

**HOWARDIAN HILLS
AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY
JOINT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
1 APRIL 2010**

DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE AONB

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To receive details of planning applications determined within the AONB during 2009.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 At the spring meeting, the JAC receives an annual report on the number and type of planning applications determined within the AONB during the previous year. This procedure was started for the first time in 1998 and gives an impression of the degree of development pressure within the AONB.

3.0 DEVELOPMENT DURING 2009

3.1 A summary of planning applications determined during 2009 appears in Appendix 1. Details have been included of all applications within the period which were approved or refused by the two principal local planning authorities – Hambleton and Ryedale District Councils. Details have not been included of applications which were withdrawn or where a decision was still pending at the end of the year.

3.2 It is clearly important not to read too much into this information. Nothing can be deduced about the scale of development or its visual impact. Nevertheless the following appear to be the most significant conclusions:

- The AONB is still under relatively little development pressure; even more so during 2009, with 50% fewer applications being determined compared to 2008. It is assumed that this has been due to the recession, as the biggest decreases have been in the Residential (both New Build and Conversions) and Householder categories.
- 95% of applications determined were approved, a figure that is significantly higher than the 5-year average of 90%. One possible interpretation is that the recession has eliminated the more speculative building developments seen during 2007 and 2008, when Approval rates dropped to the mid-80s%. This speculative/more ambitious development is the type that is probably more likely to be refused.
- Development continues to be spread across nearly all villages, but with higher numbers of applications understandably being seen in the larger villages (albeit with reduced numbers across the board). Gilling East appears to be the only parish where development has continued at a similar level to 2008, which is probably due to the development taking place on the Village Hall site.

- Most pressure was for small-scale householder applications e.g. residential extensions. The number of ‘commercial’ applications (in the Business & Commercial, Tourism & Recreation and Agriculture categories) seems to have bucked the trend of the recession and gone up by 100%. An increase from 2 to 4 is probably not statistically significant however!
- The AONB continues to be under relatively little tourist and recreational development pressure. Two applications were determined in this category this year.
- A number of significant applications and cases can be highlighted from the past year – applications for new agricultural buildings at Coulton, Gilling and Brandsby; and the erection of an 18m wind turbine at Yearsley (Refused) and 15m at Ampleforth (Approved). More applications for on-farm wind turbines in the 12-15m category are expected in the future.

3.3 In the financial year 2009/10, which obviously does not quite overlap with the calendar year 2009, 37 applications were scrutinised by the JAC, having either been referred in accordance with the agreed consultation procedure or called-up by the AONB Manager. The AONB Manager submitted comments on 21 of these consultations; objections/strong reservations were lodged in 1 of those responses; the District Council followed the JAC's recommendations of refusal, or the applicants re-submitted a more acceptable proposal, in 0 out of the cases where a decision was required (although the applicant did subsequently work closely with the AONB Manager to achieve an acceptable outcome). This has been a fairly quiet year for planning applications, although they do seem to come along in batches. A slightly smaller number of responses were made than in 2008/09, but there were fewer large or contentious proposals. In many cases the comments submitted were very minor in nature, although nonetheless important in order to get a ‘good result’ for the AONB landscape. Many of the comments made relate to the colour of materials and wall/roof finishes. Although a Condition is often placed on the development by the District Council, it is only once the development takes place that we can see whether our comments have been successful or not. Members should note that we have very little control over the workload generated by this area of our work, as it is dependent upon the number and type of applications submitted.

3.4 Copies of the 7 planning consultation responses made since the last meeting of the JAC are attached for information. The latest information on the outcome of these applications is contained in Appendix 3 of Item 3 on the Agenda.

4.0 RECOMMENDATION

That the report be received for information.

Appendix 1

Howardian Hills AONB											
Applications Determined by											
Type of Development											
(Number of applications and % approved)											
Ryedale Parishes	2005		2006		2007		2008		2009		5yr Average 2005-2009
Residential - New Build	7		10		15		16		2		10
		86%		90%		60%		88%		50%	
Residential - Conversions	10		11		14		15		1		10
		90%		91%		86%		66%		100%	
Holiday - Conversions	2		2		1		1		0		1
		100%		50%		100%		100%		~	
Householder	63		59		68		67		49		61
		94%		95%		87%		87%		98%	
Retail	0		2		0		0		0		0
		~		100%		~		~		~	
Business and Commercial	2		1		1		1		2		1
		100%		100%		100%		100%		100%	
Minerals and Waste	0		0		0		0		0		0
		~		~		~		~		~	
Tourism and Recreation	2		3		2		0		2		2
		100%		100%		100%		~		50%	
Community Facilities	2		0		1		0		0		1
		100%		~		100%		~		~	
Agriculture	8		5		7		0		0		4
		88%		60%		71%		~		~	
Other	15		37		16		26		14		22
		100%		95%		100%		96%		100%	
Total Ryedale	111		130		125		126		70		112
		94%		92%		85%		87%		96%	
Hambleton Parishes	2005		2006		2007		2008		2009		5yr Average 2005-2009
Residential - New Build	0		1		1		2		1		1
		~		100%		0%		100%		100%	
Residential - Conversions	0		0		0		0		0		0
		~		~		~		~		~	
Holiday - Conversions	0		0		0		1		0		0
		~		~		~	100%		~		
Householder	23		15		19		16		6		16
		96%		93%		95%		94%		83%	
Retail	0		0		0		0		0		0
		~		~		~		~		~	
Business and Commercial	0		0		0		1		0		0
		~		~		~	100%		~		
Minerals and Waste	0		0		0		0		0		0
		~		~		~		~		~	
Tourism and Recreation	2		1		0		0		0		1
		100%		100%		~		~		~	
Community Facilities	0		0		0		0		0		0
		~		~		~		~		~	
Agriculture	1		3		3		2		1		2
		100%		67%		33%		50%		100%	
Other	3		4		0		6		1		3
		100%		100%		~		66%		100%	
Total Hambleton	29		24		23		28		9		23
		97%		92%		83%		86%		89%	
TOTAL HOWARDIAN HILLS AONB	140		154		148		154		79		135
		94%		92%		84%		86%		95%	90%

Howardian Hills AONB						
Applications Determined by Parish						
						5yr Average
<u>Ryedale Parishes</u>	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2005-2009
Ampleforth	14	12	7	16	7	11
Bulmer	5	6	7	3	1	4
Cawton	5	2	3	5	2	3
Coneysthorpe	?	0	0	0	0	0
Coulton	5	3	8	5	2	5
Crambe	2	0	4	6	0	2
Gilling East	9	10	9	12	12	10
Grimstone	1	0	1	12	3	3
Henderskelfe	0	2	2	2	1	1
Hovingham	4	19	6	8	4	8
Howsham	2	5	6	3	4	4
Huttons Ambo	10	6	8	5	5	7
Nunnington	5	2	6	7	4	5
Oswaldkirk	5	8	9	5	3	6
Scackleton	2	2	6	2	5	3
Sheriff Hutton (High Stittenham)	1	5	2	5	1	3
Sproxton	2	3	8	2	3	4
Stonegrave	5	5	6	6	0	4
Terrington	14	17	15	16	7	14
Welburn	16	22	5	6	6	11
Whitwell-on-the Hill	1	0	0	0	0	0
Total Ryedale	108	129	118	126	70	110
<u>Hambleton Parishes</u>						
Brandsby-cum-Stearsby	6	6	7	8	1	6
Coxwold	0	1	0	0	0	0
Crayke	7	12	7	6	3	7
Dalby-cum-Skewsby	3	1	2	0	3	2
Hustwaite	0	0	1	4	0	1
Newburgh	7	2	0	0	0	2
Oulston	3	0	4	4	1	2
Thornton-on-the-Hill	0	1	0	1	0	0
Whenby	0	0	0	0	0	0
Yearsley	3	1	2	5	1	2
Total Hambleton	29	24	23	28	9	23
TOTAL HOWARDIAN HILLS AONB	137	153	141	154	79	133