

**HOWARDIAN HILLS
AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY
JOINT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
26 MARCH 2015**

DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE AONB

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To receive details of planning applications determined within the AONB during 2014.

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.
- 2.2 At the specific request of Members, information has also been included this year on the total number of applications received over the past 5 years by Ryedale District Council, Hambleton District Council and the North York Moors National Park Authority, for comparison purposes.

3.0 DEVELOPMENT DURING 2014

- 3.1 A summary of planning applications determined during 2014 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 Details have not been included of applications which were withdrawn or where a decision was still pending at the end of the year.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 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, certainly when compared to many other AONBs. The number of applications in 2014 was a significant decrease on the previous two years, but the reason for this is unknown. This illustrates the difficulty in trying to draw any comparisons or firm conclusions about the pattern or pressure of new development.
 - 88% of applications determined were approved, a figure that is lower than the 5-year average of 92%. This is a slight decrease on the figure for 2013, but the most significant conclusion is probably that planning control in the AONB is still allowing the vast majority of applications to proceed, whilst also preventing those that are not of the highest quality necessary to be permitted within an AONB.
 - Development continues to be spread across nearly all villages, but with higher numbers of applications understandably being seen in the larger villages. Activity in most villages in 2014 has been fairly consistent with the 5-year average, albeit at a generally lower level, although Terrington experienced a significantly lower-than-normal level of activity.
 - Most pressure was for small-scale householder applications e.g. residential extensions. No categories of development showed any significant variation from the 5-year average.

- The AONB continues to be under relatively little tourism and recreational development pressure, with the number of applications in 2014 being consistent with the 5-year average, although again at a reduced level.
- A number of significant applications and cases can be highlighted from the past year – erection of 3 houses in Welburn, construction of a replacement dwelling close to Kirkham Priory, substantial extensions to a house at Welburn, construction of 500 dwellings on the western edge of Malton, erection of a new farmstead at Gilling, erection of an agricultural workers dwelling at Hushwaite and erection of 3 polytunnels at Gilling.

3.3 In the financial year 2014/15, which does not quite overlap with the calendar year 2014, 87 applications were scrutinised, having either been referred in accordance with the agreed consultation procedure or called-up by the AONB Manager:

- The AONB Manager submitted comments on 38 of these consultations.
- Objections/strong reservations were lodged in 14 of those responses.
- The District Council followed the JAC's recommendations of refusal, or the applicants Withdrew the plans, in 5 out of the cases where a decision was required (2 cases still pending a Decision).
- 3 schemes were approved following re-submission/amendment in line with the AONB Manager's comments.
- For the 2013 year, the AONB Manager scrutinised 65 applications out of a total of 133 (49%). For the 2014 year the comparable figures are 87 out of 91 applications (96%). This explains the significant workload on planning application scrutiny during 2014/15.

In many cases the comments submitted were relatively minor in nature, but nonetheless important in order to ensure that the AONB landscape, wildlife and historic heritage is conserved appropriately. 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 truly 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.

4.0 DEVELOPMENT TRENDS IN A LOCAL CONTEXT

4.1 As requested, information has also been gathered from the three Local Planning Authorities in relation to the total number of applications Validated in the last 5 years. This information is shown in the table below.

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	5-year average
Ryedale District	671	736	665	677	650	679
Hambleton District	1,926	1,772	1,623	1,542	1,573	1,687
North York Moors National Park	915	803	782	807	706	803
TOTAL	3,512	3,311	3,070	3,026	2,929	3,170

4.2 The figures for the Hambleton District are considerably higher than for the other two LPAs because these include all applications for the Discharge of Conditions. If these were stripped out then the number of applications would be of the same sort of order as the other two areas.

4.3 The figures were gathered to test the hypothesis that the increase in the number of

planning consultations being received by the AONB Manager was mirrored by an increase in applications District-wide. This has not proved to be the case, as the total number of applications in all three areas has generally been falling since 2011.

- 4.4 The hypothesis that an increase in the number of planning applications was a possible indicator of an increase in economic growth is also not proven, as the number of applications has fallen since 2011.
- 4.5 As indicated in section 3.2 above, it is important not to make too many assumptions about development trends based on the number of applications/consultations. It is therefore difficult to know, based on this dataset, whether economic growth in the AONB has been increasing over the last few years.
- 4.6 Given the statistics in the final bullet point in paragraph 3.3 above, it appears that the significant workload of planning application consultation responses during 2014/15 has been due to the need to examine almost every planning application submitted in the AONB this year. This is unprecedented and, because there isn't the time to look at applications purely out of interest, there must have been some aspect of every application that it was felt necessary to scrutinise.

5.0 RECOMMENDATION

That the report be received for information.

Appendix 1

Howardian Hills AONB						
Applications Determined by Parish						
						5yr Average
<u>Ryedale Parishes</u>	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2010-2014
Ampleforth	8	10	7	12	5	8
Bulmer	2	3	0	2	2	2
Cawton	1	3	3	4	4	3
Coneysthorpe	0	0	1	0	0	0
Coulton	0	3	5	3	1	2
Crambe	1	0	2	4	3	2
Gilling East	10	9	10	8	6	9
Grimstone	0	0	0	0	0	0
Henderskelfe	0	0	1	0	2	1
Hovingham	3	9	10	9	4	7
Howsham	2	2	0	3	1	2
Huttons Ambo	6	1	6	7	3	5
Nunnington	4	4	3	5	4	4
Oswaldkirk	8	9	2	10	3	6
Scackleton	2	0	2	1	3	2
Sheriff Hutton (High Stittenham)	0	0	0	1	0	0
Sproxtton	6	1	4	4	3	4
Stonegrave	0	2	6	1	0	2
Terrington	12	5	10	4	1	6
Welburn	5	11	6	14	7	9
Whitwell-on-the Hill	0	1	2	0	2	1
Total Ryedale	70	73	80	92	54	74
<u>Hambleton Parishes</u>						
Brandsby-cum-Stearsby	0	7	12	14	7	8
Coxwold	1	0	0	0	0	0
Crayke	8	17	8	12	6	10
Dalby-cum-Skewsby	5	2	3	3	2	3
Hustwaite	2	5	14	5	6	6
Newburgh	0	1	2	0	1	1
Oulston	3	3	1	1	0	2
Thornton-on-the-Hill	1	0	0	0	1	0
Whenby	0	1	0	3	2	1
Yearsley	2	1	6	1	4	3
Total Hambleton	22	37	46	39	29	35
TOTAL HOWARDIAN HILLS AONB	92	110	126	131	83	108

Howardian Hills AONB										
Applications Determined by										
Type of Development										
(Number of applications and % approved)										
Ryedale Parishes	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	5yr Average 2010-2014				
Residential - New Build	5	4	2	7	9	5				
	100%	100%	100%	71%	78%					
Residential - Conversions	1	3	9	2	0	3				
	100%	100%	100%	0%	~					
Holiday - Conversions	0	0	1	0	0	0				
	~	~	100%	~	~					
Householder	38	34	43	42	21	36				
	87%	88%	98%	93%	90%					
Retail	0	0	0	0	0	0				
	~	~	~	~	~					
Business & Commercial	4	1	1	6	1	3				
	100%	0%	100%	100%	0%					
Minerals & Waste	0	0	0	0	0	0				
	~	~	~	~	~					
Tourism & Recreation	1	1	2	3	1	2				
	100%	0%	100%	100%	100%					
Community Facilities	0	1	1	0	1	1				
	~	0%	100%	~	100%					
Agriculture	2	4	8	7	3	5				
	50%	75%	87%	100%	66%					
Agricultural Prior Notifications	N/A	3	3	2	5	3				
Other	15	20	12	24	18	18				
	100%	100%	100%	92%	88%					
Equestrian	4	0	1	1	0	1				
	75%	~	100%	100%	~					
Total Ryedale	70	71	83	94	59	75				
	90%	88%	97%	90%	85%					
Hambleton Parishes										
Residential - New Build	0	0	2	0	1	1				
	~	~	100%	~	0%					
Residential - Conversions	0	2	4	2	1	2				
	~	100%	100%	100%	100%					
Holiday - Conversions	0	2	2	2	1	1				
	~	100%	100%	50%	100%					
Householder	15	18	20	19	22	19				
	100%	94%	90%	100%	100%					
Retail	0	0	0	0	0	0				
	~	~	~	~	~					
Business & Commercial	0	0	4	3	0	1				
	~	~	100%	100%	~					
Minerals & Waste	0	0	0	0	0	0				
	~	~	~	~	~					
Tourism & Recreation	0	4	1	1	2	2				
	~	75%	100%	100%	100%					
Community Facilities	0	0	1	0	0	0				
	~	~	100%	~	~					
Agriculture	5	8	3	10	4	6				
	80%	100%	100%	100%	75%					
Agricultural Prior Notifications	N/A	3	6	0	1	3				
Other	2	0	3	2	0	1				
	100%	~	100%	100%	~					
Total Hambleton	22	37	46	39	32	35				
	95%	95%	96%	97%	94%					
TOTAL HOWARDIAN HILLS AONE	92	108	129	133	91	111				
	91%	90%	97%	92%	88%	92%				