

PO Box 189
York
YO7 9BL
www.cprenorthyorkshire.co.uk
Tel: 07983 088120
Email: info@cprenorthyorkshire.co.uk

Branch President The Lord Crathorne KCVO Branch Chair Mr S White

Authority: Richmond District Council

Type of consultation: Planning Application

Full details of application/consultation:

Approval of reserved matters following outline approval of planning permission 16/00315/OUT for scheme design for 9 no dwellings including design, layout, appearance and scale, site layout and landscaping

At land at: Land North West of Manor House, Low Green, Catterick Village, North Yorkshire, DL10 7LN

Type of response: Comment

Date of Submission: 19th March 2020

All responses or queries relating to this submission should be directed to the Secretary for the Trustees at the contact details shown above on this frontispiece.

All CPRE North Yorkshire comments are prepared by the charity using professional planners whose research and recommendations form the basis of this response in line with national CPRE policies.

External planning consultant used in this response:



KVA Planning Consultancy Katie Atkinson, BA (Hons), Dip TP, MA MRTPI www.kvaplanning.co.uk

Comment

Registered address: PO BOX 189, York, YO7 9BL

CPRENorthYorkshire welcomes the opportunity to comment on this application for the construction of nine detached dwellings at land near Low Green, Catterick.

CPRENorthYorkshire understand that the principle of development at this location was established in May 2017 (16/00315/OUT) and responded to a similar application in July 2019 (19/00357/FULL).

Paragraph 006 of the PPG (Reference ID: 14-006-20140306) sets out that for applications for the approval of reserved matters the application should be accompanied by details of whatever aspects were not submitted at the outline stage, potentially including: Access, Landscaping, Layout and Scale. The Outline application was for the principle of the site development and included access.

Having taken the opportunity to consider the plans submitted by the applicant, CPRENY are disappointed that the applicant has not submitted a Design and Access Statement (DAS) or Planning Statement which clearly sets out how the site has been planned and what will happen to the existing bridleway or how pedestrians and other users will access the countryside etc. CPRENY remain concerned that access to the countryside may be prohibited to some residents of the area should the existing bridleway and permissive route not be fully considered and carefully managed at the design stage. Members report that existing access to the countryside has been reduced elsewhere in the locality due to the expansion of Catterick, therefore, it is vital that these routes are not lost or redirected as part of these proposals.

Having noted the comments from the Highways Officer commenting on the Public Right of Way from NYCC, it appears that CPRENY concerns are well-founded. The consideration of 'access' should not be limited to access/egress from a site but should include considerations of pedestrian routes including bridleways and the layout of internal road and footway links. This should have been included within an accompanying DAS. CPRENY, therefore, object to the proposal in its current guise, because it results in the loss of a significant section of the grass surfaced bridleway in open fields and thus does not comply with planning guidance. By using the route of a public bridleway as a road, the amenity value of the public bridleway is diminished. Paragraph 98 sets out clearly that 'decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access.'

The revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019, sets out clearly that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of development proposals to be in line with paragraph 102c which 'promotes opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport'. Similarly, paragraph 108 goes on to set out that in assessing specific applications for development it should be ensured that 'safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users' moving on at paragraph 110 to set out that priority should first be given 'to pedestrian and cycle movements both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas' and interalia that applications should 'address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility'. This has not been set out.

Equally the covering letter from the architect seta out that 'due to the relocation of the A1 the noise levels will be lower than at the time the acoustic survey was carried out.' There does not appear to be any evidence submitted to support this statement.

CPRENY, whilst acknowledging that the applicant already has outline permission for this site, does not believe that an adequate application has been made to allow the proper determination of this application. Further thought should be given to the internal access and layout of the site, particularly with a view to protecting and enhancing the existing bridleway in line with national guidance.