

			<p>with doors closed.</p> <p>Officers raised concerns about whether the expectation was that machinery such as a combine harvester might be brought to site to be worked on. The response was that machinery of this size would be worked on in the field at the client's farm, or otherwise at the location of the machinery and not at Skate Beck.</p>
3	21/01775/OUT	Agent J Saddington	Additional plan supplied to be shown at Committee
4	21/03048/OUT Huby	Ms G Pannett	<p>I'm just sending this Email as I find the handling of this planning application totally unacceptable ! What is the actual point of putting in an objection when literally not one has been listened to ? I live next door and my main concern was privacy noise and the upset caused by the constant complaints that we will receive about our animals , I'm a registered Farmer and we bought this house with a two acre paddock after saving for what seemed a lifetime to achieve our dream , to have it ruined by pure greed ! We bring our sheep here to lamb in spring so we can monitor the lambing and be there throughout to minimise loss ! This can be a very noisy period ,my stables I've waited a lifetime for back on to the bungalows and what do I do when the start kicking the doors etc , live a life in fear of being reported ? By people who may have never lived alongside animals .. The gravel driveway next to our bedroom , which is going to be a nightmare .to say I feel let down is a nightmare it is a lose lose situation for us and win win fir next door . They put stables up without permission , planted a static caravan that is now trashed after many a wild party ! Let the hole place turn into an absoloute disgrace full of rats that we have spent a fortune controlling ! We were good neighbours to them have tolerated so many issues that they have caused as we don't like trouble ! There reward for all thisreward ! Planning permission granted ! Us , do everything by the book , planning etcour reward get told if our animals cause any trouble to our new neighbours , they can report us to the Environment .. could you explain to me how this is in anyway fair ! We are heartbroken by all this as I can just predict the outcome of all this . We don't even need any more housing in Huby the school is at full capacity and not one person is in favour of this except the Moore's .. yours Gillian Pannett x</p>
		Officer response	The above respondent also submitted a screenshot of the Officer report with reference to paragraphs 5.28 and 5.29 (page 51). In response to neighbour comments above additional conditions are recommended to control the access driveway surfacing and boundary

			<p>treatments as follows.</p> <p>Prior to the occupation of the dwellings hereby approved details of the materials to be used in the final surface of the access road shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The access road shall thereafter be constructed in line with the approved details prior to the occupation of the dwellings.</p> <p>Prior to the occupation of the dwellings hereby approved details of the boundary treatments shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The boundary treatments shall thereafter be constructed in line with the approved details and maintained as such for the lifetime of the development.</p>
5	20/02448/FUL Scruton	Officer	Following discussion with the Ramblers Association, it is recommended that a condition be added to the recommendation limiting the height of the boundary fence, adjacent the PROW to 1m in height.
6	22/00321/FUL Scruton	Officer	<p>Policy EG8 is relevant to this application and states:</p> <p>Protection of the visitor economy New development must ensure that it can be integrated effectively with existing visitor attractions and accommodation. Proposals for development that would prejudice the operation or use of existing visitor attractions, facilities or accommodation will not be supported.</p> <p>In determining the application Members must consider the potential for the development to impact on the adjacent holiday cottage business. There is potential, through noise, vehicular movements and loss of outlook, for the proposals to have an adverse impact on the holiday cottages. It is officer opinion, that through the controls set out in conditions and the existing lawful use of the site, the proposed development will not have any significant impact in these terms.</p> <p>The applicant has set out a connection between the proposed business and the existing livery business on the site. It is considered that the operation of the businesses separate from the occupation of the dwelling on site would result in a conflict. As such should the application be</p>

		<p>Renotification</p> <p>Objection</p>	<p>approved an additional condition is recommended to tie the occupation of the dwelling to the running of the businesses. Concern has been expressed about external lighting and as such a condition is recommended on this basis.</p> <p>Condition. The businesses located at Field House Equestrian shall only be operated by the occupier of the associated dwelling on the site, known as Field House.</p> <p>Condition. No external lighting shall be installed except in compliance with a lighting scheme that has first been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The lighting shall then be installed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>The site location was amended by the applicant and a further 10 days given for comments. This period expires on the 16 May.</p> <p>An additional objection has been received from the neighbouring occupier, summarised below:</p> <p>This scheme is contrary to every criterion under which a business might warrant a countryside location, as set out in Policy EG7 It does not involve the re-use of an existing building: it is not well related to any existing rural settlement: nor is it shown that it cannot be located within a nearby settlement or within an identified employment location (for example, barely 2km distant in Leeming Bar): nor does it 'specifically require' a countryside location. It is claimed that the 'workshop' would accommodate the applicant's Worcestershire model making business, the profits from which would allow investment in equestrian use. It is claimed that a unit on an employment site is beyond the resources of the model making business, this is doubtful or conjecture. Nothing links the mooted permission to the equestrian business or to the applicant, nor indeed, is there any restriction on the potential use of the structure. There is no guarantee of any financial synergy between the proposed building and the existing livery, but also the terms of the permission currently suggested permit a host of uses</p>
--	--	--	--

		Officer	<p>wholly unacceptable in this, or any other, isolated rural location.</p> <p>The relative freedom in this application contrasts with the relative care taken to control the scope of previously permitted employment uses in terms of noise insulation and management by the occupants of Field House. Similar arrangements controlled the sale of equestrian goods and later the wider sales of listed agricultural, garden, pet and equestrian goods.</p> <p>In contrast, there is no functional connection between the manufacture of models and the keeping and stabling of horses.</p> <p>Concern that small machines can be as noisy as large ones.</p> <p>Consider that the preparation of an acoustic report would have been particularly straightforward in this instance as the machinery is supposedly already installed and operating in Worcestershire.</p> <p>Given the proximity of the 'workshop' to residential uses, the failure to properly ensure a high standard of amenity for neighbouring residents is simply to ignore the statutory requirements imposed by Policy E2.</p> <p>The Planning Officer notes that a condition could be imposed to control the noise emitted from the 'workshop', but fails to suggest one, save for requesting details of the machinery and ventilation equipment. It may be that a suitable condition emerges at the committee meeting.</p> <p>There is a failure to examine the noise from the proposed 'workshop' in the light of Policy EG8, which looks to protect existing visitor attractions and accommodation.</p> <p>There is no assessment of how the possible contribution to the rural economy from the potential 5 additional manufacturing jobs might be offset by the decline in visitor spending due to the resulting unattractiveness of the holiday cottages.</p> <p>There is no assessment on the parking and manoeuvring of 5 additional cars close to the private amenity areas of the cottages.</p> <p>The building would obscure some existing views of the open countryside.</p> <p>The windowless walls and corrugated roof would create an alien industrial presence</p> <p>Fails to protect or enhance the openness and special character of the landscape, as required by Policy E7.</p> <p>The intrusive presence of this industrial building would be exacerbated by the installation of LED lighting 'throughout' (obviously evident through the numerous roof lights) and the possibility of security lighting in the yard.</p> <p>The issues raised around the principle of development are covered within the report. Matters</p>
--	--	---------	---

		Response	<p>pertaining to noise disturbance are again covered in the report. However, should Members consider that additional information should be sought on this issue, it is understood that the applicant would be happy to have an acoustic report prepared. Should this be the case, the matter could be delegated to officers to conclude the acoustic measures required.</p> <p>The objection sets out concerns about the industrial appearance of the building. However, officers consider that the site already has a somewhat industrial appearance from the existing buildings and the location and size of the proposal results in only minor change in this respect.</p> <p>It is officers view that subject to the conditions set out in the recommendation along with the two additional conditions recommended in this update, that the development can be implemented without significant harm.</p>
7	21/02972/MRC	(None)	
8	22/00686/REM South Kilvington	Officer	<p>Arboricultural impact assessment received, the buildings are all outside the root protection areas, there is a slight infringement by the drives (shown by the pale blue on the impact assessment), but these are within acceptable percentages in regards to BS5837. The survey identifies the 5 trees along the site frontage (4 x Sycamore and 1 x Common Lime) as 4 x category A2 trees and 1 x C2, and recommends works to three of the trees comprising 'crown lift to provide 3.5m clearance above the path, and formatively prune provide 2m clearance from hedge. These trees are protected by a TPO and the applicant will have to apply to carry out the works to these trees</p> <p>Additional condition (6) The development shall not be commenced until the protective fencing has been erected, and ground protection measures undertaken in accordance with drawing number BA11504TPP P, and no existing trees shall be topped, lopped, felled or uprooted, materials stored, machines or huts stationed or temporary site roads and accesses constructed other than in complete accordance with the plans approved by the Local Planning Authority under condition 2 above. Erection of protective fencing is required before commencement in order to ensure adequate protection of trees at all stages of the development process, including site clearance.</p>

			Amend condition 2 to include drawing number BA11504TPP P received by Hambleton District Council on 10 May 2022 NO DETAILS SUBMITTED YET IN RELATION TO BNG. DEFER?
9	22/00007/TPO2	(None)	