



The countryside charity
North and East Yorkshire

PO Box 189
York
YO7 9BL

www.cpreney.org.uk

Tel: 07983 088120
Email: info@cpreney.org.uk

Branch Chair
Mrs Jan Arger

Authority: Hambleton District Council

Type of consultation: Planning Consultation

Full details of application/consultation: 22/01334/OUT - Application for outline planning permission with some matters reserved (Appearance, landscaping layout and scale) for the Construction of 35 Dwellings including Conversion of Existing Barn and 4 Self-built Plots together with Associated Highway Works, New Open Space, Play Area and Public Car Parking and Demolition of a Dwelling

At land: School Farm, 17 Station Road, Great Ayton, North Yorkshire, TS9 6HA

Type of response: Objection – Further comments

Date of Submission: 7th March 2023

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 and East 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.kvaplaning.co.uk

Comment

CPRE North and East Yorkshire ('CPRENEY') submitted an objection to the above application in August 2022. The applicant has since submitted a rebuttal response to comments raised by this charity and other commentators. This response is by way of response to the applicant's rebuttal. As such it is to be read alongside the original CPRENEY response and does not supersede it.

For the sake of clarification, CPRENEY continue to object to the scheme for outline planning permission with some matters reserved (Appearance, landscaping layout and scale) for the Construction of 35 Dwellings including Conversion of Existing Barn and 4 Self-build Plots together with Associated Highway Works, New Open Space, Play Area and Public Car Parking and Demolition of a Dwelling, at land at School Farm, 17 Station Road, Great Ayton, North Yorkshire, TS9 6HA.

As stated previously, CPRENEY recognise that the proposal is in outline form with all detailed matters reserved excluding access. The applicant has provided an illustrative proposal highlighting how the proposed development could be designed to sit on the site, however, as this is only indicative and could change during the planning process, CPRENEY does not give great weight to this in formulating this response and therefore only addresses the principle of the proposal for development at this location.

CPRENEY agrees with the applicant that Great Ayton is indeed categorised as a 'service village' in the Council's newly adopted Local Plan as can be seen within the previous CPRENEY objection to the proposal. However, it is absolutely correct (as indicated in the CPRE response) that the Council has not chosen to allocate land in the settlement via the Local Plan. The fact that the Inspector deleted a proposed allocation for 30 dwellings in Great Ayton (site GTA1) as it was contrary to planning policies with regards to heritage assets is highly pertinent to the CPRE case. The Council did not offer a replacement provision for the settlement through the allocation process. Thus ensuring land was allocated and available elsewhere in the district which was policy compliant.

It is absolutely the case that Policy S3 directs housing through the settlement hierarchy of Northallerton and Thirsk, the market towns of Bedale, Easingwold and Stokesley *'and large villages as defined in the settlement hierarchy as Service and Secondary villages, commensurate with their size, character and the concentration of services and facilities in these locations and their role in providing services to residents of other nearby communities'*. It is however, important to read the 'housing development' section of the same policy in the determination of the proposal, which goes on to state that *'to help maintain the sustainability of rural communities and to address local affordable housing and other housing requirements, limited development will be located in service villages and secondary villages where there is a good range of service and facilities to support the level of growth proposed. The sites allocated in these villages can be developed in a way that does not detract from their character and form.'* As such and as referenced above, there are no allocations in Great Ayton. Ergo, the Council has not put forward any other site which they consider can be developed in a way that does not detract from the settlements character and form, hence the opinion that they consider there to be other more suitable and available sites within the district.

A proposal for 35 houses is considered to be major development in planning terms. Whilst development is indeed welcomed through the local plan policy, the fact that there are no allocations for the settlement must mean that the settlement is to be 'limited' – presumably to that of local affordable housing etc as set out in the paragraph above and relevant part of the policy – which the applicant has not considered in their rebuttal.

Regardless of the applicant or proposer, the site in question remains the same albeit a smaller scale of a previously appealed planning proposal. Contrary to the applicant, CPRENEY remain of the opinion that the Inspector's report and subsequent appeal dismissal is not 'largely irrelevant' to this proposal. The setting of Great Ayton and form of development has not altered in between appeal and the submission of this proposal.

Whilst the developable area of the site is indeed smaller, CPRENEY believe any development at this site should be considered as encroachment into the open countryside and would lead to indefensible boundaries for the wider site and on adjacent land to the north of the settlement which would bring substantial development into a previously undeveloped area and is as such is wholly inappropriate in this location.

The fact that the Council can demonstrate a substantial housing land supply and has an up-to-date Local Plan means that policies within the Local Plan must be given full weight in the determination of the proposal. CPRENEY consider that the failure to comply with the recently adopted spatial strategy for the distribution of development is also a factor weighing heavily against the proposals.

As such, CPRENEY maintain that the proposal would cause serious environmental harm to the character and appearance of the countryside and impact significantly on the cultural heritage assets associated with the settlement.

Should any further information be submitted in support of the proposals, CPRENEY reserve the right to comment further.