



The countryside charity
North Yorkshire

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: North York Moors National Park Authority

Type of consultation: Planning Application

Full details of application/consultation: NYM/2019/0628/FL - construction of 2 no. single storey dwellings with associated access, parking and amenity space (revised scheme to NYM/2015/0919/FL)

Additional Information response

At land at: the rear of Brookfield, Maltongate, Thornton Dale

Type of response: Objection

Date of Submission: 30th July 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.

Please note, CPRE has undergone a national rebrand and whilst the charity, ethos and motivation remains the same – CPRE will now be known as 'CPRE – The Countryside Charity'

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 Heritage Consultant used in this response:



1 Voyage Ltd.
Beth Davies,
MA Hons, PgDip

Comment

CPRE North Yorkshire ('CPRENY') welcomes the opportunity to comment on the additional information supplied by the applicant in relation to this site.

The additional information submitted by the applicant regarding land ownership demonstrates his lack of understanding with regards the heritage significance of the site and how heritage value is assessed.

The application site and wider area has medieval origins. The document submitted begins its analysis in 1877 which is relatively late considering the 'modern' period, in planning terms, begins in 1948.

The document is focused on who owned/now owns the pound and establishes that the ownership has changed in the last 150 years arguing that in 1877 the pound was not in the ownership of Brookfield. If the ownership of the pound can change in the last 150 years it is surely possible, if not likely, that the ownership changed in the several hundred preceding years and that the pound could have originally been linked to Brookfield as the historic mapping previously submitted by the CPRENY would support.

The information supplied is, however, useful in evidencing that the application site has consistently been in use as undeveloped, ancillary space. The applicant cites a number of low intensity, non-residential uses including farmland, market garden, domestic garden and informal use as a builders yard (although none of the maps submitted show any related structures associated with the latter use). The site is clearly now used as a garden again.

All the maps submitted by the applicant confirm that the application site has remained an open space within the setting of the Brookfield, the pound and listed buildings to the east of Maltongate and within the Conservation Area. The historic open nature of the site is a factor highlighted by the Inspector as being of heritage significance.

The focus on ownership is also irrelevant. A registered park and garden or block of listed flats can both fall within several different ownerships and still be managed holistically, just as a Conservation Area will cover hundreds of separate land ownerships but is managed as one area with a distinctive character. The draft Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan for this area highlights the importance of its medieval heritage and its green spaces. As one of the very few areas of land which have remained undeveloped since the medieval period; as an area of land that helps demonstrate the agricultural significance of Brookfield (a former in-village farm) and the Conservation Area and as an historically undeveloped, attractive green space which contributes to the rural character of the Conservation Area and the setting of numerous designated and non-designated heritage assets, the application site contributes in numerous ways to heritage significance, regardless of land ownership.

The applicant also highlights, helpfully, that the surrounding landscape context, which is evident in the first edition OS maps submitted previously by the CPRENY, has been significantly undermined by past war housing development. This helps reinforce the importance of the remaining elements of this landscape. If the application site were to be developed, the legibility of Brookfield as an in-village farm, the agricultural significance of the Conservation Area and its rural character and the possible association of the site and the pound would all be significantly undermined.

The additional information supplied simply serves to strengthen and reinforce the objection raised by the CPRENY to this development and the CPRENY continues to recommend that this application be refused.