.



Developers of a large housing estate look set to be allowed to create just a third of the target amount of affordable housing in order to maintain their profits at about 20 per cent.

Hambleton District Council planning officers have recommended Barratt Developments, one of the largest residential property development companies in the UK, be granted permission to increase the number of homes it can build at the site at Wilbert Farm, Sandhill Lane, Aiskew, near Bedale from 105 to 116, while reducing the proportion of affordable homes from 25 per cent to 14 per cent.

The proposed changes have stirred controversy in the community with scores of residents raising objections, saying it will create traffic problems in Leeming Bar, Aiskew and Bedale that have been brought about by the new £34m bypass.

The recommendation follows councillors both in Hambleton and neighbouring authorities voicing anger over developers repeatedly "discovering higher than expected costs" after having agreed to build affordable houses.

Councillors, who say building sufficient affordable housing is vital if young people are to be able to remain in communities, have also called into question the limited profit margins that developers claim to be working within.

Hambleton council has previously pointed towards a loophole at the stage of the planning process where developers of large and medium-sized estates are allowed to claim the requisite number of below market value properties would make their schemes unviable, due to costs such as clearing contamination or building roads.

The authority's leader, Councillor Mark Robson has called for a stringent Government policy to stop developers using unforeseen costs as a reason for building estates with less than its affordable housing targets.

Ahead of Hambleton's planning committee considering Barratt's application to change the scheme at the former chicken farm site in Sandhill Lane, officers said while the authority targeted 40 per cent affordable housing on such estates, a report on a basic viability assessment had suggested the scheme could provide at least 28 per cent affordable units.

The lack of significantly higher viability was due to abnormal costs to address highway improvements on the approach to the site, demolition costs and asbestos disposal.

Barratt initially proposed just 12.5 per cent affordable housing before agreeing to double that at planning application approval stage.

However, it said more detailed surveys of the site had led to their costs increasing significantly.

An independent assessment has since concluded a profit rate between 17 and 20 per cent couldn't realistically achieve between 17 and 21 affordable units at the site.

An officers' report to the planning committee states: "This is considered an acceptable position given the high levels of abnormal costs involved in the development of the site."

The report said as the highway authority had advised there were no concerns with the suitability of the access road and the junction with the A684, "despite the high level of local objection in this regard, there is no reasonable case to refuse the application on highways safety grounds".



« **PREVIOUS**

Work to start on Treadmills scheme on site of Northallerton's former prison

NEXT »

Public urged to lobby councillors over Friarage Hospital future



BE THE FIRST TO COMMENT

Leave a Reply

Your email address will not be published.

13th September, 2019

Members of the Planning Committee
Hambleton District Council
Civic Centre
Stone Cross
Rotary way
Northallerton
DL6 2UU

Dear Members,

**Application Number 19/01511/FUL
Residential Development at The Allotment Gardens, Masham Road, Bedale**

At the committee meeting on 25th April, 2019, Arncliffe Homes' application in respect of the above site was refused on 3 grounds. The current report to committee recommends that reasons 2 of the 3 are withdrawn but recommends refusal for "reason 1", namely - failure to provide affordable housing in accordance with Allocations Document Policy BH1.

Allocation BH1 comprises two adjacent parcels of land, each in completely separate ownership. It was a condition of BH1 that the allotments, which were located entirely on land in the ownership of Leeds Diocesan Board of Finance (the Diocese), must be re-located. Alternative locations were considered but no suitable site could be found. There was also a strong objection to any proposed re-location from Bedale Allotments Society, the local community (via a 2,500 signature petition) and the Town Council.

The Diocese would have been happy to relocate the allotments off site, in accordance with BH1, as this would have left them with much more development land extending to twice the size of the current application site. Under those circumstances, the Diocese' development site would have extended to approximately 1 hectare and there would have been no issue concerning affordable housing as the site would have been comfortably in excess of the 0.5 hectares threshold.

However, owing to the failure of all parties to identify a suitable alternative site, and in order to satisfy the strong desire of the Allotments Society and the local community to keep the allotments in their existing location, the Diocese decided to work with the Allotments Society to come up with a compromise solution. As such, it was agreed that the Diocese would forego half its development land, gift it to the Society and pay circa £60k towards the improvement of facilities. As evidenced by the paper recently submitted to the Council by the Allotments Society, they are delighted with the re-modelled allotments and greatly improved facilities which, whilst being on a smaller parcel of land, are more productive than previously.

Bedale Town Council are clearly supportive of the efforts to retain and re-develop the reduced allotment site, as in May 2016 they presented Community Awards to both Secretary Bruce Stainsby and Chairman John Burton in recognition of their drive to protect and retain allotments at their Masham Road site and also for the successful re-development of the retained allotment area. It should also be noted that (a) the Town Council did not oppose the Arncliffe Homes planning application and (b) in March 2016 Hambleton Council granted planning permission for the "Construction of a communal shed" (application 16/00043/FUL) on the allotments site. Presumably this would not have been forthcoming had the LPA considered that the allotments should be re-located. Furthermore, it is noted that Hambleton Council conferred the status of 'Community Asset' on the allotment site, as proposed by Bedale Town Council.

At the committee meeting on 25th April, 2019 one of the members stated that the Diocese' payment of £30k to the Allotments Society was not sufficient to compensate for the loss of affordable housing. The inference was that the Diocese had "got off cheaply" by making the payment in lieu of providing affordable housing. However, the comments are misleading as they misrepresent the sum paid, they fail to recognise efforts to relocate, they ignore the fact that development land was given up to the allotments and also fail to acknowledge the simple fact that the area remaining for development is below the affordable threshold, i.e. it does not apply.

The current report to committee acknowledges that there has been no artificial sub-division of allocation BH1 and that the land is genuinely in two distinct ownerships, neither of which have any control over the other. The report also confirms that the density of the proposed development is appropriate, given the shape and size of the parcel of land available for development. The developable area, after the gift to the Allotments Society, is less than 0.5 hectares and the Arncliffe Homes planning application is for 14 units. It is therefore our view, and that of our planning advisers, that the application should not trigger an affordable housing requirement.

In summary, the decision to pursue this route by the Diocese was taken for common sense reasons, in order to provide what the Allotments Society and community wanted and to release a small sustainable site for development. It is less than 0.5 ha and therefore any refusal on grounds of lack of Affordable Housing provision is simply erroneous and counter to the Council's own policies. We would therefore respectfully request that the members re-consider their position, taking into consideration the matters set out above, and approve the application as submitted.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Stafford
Managing Director