

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**  
**1 July Update list**

Agenda Item	Application number and Parish	Respondent	Comments
1	21/00404/FUL – West Tanfield	Mrs T J Collier	<p>Neighbour Representation (Objection) – Appended as “appendix 2” and summarised below:</p> <p>1 – Access routes and parking have not been adequately addressed. There is a risk of further erosion of the countryside due to the potential for associated hardstanding and further landscaping to be incorporated into the operation of the proposed building.</p> <p>2 – The report is incorrect in its description of the proposed site as “relating closely” to the established building line.</p> <p>3 – There is a lack of evidence to support the proposal and so there are insufficient means to weigh the proposal against Policy CP4.</p> <p>4 – There is a risk of further development between the existing curtilage and the proposed site. The site is likely to become a builder’s yard within the countryside. CP4 is not being sufficiently implemented to protect the landscape. There is a lack of detail within the application which has curtailed the opportunity for potential contributors to have a voice.</p> <p>5 – A landscaping and visual impact assessment has not been provided, despite a numbers of features of interest nearby.</p> <p>6 – The proposed development is a threat to the heritage of Thornborough Henge and the Nosterfield Nature Reserves and may hinder the ongoing protection of these places.</p> <p>7 – There has never been a building within the proposed site and the siting of one will change the character of the open countryside. The shed will not be used for agricultural purposes. The shed will precipitate discordant, dominant and obvious changes to landscape views and will result in the loss of the landscape’s characteristic features.</p>

Agenda Item	Application number and Parish	Respondent	Comments
		<p data-bbox="465 810 618 871">Mr Dominic Collier</p> <p data-bbox="465 911 685 1075">Officer Response (in order of comments made above)</p>	<p data-bbox="712 268 2002 328">8 – There has been an increase in land being used for domestic purposes and these changes are a threat to the Nosterfield environment as a whole.</p> <p data-bbox="712 368 2002 429">9 – The size of the proposed new shed is excessive and overbearing in the landscape and the 2013 development could be extended. There are other alternatives to the proposed scheme.</p> <p data-bbox="712 469 2002 529">10 – The harm to the environment is not justified by the need to store things which could be stored in the 2013 development.</p> <p data-bbox="712 569 2047 668">11 – Opposed to the permission of storage of builders materials and of the storage of domestic items within the proposed building. There should be a change of use application submitted as part of the due process.</p> <p data-bbox="712 708 2047 769">Images document from objector attached as document “appendix1”. This should be viewed in conjunction with “appendix 2” as both documents refer to each other.</p> <p data-bbox="712 809 2047 869">Objects to the proposal. Advises that all comments, images and representation at the planning committee meeting submitted by Mrs Collier are collective from Mr and Mrs Collier.</p> <p data-bbox="712 909 2047 1043">1 – Access appears to be through established points to the north-east and the south-west of the site, with parking not usually a consideration for developments either for private use or at a significant distance from the public highway. Landscaping and hardstanding has not been considered as it has not been applied for.</p> <p data-bbox="712 1083 2047 1217">2 – It is acknowledged that the site is outside of the existing curtilage within the officer report. The relationship referred to relates to the position of the structure being within a distance to that building line that allows for it to be read in context with Stonehaven and Nosterfield more widely, indicating that it is not an isolated structure in the countryside.</p> <p data-bbox="712 1257 2047 1318">3. The report considers that Policy CP4 has not been met and also discusses considerations of justification.</p> <p data-bbox="712 1358 2047 1380">4 – CP4 seeks to prevent development that is inappropriate to a countryside setting which is balanced</p>

Agenda Item	Application number and Parish	Respondent	Comments
			<p>with material considerations and the level of “harm” to the countryside and other material considerations. The Council is unable to assess a scheme based on development which has not occurred – the proposed plans do not include a scheme involving the area between the curtilage and the proposed site and do not suggest that the site will be solely used as a builder’s yard.</p> <p>5 - Whilst there are a number of features of interest within the local area there are a variety of reasons that a landscape and visual impact assessment has not been pursued; the low-level and small-scale nature of the proposed structure, the agricultural style of the structure, retention of significant boundary treatments, the distance between the site and any public highway. For these reasons it is considered that the landscape impact would be minimal from mid- to long-range views and that an assessment would not be required.</p> <p>6 – The proposed scheme is considered to be at such a distance from both the Henge and the Nature Reserve that there will be no immediate harm to both sites. It is further considered that the application of conditions requiring an archaeological assessment and the fitting of bat boxes would prevent and mitigate any incidental harm caused by the proposed development.</p> <p>7 – Whilst historical plans do not suggest previous development within the site this does not necessarily preclude development where harm is not identified. In this case, it is considered that the structure will accord with the character and appearance of the area and will not cause wider harm. It is further considered that conditions requiring the removal of materials from the wider site will improve the character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>8 – In general terms, i.e. those relating to Nosterfield, trends within the wider area will not have a large impact on the decision-making process, where each application is weighed upon its own merit. In terms specific to this site, it is considered that the proposal does not increase the domestic use in a manner with is inappropriate to the area.</p> <p>9 and 10 – As above, each application is weighed upon its own merit and the use of existing structures have been discussed with the agent and the applicant, but there is not deemed to be enough harm caused to make this a viable position for the Council to pursue. The officer report sets out that the existing building is able to be used for a mixed domestic, hobbies and agricultural use.</p>





Agenda Item	Application number and Parish	Respondent	Comments
5	21/00630/FUL  Huby	Officer note	<p>An amended site plan has been received on 29.06.21; drawing number D420025/01 revision C showing the drive, parking and turning area to be resin bound gravel with a 150mm wide brick sett edging at the gate to comply with the highway conditions requiring 'The final surfacing of any parking area shall not contain any loose material that is capable of being drawn on to the existing public highway.</p> <p>Condition 2 is updated to read:-</p> <p>The permission hereby granted shall not be undertaken other than in complete accordance with the location plan received by Hambleton District Council on 9 March 2021, drawing numbered D420025/01C received by Hambleton District Council on 29 June 2021, and drawing numbered D420025/02B received by Hambleton District Council on 18 May 2021 unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p>
6			
7			
8	21/00749/FUL  Crakehall	Environmental Health	<p>The Environmental Health Officer has offered further expansion on her initial no objection response to clarify this position.</p> <p><i>The proposed development would introduce a residential property close to an existing farm and there is the potential for nuisance to future occupiers from noise and smells. However, the information provided with the application has recognised the possibility of adverse impact and has sought to mitigate the impact through the design, location and orientation of the proposed development, such that any impact will be minimised. In addition, there are already several residential properties close to the farm and our records show that there have been no complaints about noise or odour from these properties in the last 10 years. Taking these factors into</i></p>

Agenda Item	Application number and Parish	Respondent	Comments
			<p><i>consideration, I consider that there is the potential for slight adverse impact from the farm, but no reason to recommend refusal, or conditions. The development itself will not have an adverse impact on the nearby existing residential properties.</i></p> <p><i>My recommendation below was based on the above factors.</i></p> <p><i>This service has considered the potential impact on amenity and likelihood of the development to cause a nuisance and consider that there will be no negative impact. Therefore the Environmental Health Service has no objections.</i></p>
9			