

**Richmond (Yorks) Constituency Area Planning Committee
Supplementary to Committee Reports**

11th April 2024

Agenda Item	Application number and Division	Respondent	
1 & 2	ZB23/01932/FUL & ZB23/01933/LBC Marc Pearson West Rounton	<u>Additional Representations</u> <u>Rountons Community Interest Group supplementary planning objection received 29.3.2024</u> Officer Commentary	<u>Rountons Community Interest Group supplementary planning objection received 29.3.2024 comprises four elements.</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Our supplementary planning objection summary document. This document sets out the key action points of the Group. It notes that pledges total £55,000, details of the Asset of Community Value process and work towards purchasing the pub as community hub.2. Appendix 1 – A Heritage Statement This document concludes the building is considered to be of community interest and its loss result in harm to the heritage asset.3. Appendix 2 – An updated analysis of the community survey results. This document provides data on survey results4. Appendix 3 – Our Vision and Mission statement This document sets out a vision for an alternative use stating priorities in years 1-2 and years 3-5. <p>Matters relating to this additional information provides a useful update on the progress of the Rountons Community Interest Group with regard to the work towards purchasing the pub and possible alternative uses.</p>

OFFICIAL - SENSITIVE

OFFICIAL - SENSITIVE

			With regard to the heritage statement these matters are already dealt within the respective planning and listed building committee reports.
		Applicant Statement	The applicant has submitted a statement which provides a summary of the speech prepared for the committee meeting. The statement provides a brief history of the applicants involvement with the public house, commentary on the community group and the Asset of Community Value, commentary on the planning application process relating to the initial officer advice in support of the application and the current recommendation following the granting of the Asset of Community Value and a suggestion to defer the determination on the application for 6 months.
3.	ZB23/01649/FUL Ian Nesbit Appleton Wiske	Additional Application Plans and/or Information	Revised Drainage Strategy Plan (23129-DR-C-0100 Rev.P2) At the request of Officers, this version of the Drainage Strategy Plan includes spot levels for the proposed access road as well as finished floor levels for all four bungalows. The plan has been uploaded to Public Access.

OFFICIAL - SENSITIVE

OFFICIAL - SENSITIVE

	Additional Representations (in respect to the ongoing reconsultation exercise)	<p><u>Local resident(s):</u> A single additional representation from a local resident (objecting to the as amended proposals) has been submitted since the publication of the Planning Agenda. This has been uploaded to Public Access, but is summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Original objections to the proposals ‘still stand’ despite the proposed amendments to the scheme. • The proposed site access would be directly opposite their property and their holiday cottage business....the associated construction work would deter business, potentially affect their minimum letting status and adversely affect the experience of holiday-makers. • It is noted that a recommended condition would require that on-site (construction) vehicle parking would need to be agreed. Will this be enforced? <p><u>Technical consultee(s):</u> The following representation has been submitted on behalf of Teesside International Airport following reconsultation: <i>“...The airport safeguarding team has assessed the proposal in accordance with the UK Reg (EU) No 139/2014 (the UK Aerodrome Regulation) and it does not conflict with the safeguarding criteria for the airport. Accordingly, we have no aerodrome safeguarding objection to the proposal based on the information provided...”</i></p> <p>The Northallerton Ramblers have asked by they have been consulted on the application (with representations require by 28th April) if the application is to be considered by the Planning Committee on Thursday 11th April. Officer explanation provided.</p>
	Recommended Additional Planning Condition	<p>The following additional planning conditions are recommended:</p> <p><u>Condition 18</u> <i>“A) No demolition/development shall take place/commence until a Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:</i></p>

1. *The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording*
 2. *Community involvement and/or outreach proposals*
 3. *The programme for post investigation assessment*
 4. *Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording*
 5. *Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation*
 6. *Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation*
 7. *Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.*
- B) No demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (A).*
- C) The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (A) and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.*

Reason: This condition is imposed in accordance with the NPPF as the site is of archaeological interest and the Local Plan policies S1, S7 and E5.”

Condition 19

“Prior to the first occupation of any of the dwellings hereby approved, a Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan (FWEP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority based on the recommendations included within the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (23129-FRA-001 Rev.A) The FWEP shall:

- a. state how occupants will be made aware that they can sign up to the Environment Agency Flood Warning services;*
- b. state how occupants will be made aware the plan itself;*
- c. provide details of how occupants should respond in the event that they receive a flood warning, or become aware of a flood;*

			<p><i>d. state the measures that will be implemented to provide appropriate refuge, as well as safe and efficient evacuation for occupiers, in a flood event; and</i></p> <p><i>e. provide details of any flood mitigation and resilience measures designed into the scheme post-permission additional to those secured at planning application approval stage.</i></p> <p><i>The approved Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan shall be implemented on first occupation of the premises hereby approved and carried out in accordance with the approved details for the lifetime of the development.</i></p> <p><i>Reason: To ensure that a strategy is in place that will reduce the risk to occupiers in the event of a flood, given that part of the site is within Flood Zone 2, in accordance with the NPPF and Policies RM2 of the Local Plan.”</i></p>
		Flood Risk – Further Officer Clarification	<p>The Officer Report (paras. 10.40 - 10.42) includes a section on ‘Flood Risk and Surface Water Drainage Management’. To supplement this section of the report, the following details and conclusions are provided (which should be read/considered in conjunction with the Officer Report):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Flood Risk Assessment (23129-FRA-001 Rev.A) has been submitted with the application. This clarifies that the majority of the site (including the footprints and curtilage areas of the four bungalows) would be within Flood Zone 1 (low flood risk) of the Environment Agency’s Fluvial Flood Maps. The EA Flood Maps show that a small element of the north-western part of the application site would be within Flood Zone 2 (medium flood risk) Overall, the FRA concludes that: <i>“the development could proceed without being subject to significant flood risk. Moreover, the development will not increase flood risk to the wider catchment area as a result of suitable management of surface water runoff discharging from the site.”</i> • As residential (‘More Vulnerable’) development within Flood Zones 1 and 2, the Exception Test does not need to be applied. The proposals would locate the footprints and residential curtilages of all four properties within Flood Zone 1, outside of the sequentially-less-preferable area of the application site within

			<p>Flood Zone 2 within which a section of the access track would be sited. The applicant has not submitted any information to show that potential alternative application sites fully within Flood Zone 1 have been considered in accordance with the NPPF and Policy RM2 of the Local Plan requirements relating to the application of the sequential test. However, Officers consider that the nature, extent and impacts of the flood risk would be very low for the development with all habitable and residential curtilage areas within FZ1 and only a small part of the proposed access track being within FZ2 with the FRA showing that a suitable Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan being achievable for the proposed development. This is considered by Officers to be an important material consideration and notwithstanding the lack of the application of the sequential test, one which would ensure that the proposed development would be subject to a relatively low risk of fluvial flooding with any impacts to property and persons acceptably mitigated through the scheme layout and flood emergency and evacuation measures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The FRA concludes that the raising of floor levels (in order for the development to resist floor risk) is not required as the dwelling would be located within FZ1.• The FRA includes recommended site evacuation procedures and routes, although it states that the levels of any flood waters is unlikely to prevent egress and ingress from/to the site (should planning permission be granted, it is recommended that a Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan is submitted and approved by condition).• The current EA Surface Water Flood Maps show no material surface water flood risk on the application site (although there are areas of low, medium and high Surface Water Flood Risk on the land to the west)• Subject to the provision of a detailed Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan, the risks to property and persons posed by both fluvial and surface water flooding are considered to be low and their impacts insignificant.
--	--	--	---

OFFICIAL - SENSITIVE

OFFICIAL - SENSITIVE

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further to the Officer Report, a response from the LLFA remains outstanding on the amended and additional surface water drainage information submitted by the agent.
		Public Right of Way - Officer Clarification	Further to the Officer Report, it is clarified that the public footpath (10.8/2/1) runs in a north-south direction through the application site. The revised site layout would ensure that the current route of the PROW would be unaffected by the proposed development, and there is no requirement for the PROW to be diverted. If planning permission is granted, it is recommended that an informative is imposed that informs the application of the need to ensure that the PROW remains temporarily and permanently unobstructed.
		Officer Report Corrections	<p>Para. 10.20 (in the 'Heritage' Section): "Section 46 66 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 places a duty on the Local Planning Authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses..."</p> <p>Para. 10.27 (in the 'Heritage Section'): "Therefore, overall, and notwithstanding the conclusions of the submitted Heritage Statement, it is not considered that the proposed development would have a neutral (not harmful) impact on the setting of the church of St. Mary's and thus the proposed development would comply with Policies S7 and E5 of the Local Plan and the NPPF."</p> <p>Section 12.0 ("Recommendation"), Para. 12.1: "That the Committee be minded to GRANTED subject to receiving a positive recommendation from the Lead Local Flood Authority and subject to no additional issues being raised by technical and non technical consultees following the expiry of the reconsultation exercise."</p>

--	--	--	--

OFFICIAL - SENSITIVE

OFFICIAL - SENSITIVE