

**Item Number:** 10  
**Application No:** 21/01461/FUL  
**Parish:** Wombledon Parish Council  
**Appn. Type:** Full Application  
**Applicant:** Miss Jessica Bargh (Westpasture Lodges)  
**Proposal:** Change of use of land for siting of 3no. glamping pods, car parking and erection of office/reception and stores building following demolition of former stables with existing storage container to be retained.  
**Location:** Land At OS Field No 2000 Flatts Lane Wombledon Kirkbymoorside North Yorkshire

**Registration Date:** 28 October 2021  
**8/13 Wk Expiry Date:** 23 December 2021  
**Overall Expiry Date:** 12 October 2022  
**Case Officer:** Niamh Bonner **Ext:** 43325

#### CONSULTATIONS:

<b>Environmental Health</b>	No objection
<b>Tree &amp; Landscape Officer</b>	
<b>Archaeology Section</b>	Comments
<b>Building Conservation Officer</b>	Comments
<b>NYCC Natural Services</b>	Recommends conditions
<b>Public Rights Of Way</b>	Recommend informative
<b>Yorkshire Water Land Use Planning</b>	
	Objects
<b>Highways North Yorkshire</b>	Recommends Conditions
<b>Yorkshire Water Land Use Planning</b>	Comments

**Representations:** Jon, Tricia & Dan Wright, Mrs Nicola Chapman, Peter & Anne Blackburn, Mr And Mrs B O'Connor, Mrs Ellen Fairbank, Dr Nigel Walters, Mrs Joanne Dickman, Mrs Alison Quinn, Mrs Gwyneth Duncan, Mr Nick Jordan, Mr Jon Wright, Jeff Dodson, Mr P Ashton, Mr & Mrs Chris W Monkman, Mr David Burns, Mr David Roberts, Mr Paul Knight, Mr Peter Ashton, Mrs Tricia Wright, Dr Andrew Lambirth,

---

#### SITE:

The application site is a 0.8ha agricultural field, broadly rectangular in form located to the east of Wombledon. The field is located c88m from the village development limits and is sited to the north of Flatts Lane, which links Wombledon with Welburn.

The site is located outside of the defined settlement limits of Wombledon, therefore considered as being located within the open countryside. A public right of way bisects the site from east to west centrally.

The site presently incorporates an internally fenced off area in close proximity to the entrance in which some shed like buildings and a steel storage container are located. Within this area presently exists some poor quality grass and stone utilised for car parking.

The majority of the site is well landscaped with mature hedgerow to all sides, with the exception of an

inset c50m stretch of the western boundary of the site, where only timber post and rail fencing is present. The remainder of the western boundary incorporates a very mature planting belt/coppice, with trees and hedgerow.

The site is surrounded by other agricultural fields/paddocks. The field directly to the east incorporates low profile buildings along the western boundary and is operated as a small holding. There is no dedicated footpath between the application site and the village.

The site does not fall within any designated Area of High Landscape Value, Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Green Belt, nor does it fall within the Village Conservation Area, which is located c230m to the west. Between the site and the Conservation Area boundary there are existing houses and landscaping. The site does include a historic ridge a furrow field pattern.

## **PROPOSAL:**

The updated current proposal seeks planning permission for the change of use of land for siting of 3no. glamping pods, car parking and erection of office/reception and stores building following demolition of former stables with existing storage container to be retained.

The scheme had been previously advertised with other proposed elements that have since been removed, including a wild swimming pool, the installation of a BBQ/External seating area and a landscaping bund. The scheme had originally proposed the pods centrally within the field to the north, this was updated to have these positioned to the south western corner of the site close to an existing coppice and presently the revised position of the pods is now in the southern part of the field but more centrally located, with the decking areas orientated southwards, still benefitting from the existing coppice to the east.

As part of the proposed scheme, the internally fenced-off area to the south east would remain. The existing area where car parking can be undertaken would remain to serve the holiday makers but would be formalised with a permeable surface. To the north of the car parking area, a small timber framed reception/office building is proposed, replacing the existing stables on the site, with a felt roof finish. This building includes a WC and store, this would span c6.47m x 3.27m, with a pitched roof form including a maximum height of c2.9m.

The existing container would be retained as part of this scheme and would span c6.05m x 2.43m with a maximum height of c2.59m. This would be repainted dark green. 2no. LPG tanks would be sited just north of the container along the boundary.

The 3no. proposed pods identified as ‘Cedar Tree Pods’ are to be identical in appearance containing a single room with bed, kitchenette, dining area and sofa, with a separated shower WC. It is considered likely that these could potentially host between 2-4 people, but most likely 2 adults comfortably. These would be constructed of timber cladding and would span 3.95m in width x 6.1m in length, with a maximum height of c3.2m in the form of a curved arch. These include a small decked area directly forward of the southern elevation, as indicated on the proposed plan spanning c3m x c3.95m.

These would be accessed from the car parking area by a wood chip walkway, which appear to be limited to the extent functionally necessary for access. The proposed plans indicate that there would be 3no. lighting locations along the path, which would be low level solar installations and the units themselves appear to incorporate external lighting. Both the levels of external lighting and extent of pathways have reduced significantly in comparison to the original plans.

It was noted in an email from the Agent on the 9th March 2022 that “The site and levels are to remain as existing with the glamping pods sat on localised shallow excavated hardcore bases.” It was further noted “*Electrical provision would be made again with a shallow trench with armed cable supply to each of the proposed 3no. pods and low level light columns. We could also possible look at solar lighting columns to reduce the excavation.*”

It was also confirmed that there would be no hot tub facilities which would be controlled by planning

condition. It is noted that there would be no permitted development rights for any further structures within the site unless placed for 28 days or less annually.

The proposed plans also indicate a significant area of new woodland planting to the north spanning c 0.5 hectares in area.

The foul water within the site would be connected to the existing mains sewers and a soakaway is proposed for surface water.

## **HISTORY:**

04/00507/FUL: Erection of stable building comprising six individual stables and tack room. (Refused.)

The proposed stable would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the landscape and the design, size, scale and materials of the stable would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the locality and, therefore, contrary to Policy AG11 of the Ryedale Local Plan.

It is noted that this application site pertained to the field which forms part of this present application and the stable proposed included a hipped roof form with a footprint of c8m x c15m and a maximum height of c6.5m.

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

Members will be able to read all consultation responses in full on the planning file.

The Parish Council made the following representation on the 7th December 2021:

*With reference to the above application, Wombleton Parish Council has been made aware of an objection submitted by a number of Wombleton residents.*

*Council feel that Wombleton is a small village with no amenities. Over the past few years, planning applications have been approved for a number of holiday homes in the village. Council feel that the village is now at saturation point with these and that any more holiday properties will stretch local roads and facilities to breaking point.*

*Whilst we understand that there are few planning issues that we can object to, (noise, health and safety etc we realise will be considered by the panel), it is the expansion of tourism into a small rural village that we find worrying. We would, therefore, ask that this application is considered with this in mind and the extra traffic impact that will be caused by this facility to local residents, on what are very narrow roads.*

The following summarised objections were received between the 24th November 2021 and 10th December 2021 from the occupiers of

4 Flatts Lane, Moor View, Hornby Cottage, 1 Shaws Close, Autumn Leaf, 8 East Terrace, 1 South View, Minerva House, Holmewood, Stone Garth, The Meadows, Nova 5 Flatts Lane, The Old Barn, Twin Gables, Rufford House, Wellgarth, 13 Langdale Avenue York (family property in close proximity.)

- Small part of a planned future development, more room in field to the west under the same ownership. The costs involved in building these pods will be significantly high and take many years to recoup the initial outlay. If this application is successful how long before an application for a site manager/owner is lodged? This application may well be part of a hidden agenda to increase the site at a later date. Does having an reception and office for 3 Pods sound realistic/like the back door for further development, especially as it would seem that the return from only 3 Pods would take a long time to recover the construction costs.
- In 2004 an application ( 04/00507/FUL) was submitted to develop this same field and was

thankfully rejected.

- Pods can sleep up to 6 adults. The proposed sewage system can cope with up to 6 people, it is likely to be overwhelmed
- Health and safety risk of pool and co-located soakaway. What is need for swimming pool?
- Development close to existing quiet residential area of village is a potential nuisance, impacts upon village tranquillity as Wombleton is very quiet. There is potential for noise disturbance including late night noise with the BBQ pit and swimming pool which is not in keeping with the nature of this quiet village. It is the duty of the planning department to reject the proposal to preserve the beauty and peace of the village. Wombleton is not a theme park but a nice quiet rural village.
- Concerns over visual impact of the proposed development with its BBQ area and swimming pool. Permitting this will change the characteristics of our village forever and this could be the thin end of the wedge, encouraging other land owners.
- Wombleton is a lovely quiet village where residents enjoy a peaceful existence along with the local wildlife, this way of life would be threatened by this development, as would any wildlife in the area. We run a release program for the local hedgehog rescue as the village is currently a safe habitat for these endangered animals. We feel this proposal would be detrimental to this important work. Concern also raised about owls.
- Planting trees is, in my opinion, just a sop, a gimmick, to make this application sound "green". It will take years for any trees to grow to anything of any substance. Is there any mention that these proposed trees should be native species?
- Loss of privacy
- Light pollution at night
- No on site supervision by trained qualified staff to rectify any out of hours issues
- Local bus service is almost non existent, this would relate to increased traffic on already busy roads. Noted no shops or amenities in the village (with the exception of the pub) so traffic will be considerably increased. Flatts Lane is a narrow lane with no footpath and very little passing space at the proposed site, part of Page Lane is unfinished track that is becoming more and more used to cut through the village. Extra traffic will be a hazard to pedestrians, children, dogs. Existing traffic does not respect the speed limits.
- The planning application does not make it clear how many people are able to stay in each glamping pod but there will be increased traffic. Flatts Lane is used by residents to walk dogs, this will put local residents and their pets at an increased risk.
- Adjacent to fields used for crops and livestock, the proposed fire pit constitutes a fire and environmental hazard and potential disturbance to animals via noise.
- Proposed BBQ and gas storage tank adjacent to existing stables and hay barn which will pose potentially a high fire risk. Gas storage goes against Government's drive for renewable energy on new developments. The owners of the field to the east noted "We are the owners of the adjacent field, which is a registered small holding.
- Firstly, the proposed BBQ area and Gas Store on the site, runs parallel to our stable block and Haybarn. This in our view is a potential high fire risk. Furthermore, we are concerned of the noise levels which would be created from the campsite, and the effect this would have on our animals. They are easily startled, and we are extremely concerned for their safety. "

- No benefit to village. The development serves to benefit only the site owner at the detriment of the village and its residents. Erosion of green belt land for personal gain (Case Officer Note: This is not designated as green belt but does related to undeveloped agricultural land.)
- It states that “all hedges and bushes are to be retained” would have an inadequate splay visibility splay at the entrance.
- Foul sewage was original to be discharged to a treatment plant on site and this has been amended to connect to the mains drainage system on Flatts Lane. This would mean a road closure and rerouting of the bus service. As the drains run south down Page Lane it could increase the blockages we already have that require regular visits. Why can't the treatment plant be retained and leave the site self contained, it would seem to suggest further expansion.
- Field is waterlogged in the winter, appears to be no provision for land drainage.
- Where is the public right of way going to be or will it be altered
- Lack of disabled access from the car park to the pods with the path material being unsuitable particularly in inclement weather.
- No provision for waste storage.
- Loss of agricultural land used to graze sheep and geese. Will this mean an application is required for change of use of this field from agricultural to commercial use? It would be more appropriate to retain the property as a small holding rather than a leisure facility.
- The Ownership question states "None of the site is an agricultural holding", but it has had horses on it, has stables on it, and is used for grazing. Is it appropriate that building work be allowed on this site?
- The applicant states SP8 supports tourism accommodation and the Yorkshire Wolds is identified as needing more accommodation, but we are not in the Wolds. Further to that, we currently have numerous sites already around Wombleton, Wrens of Ryedale Foxholme caravan Park Canadian Fields - all on Gale Lane, Wombleton Caravan Park on Moorfields
- the new Log Cabin development, currently under construction on Common Lane. Two more sites on Station Lane in Beadlam, Beadlam Rigg caravan park, Nawton. Plus various Certificated Locations around Wombleton, village B&B's and accommodation in the village pub. Will these businesses be affected? Wombleton is already ringed on the western and southern side with 6 caravan and camping sites and certainly doesn't need further developments of this type on the eastern site.
- The proposed site is Ridge and Furrow, and Wombleton has a conservation area nearby, and this has been used as a condition to deny planning permission near a Warwickshire village. I quote from <https://www.planningresource.co.uk/article/1585573/loss-ridge-furrow-field-housing-denied?fbclid=IwAR0aYrMrSqYqa5cIrI8Nd7OjU6qW127OjTBImDrHT9CTmrzKSoweowu5gBM>.
- *"The inspector observed that one of the most striking aspects of the appeal site was its medieval ridge and furrow landform, which represented a non-designated heritage asset and also contributed to the agricultural setting of the village and its conservation area. The appellant suggested that by building on only 30 per cent of the site and delivering open space on the remaining ridge and furrow areas, along with heritage interpretation boards, some harm would be off-set such that overall it would be less than substantial harm. The inspector, however, observed that this approach was not correct and the degree of harm should be considered irrespective of any mitigation proposed. Noting Historic England's consultation response that there would be substantial harm to the ridge and furrow, and rejecting a planning*

*condition to restrict the built area as shown on the illustrative plan, the inspector went on to conclude the public benefits of the scheme did not anything like outweigh this degree of heritage harm."*

- Wombledon is a conservation village. We understand that there are areas of historical
- Geographical interest eg ancient boundaries etc close to the proposed development.
- Use of pesticides on field to north may affect holiday makers.
- *"My house is approx 100yds from these pods and will be in full view. I understand that some trees will be planted to try and screen the pods. The existing trees that were planted to partially separate/screen the field have been there for approx 12 years. They are still young saplings and provide very little screening. Will we have to wait a further 12 years before the development is screened? (Case Officer note: this was prior to the movement of the pods further south where more substantial landscaping is present along the western boundary.)"*

A petition has been signed with 27 signatories concerned with the issues relating to close proximity to village, additional levels of car journeys on an existing narrow lane, loss of prime agricultural land, loss of ridge and furrow farming system. Other concerns identified are the position next door to a working stable, possible noise issues to both animals and residents and it is concluded by noting if this is granted how long will it be before a larger development is applied for? Mr and Mrs O'Connor asked for their names to be retrospectively added to the petition. This has not been physically done but in the context of this report, Members should consider that the petition incorporates 29 signatures.

Following a period of readvertisement to omit the wild swimming pool and to relocate the units from the northern side of the field to the south western corner, closer to the boundary hedge on Glatts Lane and closer to the existing more established coppice area. The meadow style landscaping area was removed along with the BBQ area. (It is noted that this remained in the description in error) A landscaping bund was also proposed to the currently open section of the western boundary.

The following summarised objections were received between the 20th June 2022 and 24th June 2022 from the occupiers of : 13 Langdale Avenue York (family property in close proximity.) Autumn Leaf, 1 South View, Holmwood, 8 East Terrace,

The occupiers of these properties all reconfirmed their objection to the scheme.

- The pods have simply been moved closer to Flatts Lane and rotated by 90 degrees, this means they are now closer to the houses on the edge of the village, to the West, expanding on the problems of noise etc. as commented on previously. I have spoken to a number of residents and the objections still stand.
- I have had a look at the proposed amendments to this application, and feel that if anything they make the planned changes to the area even more detrimental to the lives of villagers nearby, as the pods (and therefore the noise and activity associated with them) will be moving even closer to the village.
- This is the wrong development so close to a peaceful quiet village.
- This leaves the original site position of the pods free for further applications in the future, to expand the site further. This being one of the main complaints with the original application. This could be the thing end of the wedge.
- The bund raises another issue. Why is a bund required to screen off the farmers' fields to the North of this site, it surely cannot be for privacy or to reduce noise to the North across open fields. It would however screen any future increase in the number of pods as stated earlier
- Unfortunately the application still includes an outdoor barbecue area. The field behind the site

is planted with grass like produce which once mature and dry would take only one spark from the barbecue area to ignite. The field next to the site is home to a small holding which has a hay barn and stables. Again, one spark could ignite both putting the safety of a number of animals (sheep, alpaca, ponies, donkeys) at serious risk of injury or death. (Case Officer note: This was removed from the plans but retained in the description in error.)

- Despite the omission of the swimming pond, after the Environmental Health Officer expressed health concerns regarding such a relatively small area of still water, I note that Mr Howard Bruce for the applicants agent has said that this could possibly be applied for at a later date, if planning consent is given. Hardly reassuring.
- The Highways Officer, mentions that typically, a site like this generates 3 return car trips per day, per unit, so we're looking at 18 extra vehicle journeys per day on a single track road. Plus the vehicles associated with administration, maintenance, deliveries and tradesmen. If this is the thin edge of the wedge, which I suspect this is, and more pods are planned for the future, these vehicle journeys will rise. There are no amenities in the village, apart from the Plough Inn. The Officer also mentions the proximity of the 170 bus route. This would normally be a selling point on a camping site as it would mean the happy campers could travel locally without taking the car. However, the 170 service has been cut back so drastically as to make it almost useless to visitors and locals alike.
- NYCC Ecology dept have recommended a couple of sparrow terrace nest boxes to make up for the loss of existing nesting sites. These will be little or no compensation to the wildlife already using this previously undisturbed habitat, and surely we should be looking to increase nesting sites, rather than just replacing.
- Hundreds of trees have already been planted on this site, and not as originally mapped on the application. Has planning consent already been decided? The electricity supply has already been installed to the edge of the applicants land, presumably at great expense. Has planning consent already been decided? How will 3 glamping pods pay back the considerable outlay already spent? Is this the thin end of the wedge? Are more planned? Has planning consent already been decided?

The Parish Council responded in an email dated 15th June to note *“We have received new details for this application but they are not presently on the planning portal for comment. Wombledon Parish Council would like it to be noted that their original objection still remains in place for the new submission.”*

The Case Officer wrote to the Parish Council to confirm the revised documents were scanned on the 9th June 2022 (the reconsultation began on the 10th). It was noted that hopefully the Parish were able to see these but they were also attached within that email for ease. Additional time was offered to review the scheme.

A final period of readvertisement was undertaken on the current scheme, which sees the pods orientated southwards within a more central position in the southern section of the site, the omission of the bund to the western boundary, additional landscaping to the north and clarity in the description over the removal of the BBQ pit.

Objections were received between the 28th September 2022 and 12th October 2022 from the occupiers of 1 South View, Holmewood and Twin Gables. The occupiers of all these properties reconfirmed their objection to the scheme.

The following objection was made by the occupier of Twin Gables:

*“The amendment made to the above application has not changed the original reasons for objection. The glamping pods bring no benefit to the village and in return we have more traffic along very narrow*

country lanes.

*The village is a conservation area and is within an area of outstanding natural beauty. The pods would bring noise and traffic.*

*The land owners are seeking to profit from this venture and as they do not live in the village it is of no consequence to them. They must also believe that it is a foregone conclusion that they will get planning permission as they have already spent a large sum of money land scaping the rear of the field and establishing electricity to the field.”*

## **POLICIES:**

Local Plan Strategy - Policy SP8 Tourism  
Local Plan Strategy - Policy SP13 Landscapes  
Local Plan Strategy - Policy SP16 Design  
Local Plan Strategy - Policy SP17 Managing Air Quality, Land and Water Resources  
Local Plan Strategy - Policy SP19 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development  
Local Plan Strategy - Policy SP20 Generic Development Management Issues  
Local Plan Strategy - Policy SP21 Occupancy Restrictions  
National Planning Policy Framework  
National Planning Practice Guidance

## **APPRAISAL:**

The main considerations in assessing the impact of this application are:

- i) Principle of the Development
- ii) Character, Form, Design and Landscaping.
- iii) Archaeology and Heritage
- iv) Residential Amenity
- v) Highway Impact
- vi) Ecology
- vii) Other matters, including consultation responses

- i) Principle of the Development

Policy SP8 (Tourism) acknowledges that a key contributor to Ryedale's rural economy is tourism, and within the 'Wider Open Countryside' seeks to support new static caravan/chalet style self-catering *“that can be accommodated without an unacceptable visual intrusion and impact on the character of the locality.”*

It is also noted that whilst falling outside of Wombledon development limits and c88m from the nearest residential property, a proposed tourism use in this location would however maintain a link with the village and amenities for potential holidaymakers such as the village pub and the bus route.

It is therefore considered that, in principle, the principle of the development is acceptable in this open countryside location, subject to a full assessment on Character, Form, Design and Landscaping and the imposition of the time limited occupancy conditions for new holiday accommodation detailed within Policy SP21 Occupancy Restrictions in the Ryedale Plan, Local Plan Strategy

The issue about potential saturation of the market and the village in terms of capacity to absorb further holiday development is noted, as is the possible impacts upon existing tourism businesses. The Ryedale Plan Local Plan Strategy does not dictate specific levels of holiday accommodation and whilst it is noted that there may be a significant level of provision in Wombledon, each application must be determined on its own merits. This could therefore not relate to a reason for refusal in isolation.

In response to some of the issues raised within the incoming representations, it is noted that it is not



possible to take into account potential future applications within surrounding land as part of this scheme. If future applications are submitted, these will be assessed on their own merits. Therefore comments made about future applications being forthcoming to pay for works undertaken cannot be considered relevant in the determination of this scheme. However, as part of the determination of this scheme, as will be discussed in the following section, it was made clear that Officers were not supportive of the proposed holiday accommodation in the northern part of the field.

Furthermore, pertaining to the installation of electrical infrastructure, the Agent confirmed in an email dated 16th March 2022 *“With regards to the current installation of electrics to site - This has been a separate application to the local electricity provider to allow our client electricity to the current stables etc.”* This is not considered to require planning permission. Any such work is undertaken at the Applicant’s own risk and would in no way influence an Officer’s recommendation on a proposed development.

ii) Character, Form, Design and Landscaping.

Policy SP13 of the Ryedale Plan, Local Plan Strategy notes: *“Development proposals should contribute to the protection and enhancement of distinctive elements of landscape character that are the result of historical and cultural influences, natural features and aesthetic qualities including:*

- *The pattern and presence of distinctive landscape features and natural elements (including field boundaries, woodland, habitat types, landforms, topography and watercourses)*
- *Visually sensitive skylines, hill and valley sides*
- *The ambience of the area, including nocturnal character, level and type of activity and tranquillity, sense of enclosure/exposure.*

SP16 Design of the Ryedale Plan, Local Plan Strategy notes: *Development proposals will be expected to create high quality durable places that are accessible, well integrated with their surroundings and which “Reinforce local distinctiveness and... Protect amenity and promote well-being.”*

*To reinforce local distinctiveness, the location, siting, form, layout, scale and detailed design of new development should respect the context provided by its surroundings including:*

- *Appropriate materials and traditional construction methods and techniques are used.*
- *Topography and landforms*

Policy SP20: Generic Development Management Issues of the Ryedale Plan, Local Plan Strategy notes:

- *New development will respect the character and context of the immediate locality and the wider landscape/townscape character in terms of physical features and the type and variety of existing uses*
- *Proposed uses and activity will be compatible with the existing ambience of the immediate locality and the surrounding area and with neighbouring land uses and would not prejudice the continued operation of existing neighbouring land uses*

Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework notes *“Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:*

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;*
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;*
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);*
- d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types*

*and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit”*

Concern had originally been raised by Officers in relation to the original scheme which incorporated the 3no. pods located within the northern half of the site (c70m from the highways and between c45m and c67m away from the replacement reception/office building at the nearest point.) This would have been located adjacent to the currently open western boundary so would have been reliant on the proposed new landscaping area to help soften/screen the pods, which may potentially have taken time to become mature and sufficient. This original scheme also included the natural swimming pool and external BBQ area.

There was concern that, notwithstanding the significant proposed new landscaping, the proposed pods (by virtue of their proposed isolated positioning) related to a visual incursion within a generally undeveloped paddock distanced from existing structures and established landscaping. It was considered that this was at odds with and detrimental to the agricultural nature and character of the existing field in discordance with Policies SP13, SP16 and SP20 of the Ryedale Plan, Local Plan Strategy. The proposed swimming pool was also considered to represent an alien feature in an agricultural paddock.

A suggestion to move the units to the south western corner of the site was made, to take advantage of the existing landscaping/coppice at this point, which would help the proposed units appear less isolated and reduce the level of incursion into the field. This advice was taken, however the Agent subsequently submitted revised plans with the units repositioned in the southern part of the site, although more centrally located (c32m from the road and between c25m and c52m from the proposed replacement reception/office building.) It is these final plans which are currently being considered.

On balance, given the location of the existing well established coppice to the east boundary together with the mature field boundary to the south, it is considered that the proposed units would be positioned within a much improved location in comparison to the original scheme, with limited potential visual intrusion. Additionally, the units themselves incorporate a relatively low profile scale and are constructed with natural materials, which would help them to assimilate in this location. Their orientation north south would also appear more glimpsed from public views along the highway to the south. Whilst these units would be clearly visible from any users of the public footpath, this would be a localised view of the units, within the field itself only which is considered acceptable.

The retention of the proposed woodland to the north, although no longer playing a fundamental role in screening the units, is maintained as part of this updated scheme. It is considered that this is beneficial and would help to enhance the wider appearance of the site. A full landscaping condition will be recommended.

In terms of lighting, the scheme indicatively proposed low level solar lighting, with three units to light the walkway. Lighting on the units themselves is likely as well as potentially within the car park area and a condition to secure full details of all lighting is proposed. Only suitably sensitive lighting would be approved and an informative will provide a link to the North Yorkshire Moors dark skies lighting advice.

It is also considered that the proposed replacement reception/office building incorporates a suitably scaled, functional appearance, commensurate with the stable it is replacing. It is also noted from review of Google Earth that the storage container has been present for over 4 years and incorporates a lawful use. Its painting a more recessive dark green colour is consequently not required but welcomed and would be conditioned for completion prior to the commencement of the holiday use. The approach of retaining the south eastern corner of the site as a functional area, where the car parking, storage and office/reception uses occur is welcomed as this would limit additional further visual incursion within the undeveloped field, ie. if parking was adjacent to the pods it would incorporate significant additional levels of hardstanding etc. It is also considered that there is significant scope for storage of waste within this area. It will be in the interests of the site operators to store this in a sensible way that would not impact upon their guests and by extension, the wider locality.

In conclusion, the revised scheme relates to a much more ‘light touch’ approach, with the removal of the swimming pools, BBQ area, much of the proposed lighting and the previously greater level of

woodchip walkway.

Subject to the appropriate conditions, it is considered that this proposed scheme incorporates an acceptable design which would not over domesticate this site, nor adversely impact upon the naturalist character of the field or result in harmful wider landscape impacts, in accordance with Policies SP13, SP16 and SP20 of the Ryedale Plan, Local Plan Strategy.

### iii) Archaeology and Heritage

NYCC Archaeology were consulted due to the presence of ridge and furrow patterns within the field. They noted in their first response dated 16th February 2022:

*“I have had some previous correspondence on this site and the land to the west in respect of a tree planting proposal last year.*

*The site does contain ridge and furrow which is very straight and narrow, suggesting a post-medieval date. The ridges are truncated at both the western ends and the eastern end and this might now be considered as a fragment of what was originally a much wider pattern of ridge and furrow forming the open field system of the village of Wombleton.*

*When ridge and furrow is fragmentary like this is it harder to build a case of significance. Although it does relate directly to the village and forms part of its traditional agricultural setting it does appear to be a later example of this type of ploughing and its fragmentary nature also goes against it.*

*There are no details in the application as to whether the intention is to level the earthworks or to retain them. At the moment it is not clear if the impact will be localised to the glamping pods and other new facilities. The applicant could be asked to confirm the level of impact. It may also be possible to minimise impact in the area of the pods and access tracks by building up levels rather than reducing them. It is likely that impact from the proposed pool would be unavoidable.*

*In summary I would say that the ridge and furrow is a heritage asset of local interest, although the significance of the asset is not such as to preclude the development if the footprint is limited. If the level of impact is greater than the loss of the ridge and furrow would require greater consideration as the ridges do form part of the immediate landscape context of the Conservation Area.”*

It was noted in an email from the Agent on the 9th March 2022 that *“The site and levels are to remain as existing with the glamping pods sat on localised shallow excavated hardcore bases.”* It was further noted *“Electrical provision would be made again with a shallow trench with armed cable supply to each of the proposed 3no. pods and low level light columns. We could also possibly look at solar lighting columns to reduce the excavation.”*

In a revised response dated 21st March 2022 the NYCC Archaeologist noted: *“Further to my email of 16 February 2022, the swimming pool element of the proposal has now been removed lessening the physical impact of the proposal. The cover email for the re-submitted plans states that the site will not be levelled and the below ground impact will be limited to the sub-bases and bark finished footpaths to the pods. This again limits the overall physical impact of the proposal on the ridge and furrow. My conclusion is that the ridge and furrow is a heritage asset of local interest and that the proposal will have a minor to moderate impact upon it. This impact should be considered as part of the balanced planning judgement.”*

The Council’s Building Conservation Officer was provided with the consultation responses from the NYCC Archaeologist and in her response dated 23rd June 2022 she confirmed: *“This is quite far from the cons area on a lane that has mid-late 20th century housing, which does not contribute to the setting of the cons area. In my opinion, it will have a negligible impact on the conservation area.”*

On balance, it is considered that the physical impact upon the ridge and furrow would be limited to the subbases of the three small-scale pods; therefore the conclusion of the NYCC archaeologist is that the

impact is minor to moderate. This is balanced against the benefits of creating additional tourism development, which Policy SP8 identifies as a key contributor to Ryedale's rural economy.

Furthermore, it is acknowledged in the balance, that as part of this scheme, an additional 0.5 hectares of woodland planting will be secured. The Case Officer has been provided with written confirmation from the NYCC archaeologist that the tree planting would not affect the ridge and furrow.

It is therefore considered that this proposal remains in accordance with Policy SP12 of the Ryedale Plan, Local Plan Strategy, the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990 and National Policy.

iv) Amenity;

Policy SP20 Generic Development Management Issues of the Ryedale Plan, Local Plan Strategy notes:

- *New development will not have a material adverse impact on the amenity of present or future occupants, the users or occupants of neighbouring land and buildings or the wider community by virtue of its design, use, location and proximity to neighbouring land uses. Impacts on amenity can include, for example, noise, dust, odour, light flicker, loss of privacy or natural daylight or be an overbearing presence*
- *Developers will be expected to apply the highest standards outlined in the World Health Organisation, British Standards and wider international and national standards relating to noise*

Paragraph 130 (f) of the National Planning Policy Framework notes that “*Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments: create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.*”

It is noted that the nearest part of the proposed application site for 3no. glamping pods is located c88m from the boundary of the residential property of 1 South View (the nearest property), with the outdoor decking area of the closest pod further inset by approximately 12 metres. As noted, with the movement of the pods southwards, whilst this would be closer to 1 South View, it would be screened by a thick established coppice along the western boundary of the site.

This proposal has been fully considered by the Council's Environmental Health Team. In a response dated 19th November 2021, there was a very strong objection to the originally proposed wild swimming pool.

Following the removal of this from the scheme, the Environmental Health Team were re-consulted. In a final response dated 10th November 2022, it was noted that “*As stated previously our concerns centred around the use of a wild swimming pool and hygiene/pollution and safety issues. In the absence of this and the fact that foul sewage will discharge to mains, I would have no objections and am satisfied that the use of the glamping pods would have minimal impact on neighbouring dwellings.*”

The concern pertaining to fire risk and the adjoining smallholding was noted, it is considered that the omission of the BBQ fire pit – which would have had naked flames – is welcomed in that regard. The LPG tanks will remain in proximity, however it is noted that these would be installed by a suitably qualified person and properly maintained. It is not considered that these would result in the same level of concern as a fire pit. No third response has been received from the operator of the small holding following the omission of the fire pit from the plans/description.

It is not considered that the use of pesticides within adjoining fields would harmfully impact future holiday makers.

Furthermore, it is not considered that the levels of additional vehicular traffic would result in material

impacts upon the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

It is also not considered that the revised scheme would be likely to harmfully impact the wellbeing of the animals within the adjoining site. There are many examples throughout Ryedale of holiday units in proximity to livestock. The site benefits from well-established field boundaries and with the omission of the BBQ fire pit, the nearest decking area would be located c33.5m from the eastern boundary.

Additionally, it is not considered that this scheme would have any privacy impacts.

Therefore, whilst the concerns raised within the neighbouring responses are noted and have been considered, following review by the Council's Environmental Health Team it is not considered that these holiday pods would result in material harm to the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring properties, given the significant distances between the site and neighbouring residents. It is also noted that should issues occur in the future, the Council have a wide range of powers with which to address potential noise nuisance which would be administered by the Environmental Health Team. Consequently, this proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy SP20 of the Ryedale Plan, Local Plan Strategy.

#### v) Highway Impact

Policy SP20 Generic Development Management Issues of the Ryedale Plan, Local Plan Strategy notes:

*Access to and movement within the site by vehicles, cycles and pedestrians would not have a detrimental impact on road safety, traffic movement or the safety of pedestrians and cyclists.*

The proposed holiday units will be accessed via the gated access to the field. North Yorkshire County Council Highways were consulted on the proposal and confirmed the following in a responses dated 15th December 2021 *"Notwithstanding the comments made to Ryedale District council regarding the proposals the local highway authority do not consider the proposals to give rise to concerns regarding the safety of highway users accessing the site. This type of holiday accommodation typically generates 3 return trips per unit, per day.*

*Consideration is given to the locality and proximity to the 170 service bus route in both directions. Adequate visibility can be achieved from the existing access in both directions save for the trimming back of low branches when the tress are in leaf however the access construction should be improved to a highway specification."* A condition relating to the access improvements was proposed.

Therefore, whilst concerns have been raised locally within the incoming consultation responses, it is considered following review by the statutory consultee that this proposal could be acceptably accommodated without materially adverse impact upon access and highway safety. It is also noted that cycle parking will be provided adjacent to the pods.

NYCC Highways Public Right of Way Team have also provided a consultation response on this scheme and an informative is recommended. No proposal to change the public right of way is indicated and the revised scheme would have no physical impact upon this.

Therefore, whilst the concerns of the Parish Council and neighbouring residents are noted, following careful review it is not considered that this proposal would have a materially harmful impact upon the highway network.

#### vi) Ecology

NYCC Ecology were consulted on this proposal and the Bat Breeding Bird and Barn Owl Survey (MAB July 2022).

In their response dated 22nd November 2021 the NYCC Ecologist noted *"Thank you for consulting the*

*NYCC ecology team regarding this application. The proposed landscaping offers substantial net gains for biodiversity including new woodland and meadow planting. The lighting scheme is low-key and retains dark corridors around the periphery of the site, which benefits nocturnal wildlife. I am assuming the woodland planting would be detailed as a condition?*

*The application is supported by a bat survey of the stables building proposed for demolition: no evidence of roosting bats was detected. The survey report (para 4.1.1.6) helpfully clarifies that the proposed development is unlikely to impact upon any other protected species.*

*We would recommend a Condition to adhere to the recommendations set out in section 4.2 of the bat survey report (Quants Environmental, September 2021). These include precautionary advice on what to do in the unlikely event that bats are encountered and on timing of demolition in relation to nesting birds, as well as the provision of 2 sparrow terrace boxes as compensation for lost nesting places.”*

Although the points pertaining to impacts upon wildlife are noted, in particular owls and hedgehogs, it is considered that this has been carefully reviewed by both the Ecologist employed by the Applicant and the NYCC Ecologist. Their recommended condition will be attached. It is therefore considered that this meets the requirements of Policy SP14 of the Ryedale Plan, Local Plan Strategy.

vii) Other matters, including consultation responses.

In relation to the site drainage, the Agent has confirmed in the Application form their intention to create soakaways for surface water drainage which is acceptable and will be conditioned. It is noted that the units would connect to the existing sewerage system. Yorkshire Water have been consulted on this application and have recommended conditions. Although concerns have been raised in relation to the existing sewerage system in the village, Yorkshire Water have no issue with the additional connection and this is the preferred option in the drainage hierarchy. It has been raised that the field is waterlogged at times, however a surface water soakaway is proposed.

The level of local concern is noted and has been fully considered. As reviewed above, it is considered that subject to the recommended conditions, the development for new holiday accommodation in the edge of village location has been found to be acceptable in terms of principle, with the revised design considered to assimilate in this rural setting without harmful wider landscape impact. The revised scheme, with a more ‘light touch’ approach, is supported as is the significant level of tree planting proposed. Full consideration has been given to maintaining an appropriate level of residential amenity as is the impacts of the proposed development upon access and highway safety.

Therefore officers are satisfied that this proposal conforms with Policies SP1 General Location of Development and Settlement Hierarchy, SP8 Tourism, SP12 Heritage, SP13 Landscapes, SP14 Biodiversity, SP16 Design, SP17 Managing Air Quality, Land and Water Resources, SP19 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development, SP20 Generic Development Management Issues, Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development and SP21 Occupancy Restrictions of the Ryedale Local Plan, Local Plan Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

**RECOMMENDATION:                      Approval**

1            The development hereby permitted shall be begun on or before .

Reason:- To ensure compliance with Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved documents/plan(s):

Location Plan and Site Plan as Existing (Drawing no. S101 Rev D)  
Plans, Sections and Elevations - Cedar Tree Pods - XL Grande (Drawing no. F105 Rev C)  
Site Plan and Elevations as Proposed. (Drawing no. F101 Rev J)  
Site and Drainage Plan (Drawing no. F103 Rev G)  
Car Park, Office and Storage Plans and Section as Proposed (Drawing no. F102 Rev H)

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning

- 4 Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, no external lighting shall be installed within the application site without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure any additional lighting in this rural location does not result in harm to character and tranquillity of the area in discordance with Policies SP13, SP16 and SP20 of the Ryedale Plan - Local Plan Strategy.

- 5 Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, prior to any above ground construction of the new development hereby approved, plans showing full details of a landscaping and planting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall provide for the planting of new trees/hedging and show any areas to be grass seeded or turfed. The submitted plans and/or accompanying schedules shall indicate numbers, species, heights on planting, and positions of all hedging plants. All planting, seeding and/or turfing comprised in the above scheme shall be carried out during the first planting season following the commencement of the development, and any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of development die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To protect visual amenity and the character of the area and to ensure a satisfactory environment having regard to SP13 and SP20 of the Ryedale Plan, Local Plan Strategy

- 6 The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the following ecological measures:

i) Section 4.2 of the bat survey report (Quants Environmental, September 2021).

Reason: In the interest of ecological protection and mitigation in accordance with Policy SP14 of the Ryedale Plan, Local Plan Strategy.

- 7 No hot tubs shall be installed within the application site without the submission of a planning application to the Local Planning Authority in that regard.

Reason: To prevent potential further impacts upon the local drainage system, visual intrusion and to prevent enhanced levels of noise and disturbance in accordance with Policies S16, SP17 and SP20 of the Ryedale Plan Local Plan Strategy.

- 8 Prior to the site being brought into commercial tourism use, the storage container to be retained shall be repainted in a dark green colour finish.

Reason: To protect visual amenity and the character of the area and to ensure a satisfactory environment having regard to SP13 and SP20 of the Ryedale Plan, Local Plan Strategy

- 9 Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, all surface water and foul water shall be undertaken to the satisfaction of an approved Building Control Inspector. If this cannot be provided satisfactorily, the LPA must be advised and prior written approval for another method of surface water disposal agreed in writing.

Reason: To ensure that no discharges take place until proper provision has been made for their disposal and to satisfy the requirements of Policies SP17 and SP19 of the Ryedale Plan - Local Plan Strategy.

- 10 The site shall be developed with separate systems of drainage for foul and surface water on and off site. The separate systems should extend to the points of discharge to be agreed.

Reason: In the interest of satisfactory and sustainable drainage and to satisfy the requirements of Policies SP17 and SP19 of the Ryedale Plan - Local Plan Strategy.)

- 11 No piped discharge of surface water from the application site shall take place until works to provide a satisfactory outfall, other than the existing local public sewerage, for surface water have been completed in accordance with details submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the site is properly drained and in order to prevent overloading, surface water is not discharged to the public sewer network and to satisfy the requirements of Policies SP17 and SP19 of the Ryedale Plan - Local Plan Strategy.)

- 12 The crossing of the highway verge and/or footway must be constructed in accordance with the approved details and/or Standard Detail number E50 Rev A and the following requirements.
- o Any gates or barriers must be erected a minimum distance of 1.5 metres back from the carriageway of the existing highway and must not be able to swing over the existing or proposed highway.
  - o Provision to prevent surface water from the site/plot discharging onto the existing or proposed highway must be constructed in accordance with the approved details shown on drawing and maintained thereafter to prevent such discharges.
  - o The final surfacing of any private access within 2 metres of the public highway must not contain any loose material that is capable of being drawn on to the existing or proposed public highway.
- All works must accord with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory means of access to the site from the public highway in the interests of highway safety and the convenience of all highway users in accordance with Policy SP20 of the Ryedale Plan - Local Plan Strategy.

#### MHi-C New and altered Private Access or Verge Crossing -(MHC-03)

Notwithstanding any valid planning permission for works to amend the existing highway, you are advised that a separate licence will be required from North Yorkshire County Council as the Local Highway Authority in order to allow any works in the existing public highway to be carried out. The 'Specification for Housing and Industrial Estate Roads and Private Street Works' published by North Yorkshire County Council as the Local Highway Authority, is available to download from the County Council's web site:

[https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/sites/default/files/fileroot/Transport%20and%20streets/Roads%2C%20highways%20and%20pavements/Specification\\_for\\_housing\\_\\_\\_ind\\_est\\_roads\\_\\_\\_street\\_works\\_2nd\\_edition.pdf](https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/sites/default/files/fileroot/Transport%20and%20streets/Roads%2C%20highways%20and%20pavements/Specification_for_housing___ind_est_roads___street_works_2nd_edition.pdf)

The Local Highway Authority will also be pleased to provide the detailed constructional specifications referred to in this condition.



## INFORMATIVE(S)

- 1
- i) There is a Public Right of Way or a 'claimed' Public Right of Way within or adjoining the application site boundary - please see the attached plan.
  - ii) If the proposed development will physically affect the Public Right of Way Permanently in any way an application to the Local Planning Authority for a Public Path Order/Diversion Order will need to be made under S.257 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as soon as possible. Please contact the Local Planning Authority for a Public Path Order application form.
  - iii) If the proposed development will physically affect a Public Right of Way temporarily during the period of development works only, an application to the Highway Authority (North Yorkshire County Council) for a Temporary Closure Order is required. Please contact the County Council or visit their website for an application form.
  - iv) The existing Public Right(s) of Way on the site must be protected and kept clear of any obstruction until such time as an alternative route has been provided by either a temporary or permanent Order.
  - v) It is an offence to obstruct a Public Right of Way and enforcement action can be taken by the Highway Authority to remove any obstruction.
  - vi) If there is a "claimed" Public Right of Way within or adjoining the application site boundary, the route is the subject of a formal application and should be regarded in the same way as a Public Right of Way until such time as the application is resolved.
  - vii) Where public access is to be retained during the development period, it shall be kept free from obstruction and all persons working on the development site must be made aware that a Public Right of Way exists, and must have regard for the safety of Public Rights of Way users at all times.
- Applicants should contact the County Council's Countryside Access Service at County Hall, Northallerton via [CATO@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:CATO@northyorks.gov.uk) to obtain up-to-date information regarding the exact route of the way and to discuss any initial proposals for altering the route.