

Paul Jackson

From: Paul Jackson
Sent: 02 April 2014 12:55
To: planning@hambleton.gov.uk
Subject: 14/00360/FUL: Change of use of domestic garage/workshop to a dwelling; Oak Cottage, Crayke

I have the following comments to make in respect of this application:

1. I note that the application site is outside the Development Limit for Crayke. Although the Design and Access Statement expresses great surprise that this is the case, the extent of the Development Limit was re-confirmed in 2010 as part of the Sites Allocation DPD of the Hambleton Local Development Framework. The assessment of the Development Limit is therefore relatively recent and in this location (Conservation Area, AONB) I don't believe that there are any paragraphs of the NPPF which might indicate that the Development Limit as mapped in 2010 should be set aside as a material consideration.
2. My principal concern with this application relates to the loss of an ancillary building serving a relatively large dwelling and domestic garden area. Whilst the garage may currently be under-used, if this application is Permitted then it would appear that the dwelling will have very few ancillary storage/amenity buildings, garage, etc. It is therefore not difficult to foresee, at some stage in the future, an application for a replacement garage/workshop, because with a dwelling/garden of this size one would expect to have at least a garage. This would need to be accessed from the current parking area in front of Oak Cottage, indicating that it would probably be towards the front of the domestic curtilage. The frontage along this part of Church Hill is characterised by relatively low density housing, with significant areas of green space in between, and hence a new ancillary building in such a location could have a significantly detrimental impact on the street scene of the Crayke Conservation Area.
3. In my view the location outside the Development Limit would be sufficient grounds for Refusal if the LPA was so minded, as my concerns about possible future development of a replacement building may well be difficult to factor into the decision-making process for the current application. They are however something that the LPA, and particularly the applicant, should be aware of should an application for a replacement building be submitted in the near future.

Paul Jackson
Howardian Hills AONB Manager
The Mews, Wath Court
Hovingham
York
YO62 4NN

Tel: 0845 034 9495 / NYCC ext 6775
Mob: 07715 009426
Web: www.howardianhills.org.uk

Landscapes
for life
.org.uk



HOWARDIAN
HILLS
One of the
AONB family

Paul Jackson

From: dm@ryedale.gov.uk
Sent: 02 April 2014 16:32
To: Paul Jackson
Subject: Consultee Comments for Planning Application 14/00250/FUL

Mr Paul Jackson,

You have been sent this email because you or somebody else has submitted a consultee comment on a Planning Application to your local authority using your email address. A summary of your comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 4:20 PM on 02 Apr 2014 from paul.jackson@northyorks.gov.uk.

Application Summary

Reference: 14/00250/FUL
Address: The Garden Bungalow Kirkham Kirkham
Abbey Malton YO60 7JS
Proposal: Erection of a three bedroom dwelling and
detached garage following demolition of
existing two bedroom dwelling

Case Officer: Matthew Mortonson

[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

I visited the site on 27th March and have the following observations to make: 1) Whilst at first glance the proposal appears to be relatively modest, its location on a prominent hillside within the setting of both designated and non-designated heritage assets causes I believe some significant issues. 2) The current dwelling is single storey, small in scale and has a simple roof line and stone-coloured walls. It is well-proportioned within the (non-designated) heritage asset of the walled garden and glasshouses of Kirkham Hall, giving the impression of a 'gardener's bothy'. The **Comments:** walled garden and glasshouses form a very significant visual feature of the Kirkham Abbey area, particularly when viewed from the western side of the river/railway line. 3) When viewed from the western side of the river, by the level crossing, the dwelling sits in direct line of sight behind one of the most substantial remaining elements of Kirkham Priory, so any development in the walled garden could also have a significant effect on the setting of the Grade 1 Listed Kirkham Priory. 4) Although the principle of a replacement dwelling is not a particular issue, I have strong concerns that the replacement dwelling proposed would have a

significant detrimental impact on the setting of both the walled garden and Kirkham Priory. The proposed dwelling is taller, at 1.5 storeys, but the desire to keep the ridgeline as low as possible has also led to the use of dormers which I believe create a 'fussy' design which will increase the visual impact of the building. Because the proposed dwelling is taller and has more design details than the current simple structure, I feel that it will be out-of-proportion in the setting of the walled garden and also create a significant visual intrusion in the backdrop (setting) of Kirkham Priory. 5) Rather reluctantly, because I didn't expect there to be a major issue with this proposal, I feel that I need to OBJECT to the proposal in order to see whether a different solution can be achieved. As mentioned above, I don't feel that the principle of a replacement dwelling is a major issue, but I feel that it ought to be single storey (even if with a larger footprint) and of a simple design. The proposal to use slate roofing and render of a similar stone colour as currently is supported and would also work well with a simpler single storey design. 6) As regards the ancillary building, the garage is of a size that would match the scale of the walled garden and timber cladding is an appropriate material for such a setting. It should however be stained in a dark colour. Paul Jackson

Paul Jackson

From: dm@ryedale.gov.uk
Sent: 04 April 2014 12:13
To: Paul Jackson
Subject: Consultee Comments for Planning Application 13/00728/FUL

Mr Paul Jackson,

You have been sent this email because you or somebody else has submitted a consultee comment on a Planning Application to your local authority using your email address. A summary of your comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 12:01 PM on 04 Apr 2014 from paul.jackson@northyorks.gov.uk.

Application Summary

Reference: 13/00728/FUL

Address: The Croft Main Street Welburn Malton
YO60 7EQ

Proposal: Erection of 3 no. 4 bedroom dwellings and
1 no. detached garage following demolition
of existing dwelling, and formation of
vehicular access.

Case Officer: Rachel Smith

[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

In my response of 22nd October 2013 to version 2 of the proposals for this site, I indicated that I felt that the siting of the garage of Plot 3 was unacceptable in the street scene of Welburn. This aspect of the design has not changed in these new proposals and therefore my Objection raised on 22/10/13 stands. Neither of the developments of more modern housing on either side of this site has ancillary buildings located in front of the dwellings and I still feel that this would be an incongruous feature in the street scene. Paul Jackson

Paul Jackson

From: Paul Jackson
Sent: 08 April 2014 17:44
To: planning@hambleton.gov.uk
Subject: 14/00527/FUL: Retrospective permission for the level of excavation of soil; High Side, Brandsby

It's difficult to know how to respond to this application.

If the level of excavation needed to implement in particular the proposed new driveway and garage had been appreciated during consideration of the original planning application, then I would have objected to it. It is difficult to understand how the scheme was submitted by the applicant and agent without apparent appreciation of the substantial excavation that was going to be necessary simply to fit the proposed development on the site.

Understanding of what is proposed is somewhat hampered by the lack of reference numbers on the diagram showing the location of the cross sections, but I'm concerned about the phrase "driveway levelled to original ground level by digging down" on section BB. From my recollection on the site visit, the driveway base was already a significant way below original ground level, although of course this would presumably be built up again with aggregate to form the final driveway. Nonetheless, I'm concerned about the need for *further* excavation on the site.

Likewise, mention is made of eliminating the dangerous sloping along the driveway when approaching the proposed garage and new extension. Given the contours of the land, this would imply further digging down of the driveway so as to create a cutting – I cannot see how the slope of the driveway can be significantly mitigated without the need for substantial further excavation, due to the contours of the land and the limited space involved. For example, cross section DD shows a levelled area in front of the new garage. If that area is levelled, by definition it is going to increase the height differential between that point and the highest point of the drive – and the only way that can be mitigated is by further excavation of the driveway.

In general I find the hand-drawn cross sections and reference map (with no reference numbers on it) rather amateurish and I am not convinced that they give an accurate representation of what further excavation work will be needed in order to implement the development.

In general the site is now a complete mess and is very definitely not the kind of sympathetic development we would expect in the AONB. The original ethos of subtly incorporating a new driveway through a wooded area is completely out of the window, simply due to the amount of excavation needed to wrangle the drive and garage onto the site.

Having said all the above however, we are where we are with this site. If the LPA is happy that the submitted plans give an accurate representation of what further work is going to be carried out, that this can be adequately Conditioned and enforced if necessary, and that it will result in a satisfactory development within the AONB then I have no objection to the scheme. The principal aim from here on must be to repair the damage already done and to integrate the development back into the AONB landscape. That could either be by Approval of this application, or by Refusal and enforcement action if necessary to reinstate.

Paul Jackson
Howardian Hills AONB Manager
The Mews, Wath Court
Hovingham
York
YO62 4NN

Tel: 0845 034 9495 / NYCC ext 6775

Paul Jackson

From: Paul Jackson
Sent: 09 April 2014 13:24
To: planning@hambleton.gov.uk
Subject: 14/00467/FUL: Creation of campsite with ancillary buildings and car park; Newburgh Priory

I visited the site on 2nd April, with the applicant, and have the following comments to make:

1. In general I'm happy with the proposed positioning of the yurts and their relationship with, and any potential impact on the setting of, both Newburgh Priory and the Registered Park and Garden. Although the fabric will in essence be white in colour, the screening offered by adjacent and intervening trees during the summer months when the yurts are actually on site will limit the views of the site from the Priory itself. The LPA may however wish to consider a Condition that specifies the period during which the yurts may be present on site, although this should be adequately flexible in order to accommodate variations in seasonal weather such as an 'Indian' summer.
2. The timber boarding on the ancillary toilet and shower buildings should be stained in a dark brown or green colour, so as to blend with the woodland setting.
3. Although the car park area is not large, and glimpses of cars parked there are only likely to be fleeting, this element could present a discordant feature in the parkland landscape which, at this point, is otherwise devoid of unnatural 'man-made' features. I feel that it is essential to incorporate some screening planting of deciduous species (the car park should only be in use in connection with the development during the months of the year when leaves are on the trees) between the car park area and the entrance gate. This would also help to mitigate any adverse impacts on the setting of the Listed gate piers.
4. The impact on the setting of the gate piers is also a significant factor in relation to the verge crossing that will be needed between the gates themselves and the public highway. The Condition required by the Highway Authority gives some flexibility in relation to the materials that could be used to construct the verge crossing, and these should be chosen so as to complement the existing historic fabric as much as possible. Conservation kerbing, in probably the Harvest Buff colour, should be used rather than standard concrete kerbing. Likewise, the surface finish may perhaps be better in concrete rather than plain black tarmac, although I understand from a conversation with Graham Hind at NYCC that the standard road chippings hot-rolled into tarmac would also provide a satisfactory surface. These would give a greyer finish than the plain tarmac.

In summary, I feel that the elements of this application which present some challenges to the AONB landscape and historic environment can be adequately mitigated via some landscape planting and careful choice of materials, and the facility itself will provide an interesting addition to the range of visitor accommodation available within the AONB.

Paul Jackson
Howardian Hills AONB Manager
The Mews, Wath Court
Hovingham
York
YO62 4NN

Tel: 0845 034 9495 / NYCC ext 6775
Mob: 07715 009426
Web: www.howardianhills.org.uk

Howardian Hills

Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

The Mews, Wath Court
Hovingham, York, YO62 4NN

T. 08450 349 495
E. info@howardianhills.org.uk
W. www.howardianhills.org.uk

A joint partnership funded by Defra, North Yorkshire County Council (Host Authority), Ryedale District Council and Hambleton District Council; also involving Ryedale and Hambleton Parish Councils, Natural England, Country Land and Business Association, National Farmers Union, Ramblers and Forestry Commission

Development Management
Ryedale District Council
Ryedale House
Malton
North Yorks
YO17 7HH

Contact: Paul Jackson

My Reference:

Date: 8 May 2014

Dear Sirs

14/000257/FUL: Change of use of agricultural barn to day centre with associated parking, etc; Park House Farm, Gilling

I have the following comments to make in relation to this application:

- 1. Principle.** In principle I would support this development. It offers a new use for a redundant set of agricultural buildings which have been disused for many years and which are gradually decaying. The proposed use has a potentially high benefit to society as a whole, allowing the applicant's clients to experience the tranquillity of the AONB and utilise both this and the 'resources' offered by the buildings and surrounding land to improve their quality of life.
- 2. Design.** The only elements of design that I would normally query are the proposed full-height gable window on the western elevation and the proposed clear finish to all external woodwork. In general full-height gable windows are to be avoided as they can create significant reflections and hence draw attention to buildings in a wider landscape context. In this instance however the gable is west facing and will only reflect the sun during the latter part of summer days (no sun reaches this location during winter months, due to the steep bank to the south). The only residential property directly affected is to the west, and I hope that reflections experienced by properties in Ampleforth village would be minimal due to the separation distance and angles of viewing. In this instance therefore, and accepting that form may need to follow function for this particular building, I wouldn't necessarily wish to object to the full-height window. External woodwork on farm building conversions would normally be finished in a paint colour appropriate to the origin of the buildings, often an olive green or red. The farm building conversion that houses the AONB office has unpainted timber framed windows however in the former cart shed openings, so I have no objections to that element of the design either.
- 3. Car park.** I feel that the car park needs an element of landscaping associated with it, rather than being demarcated only by a timber fence. The supporting documentation indicates the potential for 25 FTE members of staff, which it must be assumed will mean a minimum of 25 cars. When added to an unknown number of visitors cars (see below) this will create a significant visual intrusion that will detract from both the traditional farm buildings and the AONB landscape. **This element of the scheme must therefore be re-designed so as to minimise its potentially adverse impact on the AONB landscape.**

4. **Traffic.** Whilst it will be for the Highway Authority to make recommendations as to whether they consider the single track public road to be adequate or not, from the perspective of quiet enjoyment of the Gilling valley by walkers and cyclists I have concerns about the level of traffic that this road will be expected to cope with should the application be approved. This has increased significantly in recent years, due to a number of existing and potential sources:
- a) Existing – Large farm machinery, accessing the majority of the arable land between Gilling and Ampleforth. There is no other access to the Ampleforth Abbey farmland other than via Gilling village.
 - b) Existing – Traffic passing between Ampleforth College and St Martins Ampleforth (Gilling Castle). This is principally at each end of the school day, with many parents needing to drop day pupils at both schools due to the respective ages of their children.
 - c) Existing – Nero Training Centre at Redcar House (beyond the Park Farm site). Level of traffic generation unknown.
 - d) Existing – Obstruction of the road/passing places on winter Saturdays during home rugby matches. An area of farmland was converted to rugby pitches for St Martins Ampleforth school in 2005/6 (see application ref. 05/01182/MFUL). Condition 07 (visitor parking on site) and the Informative (visitor parking on the public highway) have never been observed, resulting in significant vehicle movements/parking at certain times of the day/year.
 - e) Existing – Miniature railway/Village Hall at the western end of Gilling village. The miniature railway in particular has quite a number of car-borne visitors during its Open Weekends. Many of these park in the grass field, unless wet ground conditions necessitate on-road parking.
 - f) Existing – Fairfax Arms, Gilling village – This popular pub has a very small off-road car park. Inconsiderate (and technically illegal) parking regularly occurs right on the junction of Pottergate and the B1257, turning the junction itself into a single-lane road with a significantly reduced turning radius.
 - g) Potential – There is an extant planning permission (see Hambleton DC ref. 11/02350/FUL) for a 15-pitch touring caravan site at Redcar House (beyond Park Farm), for which the only means of access is the single track road from Gilling village. A Condition of the consent requires the construction of a number of additional passing places on the public highway. No works have as yet been undertaken on any part of this approved scheme (and indeed may never be).

Whilst not all of the above sources of traffic generation are in play at any one time, a number of them do/could occur in combination, which increases the pressure on the single-track road. They should not necessarily be considered as negative factors either, but it is important to be aware of all the traffic issues relating to this stretch of road when coming to a view about this particular proposal.

For this development there also seems to be a dis-connect between the design/function of the facility, in particular Phase 2, and the likely level of traffic generation. Paragraph 2 of the Design & Access Statement indicates that Phase 2 will contain front-of-house produce and joinery shops, with sale of goods to the general public. Point 7 of the Traffic Management Plan indicates however that the number of visitors will be "minimal". It seems unlikely that both statements can be correct – one would assume that a certain level of visitors would be necessary in order to make front-of-house facilities viable.

In conclusion I support the application in principle, but have **significant concerns** about the landscape impact of the proposed car park area and the impact of additional traffic generation on the tranquillity of the AONB.

Yours sincerely

P B JACKSON
AONB MANAGER

Paul Jackson

From: dm@ryedale.gov.uk
Sent: 08 May 2014 10:05
To: Paul Jackson
Subject: Consultee Comments for Planning Application 14/00372/FUL

Mr Paul Jackson,

You have been sent this email because you or somebody else has submitted a consultee comment on a Planning Application to your local authority using your email address. A summary of your comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 10:01 AM on 08 May 2014 from paul.jackson@northyorks.gov.uk.

Application Summary

Reference: 14/00372/FUL

Address: Jamies Cragg Caravan Site Castle Howard
Station Road Welburn York YO60 7EW

Proposal: Change of use of land to allow the siting of
2 no. two bedroom holiday lodges and
formation of parking spaces

Case Officer: Rachel Smith

[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

Comments: I visited the site on 30th April and have the following observations to make: 1) Permission was granted recently (13/00056/FUL) for the erection of 5 camping pods on this site, after detailed discussions between the LPA and the applicant. A significantly improved landscaping plan was agreed as part of those discussions, which has been carried forward into this proposal. 2) The proposed lodges are taller than the approved camping pods but, provided that the timber roof and wall cladding, doors and window frames are stained in a DARK brown colour and this is stipulated via a Condition, then I have no objections to the proposals. Paul Jackson

Paul Jackson

From: dm@ryedale.gov.uk
Sent: 08 May 2014 09:33
To: Paul Jackson
Subject: Consultee Comments for Planning Application 14/00418/AGNOT

Mr Paul Jackson,

You have been sent this email because you or somebody else has submitted a consultee comment on a Planning Application to your local authority using your email address. A summary of your comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 9:29 AM on 08 May 2014 from paul.jackson@northyorks.gov.uk.

Application Summary

Reference: 14/00418/AGNOT
Address: Woodhouse Farm Buildings Braygate
Street Broughton Malton North Yorkshire
Proposal: Erection of an agricultural building for the
housing of livestock.
Case Officer: Matthew Mortonson
[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

Comments: I visited the site on 30th April and have the following comments to make: 1) The Design & Access Statement indicates that the roof sheets will be "dark grey" whereas the Application Form only mentions "grey". To be in accordance with the New Farm Buildings & Infrastructure Design Guidance for the AONB (adopted in Oct '13 by RDC as a material consideration in the development management process) it should be clarified with the applicant/agent that dark grey sheets will indeed be used on the roof. 2) Woodhouse Farm is a collection of elderly farm buildings in a relatively open location. Views of the new building from the east, from the footpath along The Plantations, will largely be screened by the woodland itself and a small section of hedge already on the Woodhouse Farm site. The principal views will therefore come from the north/west, along the very popular bridleway on Broughton Lane. I would therefore wish to see a couple of rows of hedge shrubs/small tree species (e.g. hawthorn, blackthorn, hazel, field maple, birch, rowan) planted along the western and northern sides of the site, to break-up the profile of the new building. Paul Jackson

Paul Jackson

From: dm@ryedale.gov.uk
Sent: 22 May 2014 13:13
To: Paul Jackson
Subject: Consultee Comments for Planning Application 13/01434/OUT

Mr Paul Jackson,

You have been sent this email because you or somebody else has submitted a consultee comment on a Planning Application to your local authority using your email address. A summary of your comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 1:08 PM on 22 May 2014 from paul.jackson@northyorks.gov.uk.

Application Summary

Reference: 13/01434/OUT
Address: Land To Rear Of Holmes Crescent Holmes
Crescent Welburn Malton
Proposal: Erection of 2no. dwellings (site area
0.0418 ha).
Case Officer: Alan Hunter
[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

Comments: This site has been the subject of a number of applications for further dwellings over the years, the previous one being for 8 dwellings (07/00434/OUT). Unfortunately I ran out of time to submit comments on that application, which was Refused. Checking back to the Officer's Report for the 2007 application I cannot see any fundamental change in circumstances. If the out-of-village location was considered unsustainable at that time then the same must apply now. Likewise, the Design and Access Statement makes no attempt to indicate how the development accords with the policies of either the NPPF or the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy. In my view the proposal is still contrary to Policy - it's in an unsustainable location so is therefore contrary to NPPF para 14, and it doesn't appear to specify whether it is market or Local Needs housing. The current properties at Holmes Crescent were constructed under a previous planning policy guidance regime and were linked to the educational establishment at Crambeck. There is no such link any more and, being in open countryside away from the amenities and services of Welburn village, it would be detrimental to the AONB landscape for this cluster of houses to grow any further in size.

I therefore believe that the application should be Refused. Paul Jackson

Paul Jackson

From: Paul Jackson
Sent: 29 May 2014 13:56
To: geophysics@teslaexploration.com
Subject: '3D' seismic survey - Howardian Hills AONB

Importance: High

Dear Sirs

Many thanks for your letter of 7th May, notifying me of your proposed exploration works.

The methodology indicates that shot points will only be placed within open field locations, with vibroseis operation in all other locations. You must ensure that areas of importance for biodiversity (SSSIs, Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (North Yorkshire's equivalent of Local Wildlife Sites), Ancient woodland, species-rich grassland and Special Interest Road Verges), and areas important for buried archaeology, are not damaged either by shot point operations or by vehicle movements during wet soil conditions. This particularly relates to important grassland habitats that might be considered as 'open field' locations, and to buried archaeology in farmland. No shot point operation should take place within these areas, and ground damage by vibroseis tractors must be avoided.

I note that you are consulting with the Historic Environment Team at NYCC – they should be able to provide information on important areas of buried archaeology. You must also ensure that applicable records for SINCs and Special Interest Road Verges are accessed from the North and East Yorkshire Ecological Data Centre, so that these areas of biodiversity interest are not subject to shot point operations.

Photographs of ZLand Nodes have been included in the consultation documents but these are not referred to specifically in the methodology. Presumably these are the geophones, of which a string of 6 will be attached to each Hawk recording node? If this is the case, the positioning of the ZLand nodes should again take account of biodiversity interests. Turf should be removed, the holes dug and then soil and turf replaced in the correct order when back-filling.

Yours sincerely

Paul Jackson
Howardian Hills AONB Manager
The Mews, Wath Court
Hovingham
York
YO62 4NN

Tel: 0845 034 9495 / NYCC ext 6775

Mob: 07715 009426

Web: www.howardianhills.org.uk

Landscapes
for life
.org.uk

HOWARDIAN
HILLS
One of the
AONB family

Paul Jackson

From: dm@ryedale.gov.uk
Sent: 03 June 2014 11:40
To: Paul Jackson
Subject: Consultee Comments for Planning Application 14/00568/AGNOT

Mr Paul Jackson,

You have been sent this email because you or somebody else has submitted a consultee comment on a Planning Application to your local authority using your email address. A summary of your comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 11:34 AM on 03 Jun 2014 from paul.jackson@northyorks.gov.uk.

Application Summary

Reference: 14/00568/AGNOT
Address: West Newton Grange Leysthorpe Lane
Oswaldkirk Helmsley YO62 5YB
Proposal: Erection of a grain holding bin.
Case Officer: Charlotte Cornforth
[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

Comments: I visited the site with the applicant and as a result don't have any observations to make on the proposal. My principal concern had related to the colour of the galvanised zinc finish, which is very shiny and reflective when new. The grain bin is in fact second-hand and therefore the finish has already weathered to a dull grey. The bin will largely be shielded by the adjacent agricultural building and the top section above the building should not be unduly noticeable due to its already weathered finish. Paul Jackson

Paul Jackson

From: Paul Jackson
Sent: 05 June 2014 16:01
To: planning@hambleton.gov.uk
Cc: Helen Laws
Subject: 14/00995/FUL: change of use of agricultural land and erection of outbuilding

I have the following comments to make on this application:

1. I don't have any objection to the change of use from agricultural land to domestic. To some extent this is regularising the situation that currently prevails and the area in question is well screened by the substantial roadside hedge.
2. The proposed building has approximately double the footprint of the current sheds, and I'm unclear on how it relates to them in terms of height. I assume that it will be taller.
3. Whilst I don't have an objection in principle, I am concerned that the use of clay pantiles on the roof will make the new shed stand out very starkly against the dark backdrop of the wood. The site is viewed clearly from the B1363 outside the old shop, from where it would be visible but the Woodside cottages themselves barely so. This will give the visual effect of the new shed being a stand-alone building, not connected to any dwelling. The current wooden sheds have a dark felt roof and I would much prefer dark grey sheeting or slate for the roof of the new building, as this will blend into the background. It will also mirror the colour palette of the existing outbuildings at Woodside.

Paul Jackson
Howardian Hills AONB Manager
The Mews, Wath Court
Hovingham
York
YO62 4NN

Tel: 0845 034 9495 / NYCC ext 6775

Mob: 07715 009426

Web: www.howardianhills.org.uk

Landscapes
for life
.org.uk



HOWARDIAN
HILLS
One of the
AONB family

Howardian Hills

Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

The Mews, Wath Court
Hovingham, York, YO62 4NN

T. 08450 349 495

E. info@howardianhills.org.uk

W. www.howardianhills.org.uk

A joint partnership funded by Defra, North Yorkshire County Council (Host Authority), Ryedale District Council and Hambleton District Council; also involving Ryedale and Hambleton Parish Councils, Natural England, Country Land and Business Association, National Farmers Union, Ramblers and Forestry Commission

Development Management
Ryedale District Council
Ryedale House
Malton
North Yorks
YO17 7HH

Contact: Paul Jackson

My Reference:

Date: 6 June 2014

Dear Sirs

14/00494/HOUSE: Erection of part two storey/part single storey rear extension, replacement front porch, double garage and detached block of three stables; Stone Lea, Welburn

I have the following comments to make in relation to this application:

1. I have no observations to make in relation to the replacement front porch, the detached double garage and the detached block of three stables. The locations of the garage and stables are screened by either existing buildings or semi-mature trees, and the timber-and zinc construction would be appropriate for these ancillary buildings.
2. I do however have significant concerns about the scale, design and materials of the proposed two storey/single storey extension, particularly in relation to the impact of its eastern and northern elevations on designated heritage assets and the AONB landscape. These concerns are strong enough to constitute an objection to this element of the scheme.
 - a) Whilst it is understandable that the conversion of the nearby Pigeon Cote Farm should use materials sympathetic to its origins as an agricultural building, I don't believe that the use of timber boarding and a zinc roof would be appropriate when attached to a stone-and-pantile dwelling which has no history of agricultural use.
 - b) Eastern elevation – The scale, design and materials will I believe have a significantly detrimental impact on three designated heritage assets, namely the Welburn Conservation Area, the setting of the adjacent Listed Elmtree House and the views outwards towards the Grade 1 Registered Park and Garden of Castle Howard. As it currently stands, the eastern elevation of Stone Lea exhibits no evidence of a rearward extension, as the current accommodation sits under a symmetrical roof at the eastern end of the building. The proposed extension is almost three times as long as the current extension, as well as extending right to the eastern end of the building. This will significantly reduce the view outwards from Welburn's main street towards the Stray Walls (Grade I Listed) and the Pyramid, St Anne's Hill (Grade I Listed), as well as impacting on Elmtree House and the Conservation Area.
 - c) Northern elevation – Again, I believe that the scale, design and materials of both the two storey and single storey elements will have a significantly detrimental impact on two designated heritage assets, namely the Welburn Conservation Area and the setting of the Listed Clematis Cottage which is directly behind Stone Lea when viewed from the north. Of particular concern is the full-height (plus apex) glazing of the two storey gable end.

This extremely large expanse of glass will be very visible from the well-used Public Rights of Way network to the north of the village, including from the tower at the end of the Stray Walls at Castle Howard. It will appear very incongruous in comparison with other buildings in Welburn village, which generally have small window openings, as well as creating significant reflections when evening sunlight shines on it. As such, I feel that it will have a significantly adverse impact on both the AONB landscape and the Welburn Conservation area.

In conclusion, whilst I have no comments to make on the ancillary buildings I would wish to object to the impact of the two storey and single storey extension on the grounds of significant adverse impact on the AONB landscape and designated heritage assets.

Yours sincerely

P B JACKSON
AONB MANAGER

Paul Jackson

From: dm@ryedale.gov.uk
Sent: 06 June 2014 16:13
To: Paul Jackson
Subject: Consultee Comments for Planning Application 14/00303/FUL

Mr Paul Jackson,

You have been sent this email because you or somebody else has submitted a consultee comment on a Planning Application to your local authority using your email address. A summary of your comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 4:08 PM on 06 Jun 2014 from paul.jackson@northyorks.gov.uk.

Application Summary

Reference: 14/00303/FUL
Address: Sundial Farm Cawton York YO62 4LW
Proposal: Erection of a general purpose agricultural building.
Case Officer: Alan Hunter
[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

I have the following comments to make on this application: 1) Because this proposed building will be alongside another building erected a few years ago, judging its potential impact on the AONB landscape is much easier as there is already an identical structure there to make reference to. Because of topography and land cover vegetation, the new building will be viewed as a standalone structure in long distance views from Gilling to the west, and as part of the existing farm steading in short distance views from within Cawton itself. 1) The roof covering is proposed to be grey fibre cement sheeting. This should be the dark grey, or Anthracite Grey, sheeting as has been used on the last two buildings erected at this steading. 2) The two previous buildings referred to above (a stand-alone shed and then a lean-to extension) had a Condition stipulating the planting of a strip of trees and shrubs along the northern elevation following completion. Because the proposed new building will be seen in the long distance view from the west, I consider that some form of landscaping is again essential. Because however there will also be short distance views from within Cawton itself, I feel that the best option is to plant a similar strip of trees and shrubs along the northern and western sides of the new

building, extending southwards to meet a triangular copse proposed as landscape mitigation for the other current application for this steading (14/00304/FUL). Paul Jackson

Paul Jackson

From: dm@ryedale.gov.uk
Sent: 06 June 2014 16:28
To: Paul Jackson
Subject: Consultee Comments for Planning Application 14/00304/FUL

Mr Paul Jackson,

You have been sent this email because you or somebody else has submitted a consultee comment on a Planning Application to your local authority using your email address. A summary of your comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 4:22 PM on 06 Jun 2014 from paul.jackson@northyorks.gov.uk.

Application Summary

Reference: 14/00304/FUL
Address: Sundial Farm Cawton York YO62 4LW
Proposal: Erection of a general purpose agricultural building.
Case Officer: Alan Hunter
[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

I have the following comments to make on this application: 1) The new building will be viewed as part of the existing farm steading and due to topography and land cover vegetation should only be visible in short distance views from within Cawton itself. 2) The roof covering is proposed to be grey fibre cement sheeting. This should be the dark grey, or Anthracite Grey, sheeting as has been used on the last two buildings erected at this steading. 3) The two previous buildings referred to above (a stand-alone shed and then a lean-to extension) had a Condition stipulating the planting of a strip of trees and shrubs along the northern elevation following completion. Because the proposed new building will be seen in short distance views from within Cawton itself, I feel that some form of landscaping will be necessary on the western side of the new building. As an awkward area of grass field will be created should the other application for this steading (14/00303/FUL) be approved, I feel that this would be an ideal site for creating a small triangular copse. The northern end of the copse would meet with the strip of tree and shrub planting proposed as landscape mitigation for 14/00303/FUL. Paul Jackson

Paul Jackson

From: dm@ryedale.gov.uk
Sent: 18 June 2014 16:13
To: Paul Jackson
Subject: Consultee Comments for Planning Application 14/00532/FUL

Mr Paul Jackson,

You have been sent this email because you or somebody else has submitted a consultee comment on a Planning Application to your local authority using your email address. A summary of your comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 3:58 PM on 18 Jun 2014 from paul.jackson@northyorks.gov.uk.

Application Summary

Reference: 14/00532/FUL

Address: West Mill House Farm Stittenham Hill
Bulmer YO60 7TP

Proposal: Change of use of agricultural land to form a 50m x 25m menage together with installation of a horse walker for private domestic use

Case Officer: Matthew Mortonson

[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

Comments: I have the following comments to make on this application: 1) The fields to the north and east of the farmstead contain a good surviving remnant of the rigg-and-furrow cultivation system. Although undesignated, this heritage asset is considered to be significant enough to merit inclusion in the AONB Management Plan as a Historic Environment Priority Site. Spoil from developments by previous owners was disposed of on part of the area, and further degradation should be avoided. I would therefore like to see a Condition covering on-site disposal of spoil, to ensure that the rigg-and-furrow isn't damaged any further. 2) New tree planting is proposed to replace the four mature willows to be felled to create room for the horse-walker. I would prefer the trees to be planted to the south of the farmstead, to re-create the effect offered by the existing trees, i.e. associated with the farmstead and helping screen the existing buildings. The tree planting should not be carried out in such a manner or location as to impact on the rigg-and-furrow or its setting. Paul Jackson

Paul Jackson

From: dm@ryedale.gov.uk
Sent: 25 June 2014 13:17
To: Paul Jackson
Subject: Consultee Comments for Planning Application 14/00574/MFUL

Mr Paul Jackson,

You have been sent this email because you or somebody else has submitted a consultee comment on a Planning Application to your local authority using your email address. A summary of your comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 1:02 PM on 25 Jun 2014 from paul.jackson@northyorks.gov.uk.

Application Summary

Reference: 14/00574/MFUL
Address: Musley Bank Stables Musley Bank Malton
North Yorkshire YO17 6TD
Proposal: Erection of stabling buildings with ramp,
toilet block, temporary portable office
building and horse treadmill building
(revised details to part of approval
08/00630/MFUL dated 01.10.2008) - part
retrospective application.

Case Officer: Alan Hunter
[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

No substantive comments to make in respect of this proposal: 1) The revised ramp is part of the internal circulation arrangements within the site and doesn't have any impact on the wider landscape. 2) The temporary office building and new toilet block are small and use appropriately coloured materials. They are relatively small additions to the site when looked at as a whole. 3) The proposed horse treadmill building is located within the confines of the existing site and next to a taller building. Again, it is a relatively small addition to the site as a whole. 4) Condition 3 of the original 2008 planning consent required the preparation and implementation of a landscaping plan, with planting to start in the first season following commencement of the development. I'm not sure if the landscaping plan was submitted and approved or not, as there doesn't appear to be any new landscaping on the site? Paul Jackson

Paul Jackson

From: dm@ryedale.gov.uk
Sent: 25 June 2014 13:04
To: Paul Jackson
Subject: Consultee Comments for Planning Application 14/00591/FUL

Mr Paul Jackson,

You have been sent this email because you or somebody else has submitted a consultee comment on a Planning Application to your local authority using your email address. A summary of your comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 12:49 PM on 25 Jun 2014 from paul.jackson@northyorks.gov.uk.

Application Summary

Reference: 14/00591/FUL

Address: Telephone Exchange Old York Road
Whitwell On The Hill Malton

Proposal: Erection of 12.1m wooden pole supporting
0.3m microwave radio dish to enable
broadband delivery to Westow village

Case Officer: Charlotte Cornforth

[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

No substantive observations to make on this proposal. 1) Support the provision of improved broadband speeds to communities and businesses within the AONB, in line with Management Plan Objectives. 2) Damage/removal of existing trees should be kept to a minimum, to preserve screening of both the new pole and the existing Telephone Exchange building. Paul Jackson

Howardian Hills

Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

A joint partnership funded by Defra, North Yorkshire County Council (Host Authority), Ryedale District Council and Hambleton District Council; also involving Ryedale and Hambleton Parish Councils, Natural England, Country Land and Business Association, National Farmers Union, Ramblers and Forestry Commission

Development Management
Ryedale District Council
Ryedale House
Malton
North Yorks
YO17 7HH

The Mews, Wath Court
Hovingham, York, YO62 4NN

T. 08450 349 495
E. info@howardianhills.org.uk
W. www.howardianhills.org.uk

Contact: Paul Jackson

My Reference:

Date: 30 July 2014

Dear Sirs

14/00678/MOUT: Outline application for the demolition of outbuildings and erection of mixed use residential-led development; Castle Howard Road, Malton

My previous letters were written for the express purpose of providing information in relation to a request for an EIA Screening Opinion. Although that Opinion has now been issued, I felt it would be useful to bring all my comments together so as to provide my formal observations on this application:

Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment

1. I feel that the impact of the A64 as a barrier between Malton and the AONB has been significantly over-stated throughout the document. It may look like a large barrier on the map, but in truth, on the ground, there is still a significant visual connection between Malton and the AONB, particularly at the northern end (Middlecave Road). This is principally because the A64 is in a large cutting for much of this section, with only HGVs visible above the boundary hedges for one short section.
2. This is significant because the current western boundary of the built-up area of Malton is characterised by mature trees and only occasionally visible buildings. Even with the 33KV pylons and wirescape, Malton and the AONB appear to blend reasonably seamlessly into each other in a relatively contiguous landscape. As such therefore the application site has a broadly similar landscape character to the eastern end of the AONB, and I don't feel that the importance of the application site to the setting of the AONB has been explored at all.
3. In a similar vein, the importance of the AONB for quiet recreation doesn't seem to have been taken into account. It takes less than 5 minutes to walk from the suburban area of Middlecave Road, into the Plantations and thence become immersed in the open countryside atmosphere of the AONB.
4. I consider Viewpoint 2 (as originally mapped in the first version of the LVIA) to be the critical one in relation to visual impact on the AONB.

Cont'd...

In order to be able to properly assess the potential impact on the AONB, it will be necessary for a ground level horizon visualisation of the development from Viewpoint 2 to be provided. It will be important to understand at what point in time the visualisation represents, in order to assess any impacts during the period before screening plantings reach maturity. Photos taken during a site visit to the original Viewpoint 2, and looked at in conjunction with the tree heights given in the Tree Survey, would seem to indicate that the taller elements of the proposed development will break the skyline when viewed from this location. The applicant should be asked to provide the visualisation before any determination of this application is made.

5. With regard to Viewpoint 3, whilst in general I agree with the assessment I feel that it overlooks the effect of seasonality on the screening provided by the belt of mature broadleaved trees. Whilst providing almost total screening during the summer months this will be reduced somewhat during winter months, and I would suggest that in winter the Magnitude of Change may in fact be Slight or even Medium, making the Overall Impact Significance at least Moderate.

Traffic

1. Residents accessing employment opportunities westwards along the B1257 are highly likely to use Braygate Street and Swinton Lane, as 'rat-running' drivers already do to avoid the Newbiggin/Pasture Lane traffic lights and Horsemarket Road. This would apply to residents working at sites such as Swinton Grange, Malton Foods, BATA, etc, as well as further afield in Kirkbymoorside, Helmsley and Thirsk.
2. I'm unable to estimate what proportion of residents would have employment sites to the north west, and hence use Braygate Street and Swinton Lane, but this would be adding to what might already be considered an 'unnaturally' high level of traffic on these routes through the AONB. I consider this to have a potentially moderate negative impact on the tranquillity of the AONB.

In conclusion, I'm sufficiently concerned about the lack of information provided in the LVIA (about the potential impact on the AONB and its setting) to feel that an Objection is warranted at this stage. Although the application is only in Outline, the design ethos for the site indicates a desire to have buildings of a substantial height and the LVIA simply doesn't provide enough information on the potential impact of these on the AONB and its setting.

Yours sincerely

P B JACKSON
AONB MANAGER

Howardian Hills

Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

A joint partnership funded by Defra, North Yorkshire County Council (Host Authority), Ryedale District Council and Hambleton District Council; also involving Ryedale and Hambleton Parish Councils, Natural England, Country Land and Business Association, National Farmers Union, Ramblers and Forestry Commission

Development Management
Ryedale District Council
Ryedale House
Malton
North Yorks
YO17 7HH

The Mews, Wath Court
Hovingham, York, YO62 4NN

T. 08450 349 495
E. info@howardianhills.org.uk
W. www.howardianhills.org.uk

Contact: Paul Jackson

My Reference:

Date: 8 August 2014

Dear Sirs

14/00734/MFUL: Establishment of a farmstead to include agricultural workers dwelling, erection of sheds, creation of storage area and landscaping; OS Field 1811, Gilling

I have the following observations to make on this application:

1. The case for the justification for this development seems to hinge around the insecurity of tenure in relation to the rented land and buildings at Ampleforth College. Leaving aside the issues of lack of on-site accommodation for a farm worker and the poor condition of the rented buildings, the reasoning for the proposed development seems to be somewhat flawed. On p2 of the Planning Justification & Agricultural Appraisal document it states that the applicant intends to focus his livestock/cattle operation on land under his control and ownership. In the following Justification/Support paragraph however it refers to the site having been chosen for a variety of reasons, including "accessibility to rented land for ease of livestock movements". I'm afraid that this can't work both ways. If the rented livestock buildings aren't available then neither is the rented pasture land that supports almost the entire livestock/cattle enterprise – the two elements are linked to each other. The 500 fattening lambs on the land around Gilling will use a mixture of permanent pasture, fodder root crops and temporary ley grassland, and they don't require the extent of buildings proposed as no lambing is involved. In short, the application proposes the establishment of farm buildings and a farm workers dwelling on the basis that the rented grazing land will always be available, whereas the justification for the extent and location of the development assumes that the tenancy will end in 8/9 years' time. In my view this proposal should be assessed on the basis of the needs of the owned land *only*, excluding all rented land and buildings from the equation (unless the availability of other rented pasture land can be demonstrated, to compensate for the assumed loss of the Ampleforth College land). If a longer tenancy was negotiated on the Ampleforth College land then this would give some support to this application but, more importantly, it could encourage landlord and/or tenant investment in the current buildings, which would still be the preferred option from the point of view of conserving and enhancing the AONB landscape.
2. The location of the proposed farmstead and dwelling does have some visual linkage with the developed area of Gilling, although it is of course some way outside the development limit.

Cont'd...

It is however a large development and is sited within a relatively open vale landscape. The Landscape Management guidelines for this Landscape Character Zone of the AONB, as laid out in the AONB Management Plan, encourage the restoration of a hedged landscape with hedgerow trees and copses of broadleaved trees. The planting of large areas of woodland to screen the development would not therefore be compatible with the landscape character type. I therefore have concerns as to whether a development of this size and extent could be successfully integrated into the AONB landscape.

3. Although the landscaping proposals have been improved since the pre-app version of the plans, I still don't feel that they would be sufficient to integrate the development into the surrounding landscape. In particular, the lack of any tree planting beyond individual trees is a weakness that could be addressed. Sufficient field corners would be created along the northern edge of the farmstead site to accommodate copses of native trees. Although the 3D models omit the proposed hedge planting along the adjacent farm track, they still give the impression of a very open site dominated by large farm buildings and a large dwelling.
4. Materials. As far as can be seen from the plans, the materials proposed for the farm buildings will match those of the current modern building on the site. The materials specifications should be controlled by Conditions, to ensure visual uniformity across the site and with the new building already on the site.
5. Lighting. Whilst lighting of the yard area will clearly be required, this should be to the highest modern standards and PIR controlled, to ensure that the minimum of light pollution is created.

In conclusion, should the LPA decide that the agricultural justification for the proposed development is proven, then I would still have significant concerns about the scale of the development within the AONB landscape and the extent of landscaping currently proposed. I feel that this falls short of that which would be required to mitigate the landscape impact and integrate the development into its surroundings.

Yours sincerely

P B JACKSON
AONB MANAGER

Paul Jackson

From: dm@ryedale.gov.uk
Sent: 15 August 2014 16:33
To: Paul Jackson
Subject: Consultee Comments for Planning Application 14/00786/FUL

Mr Paul Jackson,

You have been sent this email because you or somebody else has submitted a consultee comment on a Planning Application to your local authority using your email address. A summary of your comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 4:31 PM on 15 Aug 2014 from paul.jackson@northyorks.gov.uk.

Application Summary

Reference: 14/00786/FUL
Address: Grimston Lodge Moor Lane Gilling East
York YO62 4HR
Proposal: Erection of detached building comprising
single garage and one bedroom self-
contained residential annex with
demolition of existing single garage

Case Officer: Helen Bloomer

[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

Comments: I have the following observations to make on these proposals: 1) Although not Listed, the property has a strong vernacular style as part of the ancillary buildings associated with Grimston Manor. The current modern garage has a significantly detrimental impact on the setting of the lodge building and its removal is to be welcomed. 2) When viewed from the southern approach to the property I'm fairly happy that the proposed building would blend into the backdrop of trees, would not impact unduly on the setting of the main house and would appear reasonably subservient to it. 3) My principal concern however relates to the height of the building when viewed/approached uphill from the northern end. Because the building is proposed to sit at the same level as the existing drive, this will significantly increase the height of it when viewed from the north. In turn, this will make the new building appear dominant in relation to the main house and will adversely impact on its setting. 4) Given the strong contours of the site I would prefer the new building to be at a lower elevation to the drive, flowing down from the main house rather than being at the same level. I feel that a reduction in

ground level to more closely follow the contours of the site would help to integrate the proposal much better into the site. Paul Jackson

Paul Jackson

From: Paul Jackson
Sent: 15 August 2014 15:48
To: planning@hambleton.gov.uk
Subject: 14/01542/FUL: Alteration of windows, raising of roof, new flue for biomass boiler; The Old Rectory, Dalby

I have the following observations to make on these proposals:

1. Although the flue will be coloured black, which will prevent the visually intrusive effects experienced from silver stainless steel flues, I'm concerned that the height of it will have a negative visual impact on the courtyard of vernacular buildings. If re-location to the 'external' roofslope was possible I think that this would be preferable, as the flue would then be viewed in the context of the surrounding trees.
2. I have some strong concerns about the extent of glazing proposed for the southern gable end. Whilst the first floor door/window and Juliet balcony are I think acceptable, the glazed apex is I believe a step too far, particularly when considering the addition of 300mm to the ridge height. Apex glazing is not a vernacular feature and the southern elevation is part of the setting of the main house, which I believe would be detrimentally affected by glazing fully to the apex.

Paul Jackson
Howardian Hills AONB Manager
The Mews, Wath Court
Hovingham
York
YO62 4NN

Tel: 0845 034 9495 / NYCC ext 6775
Mob: 07715 009426
Web: www.howardianhills.org.uk

Landscapes
for life
.org.uk



HOWARDIAN
HILLS
One of the
AONB family

Paul Jackson

From: dm@ryedale.gov.uk
Sent: 21 August 2014 13:03
To: Paul Jackson
Subject: Consultee Comments for Planning Application 14/00807/FUL

Mr Paul Jackson,

You have been sent this email because you or somebody else has submitted a consultee comment on a Planning Application to your local authority using your email address. A summary of your comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 1:01 PM on 21 Aug 2014 from paul.jackson@northyorks.gov.uk.

Application Summary

Reference: 14/00807/FUL

Address: Scackleton Grange Farm Grange Lane
Scackleton YO62 4NB

Proposal: Erection of an agricultural building for the housing of livestock.

Case Officer: Helen Bloomer

[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

Comments: In general the proposed new building follows the principles of the AONB New Agricultural Buildings & Infrastructure Design Guidance, being sited at the existing farmstead and having dark grey roof panels. As the proposed building sits on the edge of a small valley to the north, with a Public Footpath approaching from the northwest, and is also visible from Scackleton Lane, I'd prefer to see some minor landscape screening on the external edges of the yard area on the northern and eastern sides. Hedgerow species such as hawthorn, blackthorn, hazel and field maple would be sufficient for this purpose, just to soften the elevations of the building. Paul Jackson

Paul Jackson

From: dm@ryedale.gov.uk
Sent: 28 August 2014 16:10
To: Paul Jackson
Subject: Consultee Comments for Planning Application 14/00851/ADV

Mr Paul Jackson,

You have been sent this email because you or somebody else has submitted a consultee comment on a Planning Application to your local authority using your email address. A summary of your comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 4:09 PM on 28 Aug 2014 from paul.jackson@northyorks.gov.uk.

Application Summary

Reference: 14/00851/ADV

Address: OS Field 3286 High Hutton Malton

Proposal: Erection of permanent tubular steel frame for display of non illuminated temporary signs for events within Malton and Norton, for a period of five years

Case Officer: Helen Bloomer

[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

I have the following observations to make in relation to the proposals: 1) The original permission was granted for a period of 1 year, to enable the visual impact of the sign to be assessed. I raised some strong concerns in relation to the original proposals, in relation to the size of the frame/sign and the colour of materials. 2) Visiting the site to assess this application, and having passed it a number of times during the last year, my concerns as to its visual impact have not diminished. The effect is particularly pronounced when travelling westbound at the end of the A64

Comments: Malton by-pass, when it is conspicuous as a large white rectangle silhouetted against the green backdrop of Golden Hill within the AONB. 3) Travelling eastbound the sign is less silhouetted, but nonetheless adds to the general profusion of signs close to the Low Hutton junction. 4) Although road traffic safety is not necessarily within the direct remit of the AONB JAC, closures of the A64 due to road traffic accidents lead to adverse impacts on the AONB due to the need to use diversion routes. When I visited the site on 12th August the hedge in front of the sign had grown up so as to obscure the lower part of the sign. This makes it look

somewhat unkempt, negates its principal purpose and also distracts drivers more as they try to read the text through a screen of foliage. 5) I feel that the sign creates an unacceptable visual intrusion into the AONB, but that it would be acceptable if Conditions were attached stipulating that the galvanised frame should be painted a dark green colour and that all sign banners should have a black or dark-coloured reverse side. Paul Jackson

In general terms I'm pleased to see a shift from 100% conifer to 20/30% NBL and WSH in all restock compartments that are PAWS. I understand that this component will be used to soften external and internal edges, as well as buffer any other woodland features of conservation interest.

Thinning should aim to create a buffer of open ground around Scheduled Monuments, to include both the ditch and the mound in the case of round barrows. The aim should be to remove growing trees and also to allow enough light to get in to enable a benign grass vegetation layer to grow.

17b - This compartment has a number of hollow-ways; probably alternative routes before the current road alignment was selected and then surfaced. Light machinery could travel along these, so as to maintain their form, but heavy machinery must avoid damaging them. Replanting should respect their form as much as possible.

53a - I understand that there may be a number of veteran oaks in this compartment. If so, they must be avoided during felling operations and given an adequate open halo and surrounding buffer of NBL during replanting.

56 - The fen area north of the beck is a SINC, which suffers from overshading from this adjacent woodland of dense shade-casting conifers. The riparian corridor should be established bearing the SINC in mind, as well as the prescriptions given for replanting of the riparian corridors.

Paul Jackson

From: Paul Jackson
Sent: 04 September 2014 12:26
To: 'Helen Bloomer'
Subject: RE: 14/00786/FUL - Grimston Lodge

Helen

Many thanks for sending this to me and giving me the opportunity to respond.

I would make the following further observations:

1. My original comments expressed concerns about the perceived height of the proposed building when viewed from the north, and its impact on the setting of the house, but they didn't amount to an Objection as with the Neighbour responses.
2. My assessment of the proposal may have been unintentionally mislead during my site visit. I hadn't expected to meet anyone but there were two people working on the roof, which proved to be the applicant and his father. They produced the full-size architects drawings so that I could see how the height of the garage related to the current ground levels. The crucial bit of information they gave me was that the access drive to the proposed building would be level with the current driveway – hence my original comment about setting the building lower on the site so as to reflect the natural ground slope.
3. Looking at the drawings again I now see that that piece of information was wrong, but it's important to be absolutely clear about it (particularly the applicants), so that if the proposal is approved then it is constructed exactly as per the submitted drawings.
4. My reading of the levels from the submitted drawings is as follows:
Moor Lane outside existing drive entrance – 107.50m AOD.
Existing drive to current garage (at proposed spur to new garage) – 107.50 + 0.3m?
Floor level of garage – 107.20. Garage is therefore at least 0.3m and perhaps 0.6m lower than the existing drive.
Perceived eaves height of southern gable end (garage door) = 109.80 minus (107.50 + 0.3m?) = 2m.
BUT perceived eaves height of northern gable end = 109.80 minus 105.85 (hgt on Moor Lane on section DD) = 3.95m
5. Whilst I can't recall the construction of the northern elevation of the house, and so whether it has any vernacular quality or not, my concern is that the perceived height of the northern gable end of the proposed building will also impact on the road frontage of the existing house (and hence on its setting). At the northern gable end the floor level will be 1.35m above the level on Moor Lane, and that's the principal issue that I have, in whether that is acceptable or not.
6. An additional comment on detailing, should the application be approved – the flue for the log burning stove should be black stainless steel, not silver.
7. I would reiterate my first point in that these further comments constitute Concerns, not a formal Objection.

Paul

Paul Jackson
Howardian Hills AONB Manager
The Mews, Wath Court
Hovingham
York
YO62 4NN

Tel: 0845 034 9495 / NYCC ext 6775
Mob: 07715 009426
Web: www.howardianhills.org.uk

-----Original Message-----

From: Helen Bloomer [mailto:helen.bloomer@ryedale.gov.uk]
Sent: 02 September 2014 16:50
To: Paul Jackson
Subject: FW: 14/00786/FUL - Grimston Lodge

Good afternoon Paul

Please find attached below the response from the agent regarding the above application with regards to your comments. I thought I would give you the opportunity to consider her response.

Kind Regards

Helen Bloomer
Development Management Officer
Development Management
Tel: 01653 600666 Ext 328
Email: helen.bloomer@ryedale.gov.uk

-----Original Message-----

From: Margaret Mackinder [mailto:margaret@sbamail.co.uk]
Sent: 02 September 2014 16:23
To: Helen Bloomer
Cc: Chris Pearce
Subject: 14/00786/FUL - Grimston Lodge

Dear Miss Bloomer

We have looked at the letters of objection on the planning website and would like to discuss the following points arising from them.

1. The site is very restricted in level area as described already in the design and access statement and it is difficult to site the building in any other way than as proposed .
2. The garage is effectively single storey with a roof line which copies the steep pitch of the roofs on the house. If you look at the entrance / south elevation, the garage at that point is a normal size for a single garage. The building makes use of the sloping land to provide extra accommodation without raising the roof height. The taller north elevation at the northern end of the building, created by the sloping land will be well screened by the existing road side hedge. We do feel that to introduce a different pitch on the garage would cause a jarring note. The proposed design is intended to create a lightweight timber lodge effect, in keeping with the woodland surroundings. The impact of the building to could be further reduced by removing the lighter stone sections of walling if necessary, even though the stone panels are intended to pick up the themes of the local stone buildings.
3. The existing house is very small and not capable of extension. The proposal creates a third bedroom and extra family space. The previous owner did obtain permission several years ago for an extension to the existing dwelling, but this was dependant on land which is not owned by the current applicants so they cannot implement that scheme. The applicants have no intention of creating a separate dwelling as this would severely impact on the

existing property. They accept the fact that additional family accommodation is likely to be tied to the existing dwelling by condition, if the application is approved. We would also make the point that under current planning law a garage can be converted to additional family accommodation without planning consent, provided it is not extended, so discussion about the creation of a small amount of additional accommodation is somewhat academic, and not, in the case of a single family bedroom, something which is seriously affected by currently adopted planning policies as suggested by Mr Stuart Charman in his letter. Incidentally we understand that Mr Charman no longer lives on Moor Lane and wonder if he can really be considered as a neighbour objector.

4. Mr Charman also suggests that the garage will obscure the north elevation of the house from the road. This elevation of the existing house is hardly architecturally distinguished, featuring a section of nondescript flat roof and modern windows. These are already obscured by tree cover. The existing 3 metre high beech boundary hedge at the northern end of the site also forms a very thick and effective screen to that approach to the site. The proposal seeks to open up the view of the more attractive road fronting elevation of the building by removing the existing unsightly garage and timber shed.

5. The proposed roof ridge height is 2.5 metres lower than the ridge heights of the existing house. The design has been prepared based on a full digital site survey so the levels shown are accurate. For clarification we have added additional level information about the comparative ridge and eaves levels of the proposed garage and the existing house, and revised drawings (nos 4265_AR30_02_A_A3 and 4265_AR30_03_A_A3) are attached.

6. The issue of visibility on the road has been assessed by the Highway Authority as a statutory consultee. We note that no objection has been made by their surveyor to the impact of the building on visibility. The proposed building is set inside the existing fence line and there is a reasonable verge to provide visibility for both the access to the proposed site and the site to the south of it, as shown in the photographic survey which accompanies the application. The proposed garage provides better on-site parking because its siting frees up space for additional parking space, thereby reducing the need for casual parking on the street.

Yours sincerely
Margaret Mackinder

Margaret Mackinder AA Dipl. CA. RIBA

Stone and Bean Associates Ltd
RIBA Chartered Architects & Landscape Designers

01653 696 100

<http://scanmail.trustwave.com/?c=2863&d=3eeF1Cq8IiCihTuEMfNBiqcoQWGgCnt83LQag5SZIQ&u=http%3a%2f%2fwww%2estoneandbean%2eco%2euk>

The small print. Unless otherwise stated within a contractual document, e-mail messages must not be considered as an instruction against a building contract. This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. Any view or opinions presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the company, Stone & Bean associates. Whilst every care has been taken to check this outgoing e-mail for viruses, it is seen as your responsibility to check and sweep it, and any attachments for viruses on receipt. All liability is excluded to the fullest extent permitted by law. If you have received this e-mail in error, please return to sender.

Make sure you're still registered to vote. Look out for a letter that will tell you whether you need to take action. For more information please visit www.gov.uk/yourvotematters

Access your council services online, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week at www.ryedale.gov.uk

Paul Jackson

From: dm@ryedale.gov.uk
Sent: 25 September 2014 15:17
To: Paul Jackson
Subject: Consultee Comments for Planning Application 14/00939/HOUSE

Mr Paul Jackson,

You have been sent this email because you or somebody else has submitted a consultee comment on a Planning Application to your local authority using your email address. A summary of your comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 3:15 PM on 25 Sep 2014 from paul.jackson@northyorks.gov.uk.

Application Summary

Reference: 14/00939/HOUSE
Address: Spring Bank House Easthorpe Malton North
Yorkshire YO17 6QX
Proposal: Enclosure of existing covered porch area to
form single storey front extension, erection
of front entrance canopy and erection of
first floor rear extension to include
formation of 2 no. balconies

Case Officer: Rachel May

[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

The rear elevation of this property is very visible (albeit in long distance views) from the Welburn area, and in particular from the rising ground south of Welburn towards the Exclamation Gate. The current facade presents itself as a simple flat-faced building, constructed in traditional style with pale-yellow stone walls, a red pantile roof and windows of a 'traditional' proportion. I don't feel that the proposed extension will have a significant visual impact, as its shape and form are conventional enough not to attract undue attention. I do however have

Comments: some concerns about the size of the windows and extent of the glazing. The elevation will in effect become one of 5 patio doors and 1 window, as opposed to one of (now) 2 patio doors and approximately 4 more conventional windows. The most significant visual effect of glazing is the reflections that it creates, and with the building being in such a prominent location within the AONB landscape this is an important consideration. I am however mindful that the applicants haven't suggested a large extension with full floor-to-apex glazing, which would certainly have

been unacceptable. In other similar cases non-reflective glass has been specified as a Condition of consent, and I wonder if the same option might be looked at here, for all the new south-facing glazing including the glass balustrades. Paul Jackson

Paul Jackson

To: planning@hambleton.gov.uk
Subject: 14/01869/OUT: Outline application for the erection of a family dwelling

I have the following observations to make in relation to this application:

1. The dwellings in this part of Yearsley are modern single storey ones, extending out from the core of the village and its traditional houses, which are in the local vernacular style.
2. The application site is set back from the current building line created by the dwellings on either side of it, and as such is therefore in a more elevated position. The dwellings on either side are somewhat off the crest of the small ridge and more 'nestled down' into the shallow fold in the topography that is evident at this western end of the village.
3. Although this application is only in Outline, I therefore wonder what type of dwelling might be appropriate in this location. Set back from the current building line and in a more elevated and exposed position on the edge of the village envelope, a modern 2-storey dwelling would certainly have a significantly detrimental visual impact on the AONB landscape. Even a single storey bungalow could create a significant structure which would give the appearance of 'back-land' development on the visually exposed edge of the village.
4. As a result I therefore have concerns as to whether any dwelling could be adequately incorporated into the AONB landscape in the suggested location.

Paul Jackson
Howardian Hills AONB Manager
The Mews, Wath Court
Hovingham
York
YO62 4NN

Tel: 0845 034 9495 / NYCC ext 6775
Mob: 07715 009426
Web: www.howardianhills.org.uk

Landscapes
for life
.org.uk



HOWARDIAN
HILLS
One of the
AONB family

Paul Jackson

From: dm@ryedale.gov.uk
Sent: 07 October 2014 16:34
To: Paul Jackson
Subject: Consultee Comments for Planning Application 14/00972/HOUSE

Mr Paul Jackson,

You have been sent this email because you or somebody else has submitted a consultee comment on a Planning Application to your local authority using your email address. A summary of your comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 4:32 PM on 07 Oct 2014 from paul.jackson@northyorks.gov.uk.

Application Summary

Reference: 14/00972/HOUSE

Address: Stone Lea Main Street Welburn Malton
YO60 7DZ

Proposal: Erection of part two storey/part single storey rear extension, replacement front porch, detached double garage with storage above and detached block of three timber stables.

Case Officer: Matthew Mortonson

[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

Comments: I have the following comments to make on this application: 1) The revised designs address the issues I raised previously in relation to adverse impact on the Welburn Conservation Area and the adjacent Listed Buildings. 2) I do however still have concerns about adverse impact on the AONB landscape, in relation to the level of glazing proposed in the upper storey of the extension. This relates to the retention of the apex glazing feature, which has no vernacular tradition within the AONB. Although the design is significantly more in keeping than the first version, it is still a fact that this house is on the edge of Welburn village, it will be significantly visible, and the network of footpaths and bridleways to the north of the village is extensively used by both locals and visitors. As such, the fenestration will be a particularly important detail and I feel that the apex glazing in this situation will be an incongruous feature of the external aspect of the village. Paul Jackson

Paul Jackson

From: Paul Jackson
Sent: 09 October 2014 17:17
To: 'dm@ryedale.gov.uk'
Subject: 14/00953/FUL: Erection of block of 2 stables, Rectory Lane, Nunnington

I have the following observations to make on these proposals:

1. Although the building uses vernacular materials, I have some fairly significant concerns about its potentially adverse impact on the character of the Nunnington Conservation Area.
2. The Conservation Area in this part of Nunnington is quite open, with extensive views out between the houses on Rectory Lane to the backland areas. The current stone outbuildings of the properties on the east side of Rectory Lane are low single storey structures, aligned north-south and with a ridge height of c.3.5m. There are also some low timber garage structures, with a ridge height of c.1.9m.
3. The proposed stable block sits behind one of the garage structures and, being aligned east-west, would result in a gable-end wall and visible roofslope (at odds with the alignment of the remainder of the buildings) some 2.7m taller than the garage in front of it. No elevations from a street perspective have been provided, to enable an assessment of any potential visual impact to be made.
4. Whilst I have no objection to the principle of a block of stables, it appears that the size/dimensions proposed would result in a larger/taller building than would be necessary to perform the stated function. It is also unclear why the proposed stables aren't located on the site of the existing derelict timber building, given that the grass paddock area is small in size and a building in the proposed location would further reduce the amount of grazing land available.
5. In conclusion, I feel that this building would have a detrimental impact on the Nunnington Conservation Area (and hence the character of the AONB) and would prefer to see it both reduced in size/height *and* located on the site of the existing derelict timber building. This would bring its height and alignment into harmony with the other buildings in this part of the Conservation Area.

Paul Jackson
Howardian Hills AONB Manager
The Mews, Wath Court
Hovingham
York
YO62 4NN

Tel: 0845 034 9495 / NYCC ext 6775
Mob: 07715 009426
Web: www.howardianhills.org.uk

Landscapes
for life
.org.uk



HOWARDIAN
HILLS
One of the
AONB family

Paul Jackson

From: Paul Jackson
Sent: 04 November 2014 13:37
To: 'yorkshirenortheast@forestry.gsi.gov.uk'
Subject: FLA 12/90/14-15: Scar Wood, Gilling East

I have the following observations to make in relation to these proposals:

1. Scar Wood is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and hence a Natural Environment Priority Site in the AONB Management Plan.
2. It is Ancient Woodland, with some areas of ASNW but also some sections that have been replanted with broadleaves or mixed conifers/broadleaves. The AONB Unit organised and completed a felling and replanting operation on a coupe immediately to the east of the proposed felling site some 6-7 years ago, as well as a sycamore removal/replacement with NBL operation on two older replanting schemes.
3. The section now proposed for felling appears to be the area of broadleaves, larch and spruce which was replanted some 50-60 years ago, judging by the size of the trees.
4. Previous felling schemes have generally left a fringe of broadleaves along the southern edge, so as not to create a break in the skyline. The mixed nature of the crop would appear to make this difficult for this particular coupe, unless there are any specific mature broadleaved trees that might be considered wind-firm.
5. A replanting mix has obvious not been specified at this stage, but this would be the ideal opportunity to revert this area of PAWS to Native Woodland, which would be in line with the aspirations for the site as contained in the AONB Management Plan (Objective NE3.3 and Site 1.25).

Paul Jackson
Howardian Hills AONB Manager
The Mews, Wath Court
Hovingham
York
YO62 4NN

Tel: 0845 034 9495 / NYCC ext 6775
Mob: 07715 009426
Web: www.howardianhills.org.uk

Landscapes
for life
.org.uk



HOWARDIAN
HILLS
One of the
AONB family