



Agenda

- Meeting:** Thirsk and Malton Area Planning Committee
- To:** Councillors Caroline Goodrick (Chair), Joy Andrews (Vice-Chair), Alyson Baker, Lindsay Burr MBE, Michelle Donohue-Moncrieff, Nigel Knapton, Malcolm Taylor and Greg White.
- Date:** Thursday, 18 December 2025
- Time:** 10.00 am
- Venue:** Council Chamber, Ryedale House, Malton, YO17 7HH

This meeting is being recorded and will be available to view [via our website](#) and uploaded to [our Youtube channel](#).

Business

- 1. Apologies for absence**
- 2. Minutes for the meeting held on 16 October 2025** (Pages 3 - 6)
- 3. Declarations of interests**
All Members are invited to declare at this point any interests, including the nature of those interests, or lobbying in respect of any items appearing on this agenda.
- 4. ZE25/01109/REM - Erection of 5no. dwellinghouses on land at Sutton Grange, Langton Road, Norton on Derwent** (Pages 7 - 26)
Report of the Head of Development Management – Community Development Services
- 5. Any other items**
Any other items which the Chair agrees should be considered as a matter of urgency because of special circumstances.
- 6. Date of next meeting**
Thursday, 22 January 2026.

Members of the public are entitled to attend this meeting as observers for all those items taken in open session.

You may also be interested in [subscribing to updates](#) about this or any other North Yorkshire Council committee.

Recording is allowed at Council, committee and sub-committee meetings which are open to the public. Please give due regard to the Council's protocol on audio/visual recording and photography at public meetings. We ask that any recording is clearly visible to anyone at the meeting and that it is non-disruptive.

Anyone wishing to record is asked to contact the Democratic Services Officer (details below) prior to the start of the meeting.

Contact Details

Enquiries relating to this agenda and meeting please contact:

Nicki Lishman, Senior Democratic Services Officer

E-mail: democraticservices.east@northyorks.gov.uk

E-mail: nicki.lishman@northyorks.gov.uk

Tel: 01653 638476

Website: www.northyorks.gov.uk

Barry Khan
Assistant Chief Executive
(Legal and Democratic Services)
County Hall
Northallerton

Wednesday, 10 December 2025

North Yorkshire Council

Thirsk and Malton Area Planning Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 16 October 2025 commencing at 10.00 am.

Councillor Caroline Goodrick in the Chair and Councillors Joy Andrews, Alyson Baker, Lindsay Burr MBE, Michelle Donohue-Moncrieff, Nigel Knapton and Greg White.

Officers present: Eleanor Hardie, Peter Jones - Development Manager, North, Nicki Lishman - Senior Democratic Services Officer and Alpha Love-Koh.(inc job title)

Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book

209 Apologies for absence

There were no apologies for absence.

Councillor Greg White was delayed and joined the meeting at 10:07am.

The Chair delayed the start of the meeting to 10:10am allow Members to read the late consultation response from Environmental Health Scientific Officer.

210 Minutes for the meeting held on 18 September 2025

The minutes of the meeting held on 18 September 2025 were agreed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

Voting record

5 For

2 Abstentions

211 Declarations of interests

In the interests of transparency, the Chair declared that they knew the applicant for Item 5.

In the interests of transparency for Item 4, Councillor Alyson Baker declared that a family member worked for Yorkshire Water.

In the interests of transparency, all Members declared that they had been lobbied on Item 4.

212 ZE24/01683/MOUT Application for outline planning permission (with all matters reserved except the main points of access) at land off Rainbow Lane, Peasey Hills, Malton

The Head of Development Management sought a view from the Committee on the direction of defence at an appeal for non-determination in relation to an outline planning permission (with all matters reserved except the main points of access) for the construction of up to 200

residential dwellings, open space, landscaping, habitat enhancement, drainage infrastructure and associated works at land off Rainbow Lane, Malton.

The Senior Planning Officer advised Members of recently received correspondence as follows:

- Local Highway – no objection
- National Highways – no objection
- Yorkshire Water - objection as it was considered that the public foul water sewer does not have sufficient capacity to accommodate a development of the size proposed.
- Environmental Health - the applicant's Noise Impact Assessment was considered inadequate. Further acoustic detail and acoustic mitigation measures were required.

The officer also confirmed that the soil assessment had not yet been received.

During the debate Members considered:

- The impact of developments already approved on local infrastructure
- The lack of information on noise mitigation
- The lack of capacity in the public foul water sewer
- Concerns about the impact on local highways
- Loss of the buffer zone between Malton and Old Malton
- The planning constraints listed in 4.2 of the officer's report
- The cumulative effect of Grampian conditions imposed on other recent applications

Councillor Lindsay Burr proposed and Councillor Nigel Knapton seconded that the application would have been refused for the reasons listed below.

Decision

Members considered that the application would have been refused for the following reasons:

1. The development resulted in less than substantial harm to the setting of the Conservation Area and to the listed Church.
2. The development had a harmful impact on the Visually Important Undeveloped Area.
3. The proposed emergency access onto a single carriageway, unadopted road was considered unacceptable.
4. Harmful impact of surface water run off and insufficient information on surface water attenuation and management.
5. Lack of appropriate information with regard to the impact on the amenity of future occupiers of the development resulting from noise.
6. No information provided by the applicant on Land Classification and as such it was not possible to apply appropriate weight to this issue.
7. Insufficient capacity of the sewerage system to accept the proposed additional foul flows. Members raised concerns about both the cumulative impact from housing development on sewerage capacity along with concern about the weight to be given to new housing approvals in light of housing land supply and the deliverability of housing sites where Grampian style conditions were used owing to the uncertainty of the timescales for delivery.

Voting record

6 For

1 Abstention

213 ZE25/00523/FUL - Change of use of land to site for 6 no. caravans with associated foul drainage (retrospective) at Willow Farm, Upper Helmsley YO41 1JX

The Head of Development Management sought determination of a retrospective planning application for the change of use of land to allow the siting of 6no. static caravans with associated foul drainage at Willow Farm, Upper Helmsley.

The application was referred to Committee for determination owing to the issues raised.

Members had questions on:

- The definition of special circumstance. The officer confirmed that workers accommodation in the equestrian industry is not listed as a special circumstance.
- The officer advised that the applicant's agent had offered to undertake landscaping if that would mitigate concerns.
- Would the relocation of the manure store away from the vicinity of the caravans make the proposal more acceptable

Mr O'Meara, the applicant, spoke to the application.

During debate Members were supportive of the provision of accommodation for employees, particularly in the current rental market. They were supportive of those in the racing industry, aware of the challenges and conscious of the other local businesses in the supply chain.

Members discussed alternative options to refusal including consideration of what would be a suitable time period if a temporary consent was granted to allow the applicant to submit a more suitable application.

Councillor Lindsay Burr proposed that a 1-year temporary consent be granted and Councillor Caroline Goodrick proposed and Councillor Michelle Donohue-Moncrieff seconded an amendment that a 2-year temporary consent be granted.

Decision

Members were unanimously minded to GRANT planning permission for a limited period of 2 years.

Members were supportive of the essential need for accommodation to be provided on site to enable the operation of the business but considered that the existing accommodation on site failed to provide an adequate level of amenity. Members considered that a 2-year temporary consent was acceptable to ensure the business was not prejudiced and to allow the applicant to seek to provide more acceptable accommodation.

214 Any other items

There were no items of urgent business.

215 Date of next meeting

The date of the next meeting was confirmed as 10am on 20 November 2025.

The Chair and Committee members thanked Peter Jones, Development Management Team Manager and Ellie Hardie, Senior Planning Officer, for their help and support as they move on to new opportunities.

North Yorkshire Council

Community Development Services

Thirsk and Malton Area Planning Committee

18 December 2025

ZE25/01109/REM- Erection of 5no. dwellinghouses - details of the layout, scale, appearance of all 5 no. houses along with the landscaping of the development (ZE24/07435/73 dated 22.01.25 and 20/00770/OUT dated 09.12.20 refers) on land at Sutton Grange, Langton Road, Norton, North Yorkshire on behalf of Mr Paul Sedman (Sutton Grange Developments)

Report of the Head of Development Management – Community Development Services

1.0 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To determine a reserved matters application for the erection of 5no. dwellinghouses - details of the layout, scale, appearance of all 5 no. houses along with the landscaping of the development (ZE24/07435/73 dated 22.01.25 and 20/00770/OUT dated 09.12.20 refers) on land at Sutton Grange, Langton Road, Norton, North Yorkshire.
- 1.2 The application is reported to the Area Planning Committee for determination because it has been submitted by the spouse of Councillor Lindsay Burr MBE.

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RECOMMENDATION: That the reserved matters application be APPROVED subject to the condition listed in Section 12 of this report.

- 2.1. The application relates to a 0.7 hectare grass paddock associated with Sutton Grange which is situated on the southern side of Norton. Access is gained off Langton Road to the north east of the site. The site is outside defined development limits and as such lies within the open countryside for planning purposes.
- 2.2. On the 9 December 2020 Ryedale District Council approved outline planning permission ref. 20/00770/OUT for "*Residential development of 5no.dwellings (site area 0.72ha) - access to be considered*". All other matters (layout, scale, appearance and landscaping) are reserved for a future reserved matters application.
- 2.3. On the 22 January 2025 North Yorkshire Council approved application ref. ZE24/07435/73 for the removal of Condition 05 of outline approval ref. 20/00770/OUT to delete the self-build limitation relating to the 5no. dwellings. The application was made on the basis that self-build housing was no longer viable and the removal of the self-build restriction would accelerate the delivery of new housing at the site.
- 2.4. The most recent permission remains extant and is subject to 30 conditions. Condition 1 requires the submission of reserved matters by 9 December 2025. The application was received and registered as valid on 6 October 2025.
- 2.5. The main issue is the acceptability of the detailed design of the residential development which comprises 5 detached dwellings. It is considered that the details submitted to address the reserved matters in respect of layout, scale, appearance

and landscaping are acceptable; do not result in harm to the setting of the listed building or non-designated heritage asset; and are in line with that envisaged at outline stage and comply with the requirements of the Development Plan.

3.0 Preliminary Matters

- 3.1. The case file on Public Access can be found online at <https://planningregister.ryedale.gov.uk/caonline-applications/>
- 3.2. The following relevant planning history has been identified for the application site:

20/00770/OUT- Residential development of 5no.dwellings (site area 0.72ha) - access to be considered. Approved 09.12.2020.

ZE24/07435/73- Removal of Condition 05 (housing numbers and type) of planning approval 20/00770/OUT dated 09/12/2020 to delete the self-build limitation relating to the 5no. dwellings. Approved 22.01.2025.

4.0 Site and Surroundings

- 4.1. The application site amounts to 0.7 hectares and is a grass paddock associated with Sutton Grange (under the ownership of the applicant). The site is on the southern side of Norton. Access is gained via a tree lined, single lane private driveway which meets Langton Road 110 metres to the north east of the site.
- 4.2. The site is outside development limits and as such lies within the open countryside. The site is also locally designated as a Visually Important Undeveloped Area (VIUA). The site is within Flood Zone 1, the area of lowest risk of flooding.
- 4.3. Sutton Grange is a 19th century dwelling of stone and slate construction and is considered a Non-Designated Heritage Asset. The application site, at its closet point, is approximately 30 metres east of Sutton Grange house. The Grade II listed Sutton Barn stands beyond Sutton Grange approximately 110 metres north-west of the application site.
- 4.4. Mill Beck is to the south of the application site and follows a south-east to north-west alignment. The topography of the site generally falls away towards the beck with a change in level of approximately four metres north to south. To the west of the application site is a woodland area associated with Sutton Grange. The site boundary comprises a timber post and rail fence on the northern and eastern sides with the beck to the south and mature tree and hedge planting to the west. Since the original grant of outline permission advance planting has been progressed on the northern and eastern boundaries of the site.
- 4.5. The land to the east and north east of the application site has been fully built out for 79 dwellings (Ebor Chase Development- 'Spring Beck Avenue') under permission ref. 15/00098/MOUT. In addition, the permission (ref. 15/00099/MOUT) for six detached dwellings to the north of the private driveway north-east of Sutton Grange has also been fully built out (known as 'Woodlands Close'). As a result, new housing development flanks the existing private driveway to Sutton Grange and the application site is surrounded by residential development on three sides.

5.0 Description of Proposal

- 5.1 This reserved matters application relates to the outline permission for the erection of 5no. dwellinghouses. It seeks approval of details of the layout, scale, appearance of all 5 no. houses along with the landscaping of the development (ZE24/07435/73

dated 22.01.25 and 20/00770/OUT dated 09.12.20 refers).

- 5.2 The developable part of the site; the total number of dwellings and the previously approved access arrangements are unchanged from that previously approved.
- 5.3 The approved access arrangements involve the widening of the access off Langton Road with a passing place created half way along the private driveway. The entrance to the application site off the private driveway would be formed at the existing field gate into the paddock at the northern end of the site. The new driveway (porous tarmac) would run along the northern and eastern sides of the site providing access to each of the five plots. The 4.1 metre wide roadway within the site would include two passing and turning spaces. There would be 1.2 metre high timber post and rail fencing on the western side of the access road to enclose the retained paddock associated with Sutton Grange (outside of the application site).
- 5.4 The built development is arranged as five plots within the western half of the site with the row of dwellings constructed across the field on a north-west to south-east alignment. Plots 1-4 follow a similar building line and are orientated to face east across the shared access road towards Spring Beck Avenue. The position of the dwellings in plots 1-4 range from 22 metres to 52 metres from the eastern boundary. The site narrows at its southern extent where it meets Mill Beck. The dwelling in plot 5 at the southern end of the site is turned to face north-east along the road and would abut the eastern boundary.
- 5.5 Within each of the five plots there would be a detached, two storey four bed dwelling with internal floorspace ranging between 188 to 284m². Each dwelling would have direct access off the internal roadway with forecourt parking to the front and a private garden to the rear.
- 5.6 Each plot would have a set of timber gates and gateposts to the front opening onto the forecourt. The remainder of the boundary treatment along the frontage would be 1.2 metre high metal estate railings. The plans show that the individual plots would be divided by a combination of 1.8 metre high vertical Yorkshire boarded timber fencing and beech hedgerows. There would also be 1.8 metre high vertical Yorkshire boarded timber fencing to the rear (west) boundaries of plots 1-4 and timber post and rail fencing would form the rear boundary of plot 5 where it abuts the banks of Mill Beck.
- 5.7 A 5-10 metre wide landscape buffer strip is to be formed on the eastern perimeter of the site. This will comprise the existing 2-3 metre wide planted 'shelter belt' on the inside of which there would be a 5-7 metre wide strip of wildflower grass verge planted with a shrub layer and specimen trees. A shallow swale to collect surface water off the driveway would run along the western side of this shelter belt parallel to the driveway.
- 5.8 The applicant's supporting statement explains that the design of the dwellings has sought to capture the 'cottage ornee' character of Sutton Grange, using a neo-vernacular style of architecture.
- 5.9 The pair of dwellings in plots 1 and 2 at the northern end of the row would be the smallest of the proposed units. The dwellings would be identical in size, design and appearance. Each dwelling would measure 13.8 metres in frontage width by 9.1 metres in depth and would stand 5.2 metres to the eaves and 8.5 metres to the apex.
- 5.10 The internal layout is 'handed' with a projecting gable at either end of the combined elevation. Both dwellings would feature an entrance under a pitched roof, a single chimney stack and share a detached double garage which would straddle the plot boundary. Externally the dwellings would have sandstone coloured render to the walls

with UPVC 4-pane sash windows under a slate roof. The roof would include timber bargeboards to the overhanging eaves.

- 5.11 The dwelling in plot 4 would be identical to the dwelling in plot 2 with the exception of it having a single integrated garage on its northern side.
- 5.12 The dwelling in plot 3 would be a large villa with a front elevation featuring a central, projecting gable under a hipped roof with a high projecting chimney stack. The dwelling would measure 13.8 metres in frontage width by 10 metres in depth and would stand 5.2 metres to the eaves and 8.7 metres to the apex. Externally the dwelling would have coursed rubble stone walling with UPVC 4-pane sash windows under a slate roof. The dwelling would have a single integrated garage on its northern side.
- 5.13 The dwelling in plot 5 is the largest of the group and is positioned at the southern end of the development. The front (north) elevation would be 19 metres in width and the building would extend back 10.2 metres in depth. The principal elevation would contain a series of slender gables and a feature portico entrance in the style of Sutton Grange. Externally the dwelling would have coursed rubble stone walling with decorative bargeboards to the side and front gables, a slate roof and a short chimney stack located right of centre. The dwelling would have an integrated double garage on its eastern side.
- 5.14 The application is accompanied by a supporting Design and Access Statement along with floorplans, elevations, site plan, landscaping plan and a selection of visual images.

6.0 Planning Policy and Guidance

- 6.1. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that all planning authorities must determine each application under the Planning Acts in accordance with Development Plan so far as material to the application unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Adopted Development Plan

- 6.2. The Adopted Development Plan for this site is:

Ryedale Plan- Local Plan Strategy (2013)

Policy SP1 General Location of Development and Settlement Hierarchy
 Policy SP2 Delivery and Distribution of New Housing
 Policy SP4 Type and Mix of New Housing
 Policy SP12 Heritage
 Policy SP13 Landscapes
 Policy SP14 Biodiversity
 Policy SP16 Design
 Policy SP17 Managing Air Quality, Land and Water Resources
 Policy SP18 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy
 Policy SP19 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
 Policy SP20 Generic Development Management Issues
 Policy SP22 Planning Obligations, Developer Contributions and the Community Infrastructure Levy

Malton and Norton Neighbourhood Plan (MNNP) 2024

TM6: Development on Non-allocated Sites

E1: Protection of Local Green Space
 E6: Gateways
 HD2: Development and Design – Area-wide Principles

Emerging Development Plan – Material Consideration

- 6.3. The North Yorkshire Local Plan is the emerging development plan for this site though no weight can be applied in respect of this document at the current time as it is at an early stage of preparation.

Guidance - Material Considerations

- 6.4. Relevant guidance for this application is:
- National Planning Policy Framework 2024
 - National Planning Practice Guidance
 - National Design Guide 2021

7.0 Consultation Responses

- 7.1. The following consultation responses have been received and have been summarised below.

- 7.2. **Norton Town Council (NTC):** Recommend approval

NTC approve the plans stating that “Norton is in need of housing growth in a sustainable way and this project will help achieve out development goals for the town”.

- 7.3. **Highways North Yorkshire:** Comments

The LHA note that each plot provides sufficient parking and turning and also secure cycle storage in the garages. The LHA recommend a visitor parking space is provided. The LHA welcome the passing places to be provided on the internal road way. The response also includes a request that access for refuse vehicles is considered and suitable bin collection points are provided. For completeness the response sets out the highways conditions attached to the extant permission which relate to access/verge crossing; access, parking and turning areas; a Construction Management Plan and a restriction on the domestic conversion of garages.

- 7.4. **Building Conservation Officer (BCO)** No objections

The BCO has stated “The immediate setting of the Grange to include its landscaped gardens, walled structures and semi-formal grounds will be unaffected by the proposal and preserved. The retention of open space to the north of the paddock gives visual and spatial relief helping to preserve the wider setting of the Grange which, however, is largely understood as an urbanised environment. Important aspects of the wider setting of the Grange to include the wooded beck will be unaffected. The setting of Sutton Grange will therefore be preserved.

The immediate setting of the Grade II listed Sutton barn will be unaffected by the proposal. Additionally, by virtue of distance and intervening buildings the wider setting of Sutton barn will be unaffected by the proposal. Important aspects of the wider setting of Sutton Barn to include the wooded beck will be also unaffected by the proposal. The setting of Sutton barn will therefore be preserved”.

7.5. **NYC Natural Services** Comments

The Council's Ecologist notes that the permission pre-dates mandatory biodiversity net gain requirements. With regard to the landscaping scheme the Council's Ecologist provides advice on the soil type and cutting frequency to allow sown species to establish.

7.6. **Tree and Woodland Officer** No comments to make

The Council's Tree and Woodland Officer notes the existing condition which requires an Arboricultural Method Statement to be submitted prior to the commencement of development and in the absence of the submission has no comments to make at the present time.

Local Representations

7.7. The LPA has received one representation from a local resident which raises objection to the application and the concerns are summarised as follows:

- Properties on Spring Beck Avenue will clearly see into these proposed houses. The trees that have been planted will eventually block this view but this will be an issue for a long time.
- Local wildlife would be affected- foxes, badgers, deer, owls and bats in the nearby woodland- shame for this beautiful habitat to be destroyed.
- Mature trees in the bottom corner where one of the houses immediately backs on to may result in lack of daylight.
- Area is very boggy and prone to flooding during bad weather.
- More light pollution in the area.

8.0 Environment Impact Assessment (EIA)

8.1. The development proposed does not fall within Schedule 1 or 2 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2017 (as amended). No Environment Statement is therefore required.

9.0 Main Issues

The key considerations in the assessment of this application are:

- Principle of the development
- Access
- Layout, scale and appearance
- Landscaping
- Impact on the setting of nearby heritage assets
- Other matters

10.0 ASSESSMENT

Principle of the development

10.1. The principle of residential development at the site in the form of 5no. detached dwellings has been established by the grant of outline planning permission (ref:

20/00770/OUT) in December 2020 and the subsequent grant of permission under Section 73 ref. ZE24/07435/73 in January 2025.

Access

- 10.2. The site benefits from an existing private access off Langton Road which is currently narrow and would be widened to meet highways specifications. The LHA have previously confirmed that the access arrangements, which are unchanged, are acceptable and that subject to conditions there would be no highway safety implications. In terms of accessibility within the site the roadway is positioned on the eastern side of the site off which there would be with individual private driveways to each dwelling.

Layout, scale and appearance

- 10.3. Policy SP16 of the RPLPS (2013) entitled 'Design' states that *'to reinforce local distinctiveness, the location, siting, form, layout, scale and detailed design of new development should respect the context provided by its surroundings'*.
- 10.4. In addition, Policy SP20 of the RPLPS (2013) entitled 'Generic Development Management Issues' requires that new development respects the character and context of the immediate locality and the wider landscape character in terms of physical features and the type and variety of existing uses. Policy SP20 also states:
- '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'.
- 10.5. It has been previously established that the site lends itself to a low density development within a landscaped setting that is visually contained with well-defined boundary features to the west. Due to the recently constructed housing development on three sides the development would not push the outer edge of the settlement further into the open countryside.
- 10.6. In terms of siting the proposed dwellings relate to the plots approved at outline stage and the adjacent paddock is retained undeveloped which contributes towards the setting of Sutton Grange (NDHA). The position and extent of parking and outdoor amenity space to serve each dwelling is appropriate in line with the expectations of Policy SP4. The dwellings are positioned and orientated to avoid overlooking; overbearing impacts or loss of light. The plots are a suitable distance from the neighbouring housing development to the east and the spacing between dwellings is acceptable and there would be no adverse impact on the levels of amenity enjoyed by existing and future occupants.
- 10.7. The application site abuts Mill Beck although the developable area would not encroach on the beck corridor itself. The layout shows a sufficient standoff can be incorporated to ensure no adverse impacts and no conflict with Policy E1 of the MNNP (2024).
- 10.8. The developable part of the application site is set back from the Langton Road frontage and would have no impact on the immediate streetscene or any key views. The approved scheme has been designed to retain views from the east towards the listed Sutton Barn and this is unchanged. The proposed development would preserve the visual amenity of Langton Road and would not conflict with the requirements of Policy E6 of the MNNP (2024).

- 10.9. The dwellings would all be two storey and this is considered to be an acceptable scale that does not depart from the size of adjacent dwellings. The dwellings in plots 1 and 2 are to be arranged as a pair of 'book ends' and would mirror each other in terms of size, design and appearance resulting in an appropriate degree of symmetry across the street scene at the entrance to the development.
- 10.10. In contrast the larger dwellings in plots 3 and 5 are more bespoke and are designed to appear as large Georgian homes. The dwellings have prominent principal elevations and are walled in stone to reflect the higher status.
- 10.11. There is suitable variation in terms of house sizes, palette of materials, roof forms, features within the principal façade and decorative detailing (bargeboards with finials, overdrawn eaves, stone heads and cills, entrance porticos and chimney stacks). Overall, the proposed dwellings respect the character of the areas and the distinctiveness of Sutton Grange.
- 10.12. The details relating to the scale, form and appearance of the dwellings represent good architecture and a design quality that complies with policy expectations. There would be no unacceptable impact on the appearance of the landscape, visual amenity or the character and form of this part of the settlement. In addition, the scale and layout will ensure good standards of amenity for existing and proposed residents in this part of Norton It is considered that the development is accordance with Policies SP16 and SP20 of the RPLPS (2013) and Policy HD2 of the MNMP (2024).

Landscaping

- 10.13. The proposals include a landscape buffer on the eastern boundary which would augment the existing planting that has established on the site perimeter in recent years. There is existing mature trees and vegetation cover along the beck to the west of the site which also frames the site. The landscaping of the site boundaries will provide a suitable setting for the proposed dwellings. Noting the concern raised by the neighbour on Spring Beck Avenue it is acknowledged that the existing and proposed landscaping on the eastern boundary will provide screening that would help filter views between the existing dwellings on Spring Beck Avenue and the proposed dwellings.
- 10.14. A combination of new hedgerows and timber boarded fencing will demarcate the private (rear) garden areas for each plot. The use of estate style metal fencing and sporadic tree planting to the plot frontages would help create an open parkland approach to the dwellings.
- 10.15. The Council's Ecologist has advised that the wildflower mix for the verge would need a low-nutrient soil (preferably subsoil) to establish successfully. Use of fertile topsoil would result in more competitive plants replacing the sown species. The Council's Ecologist also advises cutting several times during the first growing season after germination and removing the cuttings to deplete soil nutrients. The sown areas should be cut twice a year and the arisings removed once established.
- 10.16. Overall, the landscaping scheme is acceptable and complies with Policies SP13, SP16 and SP20 of the RPLPS (2013) and Policy HD2 of the MNMP (2024).

Impact on the setting of nearby heritage assets

- 10.17. The nearby Sutton Grange has been identified as a non-designated heritage asset and further to the north-west Sutton Barn is Grade II listed.
- 10.18. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that the Local Planning Authority pays special attention in the exercise of planning functions to the desirability of preserving the Listed Building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
- 10.19. Paragraph 208 of the NPPF states “Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal”.
- 10.20. Paragraph 216 of the NPPF states “The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset”.
- 10.21. Policy SP12 (Heritage) of the RPLPS (2013) states that:
- "Designated historic assets and their settings, including Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Scheduled Monuments and Registered Parks and Gardens will be conserved and where appropriate, enhanced. Proposals which would result in less substantial harm will only be agreed where the public benefit of the proposal is considered to outweigh the harm and the extent of harm to the asset"
- And also:
- “In considering and negotiating development proposals, the Council will seek to protect other features of local historic value and interest throughout Ryedale having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset”.
- 10.22. The detail has been considered by the Council’s BCO. Sutton Grange is set back from the road in a low lying position and well screened by treed boundaries and a wooded back. As a result clear close views of the Grange from public areas are limited.
- 10.23. The Council’s BCO notes that the “development site makes a very minor positive contribution to the wider setting of the dwelling helping to establish the dwelling in a largely relict semi-rural landscape. This landscape has however been compromised by modern housing. Additionally, the separation of the drive, falling ground levels and green screening contribute to a sense of visual and spatial detachment minimising the contribution of the development site to the wider setting of the Grange”. In conclusion on this particular matter the Council’s BCO notes that the setting of Sutton Grange will be unaffected by the proposal and preserved.
- 10.24. The Council’s BCO notes that “the setting of the now residential Grade II listed Sutton barn includes its immediate setting of domestic curtilage to include gardens and terraces, parking and garaging. Its wider setting includes modern development to its north and east. A verdant wooded valley makes a strong positive contribution to its wider setting and provides a backdrop to the barn to its west”.

- 10.25. The Council's BCO notes that by virtue of distance and intervening buildings the wide setting of the Grade II Sutton Barn will be unaffected by the proposal and preserved.
- 10.26. It is considered that, taking account of the statutory duty set out in legislation, the development would preserve the setting of the identified heritage assets and complies with the requirements of Policy SP12 and the NPPF.

Other matters

- 10.27. The conditions imposed on the extant outline permission remain active and in some cases require further submissions for written approval from the LPA (highways detailed design and construction; archaeology; site levels; drainage; external lighting; ecology; tree protection; planting and material samples) and, therefore the LPA retains control on these matters.
- 10.28. The majority of the matters raised by the local resident relate to the principle of developing the site for housing which is not under consideration as part of this reserved matters application.
- 10.29. The Council's Ecologist has not raised any concerns in relation to impact on protected species or habitats and the scheme complies with Policy SP14. The mandatory requirement for 10% Biodiversity Net Gain does not apply in this case as the original outline application was granted before the introduction of the legislation.
- 10.30. In line with current building regulations the application confirms that ground source heat pumps and energy efficient building fabric, rainwater harvesting and low-consumption internal fittings will be used across the development.
- 10.31. The former Ryedale area of North Yorkshire Council operates a CIL charging policy and Policy SP22 of the RPLPS (2013) contains a list of infrastructure which can benefit from CIL funding. The proposed development is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The site falls within a low value area, which attracts a charge of £45 per square metre (to be adjusted for indexation). The total gross internal area proposed is 1,081m².

11.0 PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

- 11.1 In light of the above considerations, the details submitted to address the reserved matters (scale, form and appearance and landscaping) for the 5no. dwellings are considered acceptable and would preserve the setting of the nearby Grade II listed building (Sutton Barn) and the non-designated heritage asset (Sutton Grange). The proposed development is considered to satisfy the relevant policy criteria outlined within Policies SP4, SP12, SP13, SP14, SP16, SP19, SP20 and SP22 of the Ryedale Plan – Local Plan Strategy (2013); policies E1, E6 and HD2 of the Malton and Norton Neighbourhood Plan (2024); and the NPPF (2024). The recommendation to Members is one of approval.

12.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 12.1 That reserved matters for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are APPROVED subject to the condition listed below.

Recommended conditions:

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Site Location Plan ref. WG1548 01, dated October 2025
 Proposed Site Plan ref. WG1548 02 D, dated 19.11.25
 No. 1 proposed drawings ref. WG1548 03 C, dated 01.10.25
 No. 2 proposed drawings ref. WG1548 04 C, dated 01.10.25
 No. 3 proposed drawings ref. WG1548 05 C, dated 01.10.25
 No. 4 proposed drawings ref. WG1548 06 B, dated 01.10.25
 No. 5 proposed drawings ref. WG1548 07 D, dated 25.11.25
 Contextual Block Plan ref. WG1548 09 A, dated 25.11.25
 Landscape proposals ref. WG1548 10 B, dated 25.11.25

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

INFORMATIVES

- 1 The Applicant/Developer is reminded that the conditions imposed on permission ref. ZE24/07435/73 remain valid and should be complied with or discharged as necessary. Conditions which require further submissions and written approval from the LPA are those numbered 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27 & 28.
- 2 The Council's Ecologist has advised that the wildflower mix for the verge would need a low-nutrient soil (preferably subsoil) to establish successfully. Use of fertile topsoil would result in more competitive plants replacing the sown species. The advice is to cut several times during the first growing season after germination and removing the cuttings to deplete soil nutrients. The sown areas should be cut twice a year and the arisings removed once established.

Target Determination Date: 01.12.2025 (Extension of time agreement until 19.12.2025)

Case Officer: Alan Goforth, alan.goforth@northyorks.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank



© Crown copyright 2025 Ordnance Survey 100053143



© Walker Graham Architects Limited (UK) 2025. Measurements scaled from plans cannot be guaranteed to be accurate. Use figured dimensions only. Only original drawings should be relied upon. WG1548 PLF_A.pln



Walker Graham Architects

Project No.

WG1548 01

Drawing No.

Drawing Title
Site Location Plan

Drawing Date
October 2025

Project Address
South-East of Sutton
Grange, Norton

Drawing Scale
1:1250 at A3

3 New Street York, YO1 8RA
44 South Bar Street Banbury, OX16 9AB
T: 01904 848 868 T: 01295 709 247

E: architecture@walkergraham.co.uk
walkergraham.co.uk

This page is intentionally left blank



Contextual Block Plan



Project
Residential development
Project Address
South-East of Sutton Grange, Norton
Client
Mrs L. Burr & Mr P. Sedman
Project Stage
Planning
Drawing Title
Contextual Block Plan
Drawing Date
October 2025
Drawing Scale
1:500 at A1

Walker Graham Architects

3 New Street
York
YO1 8RA
T: 01904 848 868
46 South Bar Street
Banbury
OX16 9AB
T: 01295 709 247

This page is intentionally left blank



- HARD LANDSCAPING**
- 1. Porous tarmac access road.**
Full infiltration permeable bitmac access road:
- Existing sub-grade with proven infiltration rate to BRE Digest 365.
- Geotextile or geomembrane.
- 200mm thick (minimum) granular reservoir layer.
- 20mm thick porous binder course.
- 6mm thick porous bitmac surface course.

Concrete pin kerbs to verges.
 - 2. Clean limestone porous passing and turning.**
- Existing sub-grade with proven infiltration rate to BRE Digest 365.
- 250-300mm thick clean limestone with soil brushed into voids and overseeded with seed mix as per verge.

Timber edge boarding, 100x25mm treated timber with limestone/grass flush with boards and verge. Tuimber pegs 50x50mm at 1.2m centres. Pegs at 450mm length, galvanised screws (or similar) minimum 2no per peg.
- 600mm deep at gateway threshold.
- 900mm deep at garage threshold.
 - 3. Sandstone setts (grey).**
100x100x100mm pointed with grey "brush-in", 50mm sharp sand : cement bed, 150mm concrete foundation on minimum 150mm limestone sub-base.
 - 4. Parkland metal fence.**
Estate railings (5 rail), c. 1.2m high with upright posts between panels. Powder blue colour.
 - 5. Timber gates with gateposts.**
Swagged timber gates on metal hinges with electric automation, Oak gateposts with metal pier caps painted powder blue to match estate railings.
 - 6. Gravel driveways with metal edging.**
- Excavate to firm ground and consolidate any soft spots. Prove existing sub-grade infiltration rate to BRE 365.
- Geotextile or geomembrane.
- 150mm thick (minimum) MOT Type 3 permeable sub-base. Include single perforated land drain to location shown surrounded in gravel with membrane wrap-around, branched into SW gully via silt trap.
- 30-40mm thick gravel finish.

Metal edging. Steel edges/edging, 100mm depth 5mm thick mild steel with steel pins welded at 1-1.5m centres to the external / grass-side. Steel pins at 25mm down from the top edge. Pin depth of 450-600 dependent upon ground conditions.
 - 7. Indian stone paths and terraces.**
- Indian stone paths generally 1.2m wide with 3m deep terraces to rear elevations.
- Nominal gradient of lawn down from terraces to rear.
 - 8. Yorkshire boarded timber fence.**
- 150x25mm vertical Yorkshire boarding with 3mm gap between boards. Fixed to 100x50mm horizontal rails between posts. Boards to both sides so double sided fence.
- 1.8m high at 8A.
- Tapered panel reducing from 1.8m to 1.5m high at 8B.
- 50mm gravel board.
 - 9. Post and rail fence.**
- 1.2m high three rail timber post and rail fence.
- To western boundary, site circa 0.5m back from top of ditch bank.

SOFT LANDSCAPING

i. Beech hedge *Fagus Sylvatica*.

Bare root 60-90cms 1+2 transplants, 6 plants per linear metre, 60cm mesh guards. 50-75mm deep bark mulch topping to bed.

ii. Beech hedge *Fagus Sylvatica* in boarded bed.

Bare roots 60-90cms 1+2 transplants, 6 plants per linear metre, 60cm mesh guards.

Timber board to either side of 1m wide planting bed set 25mm above gravel surface. 150x50mm treated boards with 50x50mm treated pegs, 450-600mm long, at 1-1.2m spacing. Pegs set below top of board. Soil to be continuous through to underlying natural soil - not hardcore of driveways either side. Soil finished 50mm down on board to allow for 50mm bark topping.

iii. Existing planted 'shelter belt'.

Planted and starting to establish. Approximately 2-3m deep allowing for growth.

Note some *Ilex Aquifolium* (Holly) and *Prunus Lusitanica* to be replaced (dead or dying).

Existing shelter belt comprising the following all at c. 2-3.5m planted at varying centres c. 1.5-2.5m.

- Prunus Laurocerasus* - Common Laurel.
- Prunus Lusitanica* - Portuguese Laurel.
- Pyracantha 'Red glow'* - Firethorn.
- Chamaecyparis Lawsoniana* - Aurea.
- Ilex Aquifolium 'Alaska'* - Common Holly.
- Pinus Species* - Pine.
- Thuja Occidentalis* - White Cedar.
- Ilex Aquifolium Aurea Variegata* - Variegated Holly.
- Aesculus Hippocastanum* - Horse Chestnut.
- Acer Pseudoplatanus* - Sycamore.
- Picea Species* - Spruce.

iv. Specimen trees.

- 28 - *Acer Campestris* - Field Maple.
- 52 - *Pyrus Calleryana 'Chanticleer'* - Callery Pear.
- 56 - *Amelanchier Arborea 'Robin Hill'* - Juneberry.
- 62 - *Crataegus Prunifolia* - Broad Leaved Cockspur.

Tree size 8-10 cms girth container grown or root balled. All trees double staked with 50-75mm treated round timber post circa 900mm above ground / 600mm driven into ground, set circa 300mm off trunk with 50mm wide rubberflex tree webbing twice screwed to post.

1m diameter 50-75mm deep bark mulch around every tree.

Vertical root barrier to 2no Tree 56 indicated with red dashed line. 400mm deep.

v. Shrub layer.

Hazels *Corylus Avellana* planted in groups of 3/5. Each group has 3no 120-150cm 1+2 transplant at 300mm spacing in a trinagle. Alternate groupings (3) coppiced to ground level every 5-7 years on a rotational basis allowing new growth and light percolation to the herb layer.

Each cluster to have a 1m diameter circle of 50-75mm mulch or bark.

x. Wildflower grass mix to verges.

%	<i>Achillea millefolium</i> Yarrow
0.5	<i>Achillea ptarmica</i> Sneezewort
0.4	<i>Betonica officinalis</i> - (<i>Stachys officinalis</i>) Betony
1	<i>Centauria nigra</i> Common Knapweed
3	<i>Filipendula ulmaria</i> Meadowsweet
0.4	<i>Galium verum</i> Lady's Bedstraw
0.5	<i>Geranium pratense</i> Meadow Crane's-bill
0.5	<i>Leontodon hispidus</i> Rough Hawkbit
1.8	<i>Leucanthemum vulgare</i> Oxeye Daisy - (Moon Daisy)
0.2	<i>Lotus pedunculatus</i> Greater Birdsfoot Trefoil
1	<i>Primula Vulgaris</i> Primrose
0.5	<i>Primula veris</i> Cowslip
0.4	<i>Prunella vulgaris</i> Selfheal
0.8	<i>Ranunculus acris</i> Meadow Buttercup
0.8	<i>Rhinanthus minor</i> Yellow Rattle
1.4	<i>Silene Latifolia</i> Red Campion
0.1	<i>Sanguisorba officinalis</i> Great Burnet
0.3	<i>Silium silaus</i> Pepper Saxifrage
1.7	<i>Silene flos-cuculi</i> - (<i>Lychnis flos-cuculi</i>) Ragged Robin
0.3	<i>Succisa pratensis</i> Devil's-bit Scabious
0.6	<i>Taraxacum officinale</i> Dandelion
0.8	<i>Vicia cracca</i> Tufted Vetch
20%	

Grasses

%	<i>Agrostis capillaris</i> Common Bent
10	<i>Alopecurus pratensis</i> Meadow Foxtail (w)
3	<i>Anthoxanthum odoratum</i> Sweet Vernal-grass (w)
3	<i>Briza media</i> Quaking Grass (w)
24	<i>Cynosurus cristatus</i> Crested Dogstail
2	<i>Deschampsia cespitosa</i> Tufted Hair-grass (w)
32	<i>Festuca rubra</i> Slender-creeping Red-fescue
3	<i>Hordeum secalinum</i> Meadow Barley (w)
80%	

Sowing Rates		
kg/ha	kg/acre	g/m2
40	16	4

y. Lawn grass mixture

Emorsgate Seeds EG22 Strong Lawn Grass Mixture.

%	<i>Agrostis capillaris</i> - Common Bent
50.0	<i>Festuca rubra</i> - Red Fescue
25.0	<i>Lolium perenne</i> - Perennial Ryegrass
20.0	<i>Poa pratensis</i> - Smooth-stalked Meadow-grass

Sowing Rates		
kg/ha	kg/acre	g/m2
250	100	25

Site Plan



Project
Residential development

Project Address
South-East of Sutton Grange, Norton

Client Project Stage
Mrs L. Burr & Mr P. Sedman **Planning**

Drawing Title
Landscape proposals
Drawing Date Drawing Scale
October 2025 1:200 at A1

Walker Graham Architects

3 New Street 46 South Bar Street
York Banbury
YO1 8RA OX16 9AB
T: 01904 848 868 T: 01295 709 247

E: architecture@walkergraham.co.uk
walkergraham.co.uk

This page is intentionally left blank



Entrance Approach sketch perspective



Eastern streetscene sketch perspective

Design principles:

The approach to design of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping is developed from the Design Intent Strategy approved at Outline stage.

The properties are inspired by the architectural character of Sutton Grange.

No's 1 and 2 present strong projecting gables to the entrance approach - referencing the gabled character of Sutton Grange - with decorative bargeboards to the entrance lobby gable.

Roof material is slate with stone coloured render to compliment yet appear distinct from Sutton Grange. Windows are vertical sliding sash.

No 3 then presents a central gable with decorative bargeboard and hipped roof. This more formal composition places symmetry towards the centre of the site. This property is walled in coursed stone.

No 4 is a variation of No 2 to present a terminating gable towards the south of the site to complete the Eastern streetscene. To compliment and relate to No 1 and 2, No 3 is in stone coloured render.

No 5 is at the southernmost end of the site and can be different in orientation and appearance to reflect this unique setting. Projecting gables with decorative bargeboards again reference Sutton Grange. Walling material is stone.

Layout orientates the properties to achieve a North-East frontage addressing the access road (streetscene) with South-West rear elevations taking advantage of the sylvan views and aspect.

Scale is commensurate with the accommodation proposed and comparable to Sutton Grange.

Landscaping reinforces the planting to the site perimeter. Forecourts have an open character of estate railings and shrub planting interspersed with trees.



Project
Residential development

Project Address
South-East of Sutton Grange, Norton

Client
Mrs L. Burr & Mr P. Sedman

Project Stage
Planning

Drawing Title
Sketch Perspectives

Drawing Date
August 2025

Drawing Scale
Not to scale at A1

Walker Graham Architects

3 New Street
York
YO1 8RA
T: 01904 848 868

46 South Bar Street
Banbury
OX16 9AB
T: 01295 709 247

rev. A (02.10.25) Revised to developed design.

Project No. Drawing No.

WG1548 08 A

This page is intentionally left blank