

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Planning Application NYM/2019/0513/FL
Date: 05 September 2019 14:21:22

We live at 16 Back Lane and continually walk past 9 Back Lane, Osmotherley. Dr and Mrs Banister are environmentally-friendly and are bringing up their children to also love nature throughout the seasons. They grow a field, which when cut, one hears thousands of insects and bird life. They are an ideal couple to have an eco-house erected as seen on the architectural drawings. We, therefore, more than support this application as innovative, green and attractive.

The house that will be demolished has been thought of as ugly by many residents, and we can't wait for it to be demolished.

Yours faithfully,
R P and F M Stevens

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: 19 Market Place, Helmsley
Date: 30 August 2019 06:48:56

Dear Mrs Bastow

I am writing on behalf of Helmsley Parochial Church Council following your letter to me of 7 August. I am sorry this reply just falls outside the 21 day time frame but our Council has only just met tonight. Also my wife dying suddenly in June has taken its toll, in normal circumstances I might have called a special meeting to keep within your deadline.

We offer these comments:

We are in favour of seeing the building come back into use as soon as possible, and have no objection to a mix of retail and residential. But we would prefer the residential units to be available for long leases, i.e. for people who work in the town, rather than as holiday lets.

Scaffolding arrangements, access for contractors, and reinstatement/ replanting on the churchyard side would have to be very carefully specified and monitored to protect graves, trees and shrubs.

We would hope that there would be noise restrictions during times of church services.

Any intention on the developers' part to ask us to prune trees etc should be made clear in advance (and of course subject to NYMNP tree officer approvals etc) not piecemeal during the works.

The new infill building between the main block and the strongroom looks acceptable but there is reference to a glazed access door and sidelight 'hidden from view' and not actually shown on the elevations — might this be unsuitably modern?

All new/replacement windows should be to highest 'heritage' standards. We ask for obscure glazing in some or all of the windows on the north side ie overlooking the churchyard.

Thank you

Tim Robinson, vicar
Sent from my iPhone

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Planning](#)
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Comments on NYM/2019/0513/FL - Case Officer Mrs Ailsa Teasdale - Received from Dr Stephen Rogers at 5 Back Lane, Osmotherley, Northallerton, DL6 3BJ
Date: 23 August 2019 18:05:41

We live at 5 Back Lane which, since it is set back from the road, faces due south directly onto the proposed site. We have discussed the plans with the applicant who very kindly called round to warn us of the proposal (for which we have received no official notification).

We support this proposal for the following reasons: (i) the current agricultural building is a real eyesore that, we understand, was hastily constructed just before it became necessary to obtain planning permission for such, (ii) the present house is of little merit and (iii) the proposed house is innovative and carbon neutral without being too different from the local vernacular or too large in scale.

We feel that, although the proposed house would be more visually apparent for us, the removal of the ugly agricultural building and present house adequately compensates for allowing a deviation from the usual building line for Back Lane.

We further note that the applicant has planted two new, mixed native hedges, which are growing well, plus a number of individual trees in the field below the proposed building which may act as screening. Furthermore, the vegetation in their field has been allowed to grow with paths cut through it which will support the local fauna which is to be applauded.

We would ask that a further hedge be planted to the north of the parking area indicated to screen and reduce the vehicle noise on the proposed gravel drive.

We would also request that any external lighting be dark sky friendly and not spill light outside of the boundary of the property (to comply with the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005).

In summary, we support this application as innovative and green with the advantage of removal of some unattractive features in the National Park.

Yours sincerely,
S C & L J Rogers

Comments made by Dr Stephen Rogers of 5 Back Lane, Osmotherley, Northallerton, DL6 3BJ

Preferred Method of Contact is Email

Comment Type is Comment

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Cc:
Subject: Planning Application NYM/20190513/FL (9, Back Lane, Osmotherley)
Date: 21 August 2019 16:47:34

For the attention of Mrs. Ailsa Teasdale

Dear Mrs. Teasdale,

Thank you for your letters and information re the above referenced planning application.

We have lived next door to No 9 Back Lane for over 33 years, and we would wish to make the following main points.

During that time the land behind No 9 Back Lane and behind our house has been used variously to graze Poll Dorset sheep, Jersey cows and Dartmoor ponies and to produce crops of hay. All these activities have been carried out to the best of agricultural practices, and have made a positive contribution to the local ambience and character of the village. The present owners have not continued with these, or similar activities; and appear to be wishing to adopt a different course of action and pursue a "change of usage" policy for the property.

The majority of the land has been allowed to grow wild, become extremely weedy, spreading seeds into adjacent properties, and is no longer the pleasing aspect it once was. The outbuildings, admittedly unsightly, have not been maintained; and one building has already been demolished and removed.

We have no problem with, and would support, the tidying up of the land, and the demolition and removal of the unsightly outbuildings.

We also agree that the house currently on this site has little in the way of architectural merit and has a number of inherent practical problems. The problem with this proposal is not with the demolition and removal of this property but with what and how it is proposed to replace it. There are a number of issues that present a problem with proposal. These include but are not limited to:-

The direction in which the proposed replacement house faces has been rotated though approximately 180 degrees from the position occupied by the current house. The proposed front of the house will, therefore, face over the the back gardens of Nos 5, 5a, 5b, and 7 Back Lane and, in so doing, will have a negative effect on their privacy and amenity. The back of the proposed house will similarly impact negatively on the nearby Cleveland Way and on Back Lane itself.

The architects of this proposal are arguing for a slate roof, and maintain that this is common in Osmotherley. When the oldest buildings in Osmotherley, concentrated in the centre of the village, were constructed the only practical available roofing materials were stone slabs and slates. Stone slabs were very heavy and unwieldy; and slate presented a more pragmatic alternative. Pantiles were not yet available in those days. As time passed by pantiles became the roofing material of choice. If Osmotherley is viewed from Green Lane or Rueberry Lane on the Cleveland Way The clear impression is of a traditional Yorkshire Moors village the houses of which have pantile roofs. Indeed, when Birch cottage, the adjacent property at No 11 Back Lane, was built on the site of a demolished cow byre pantiles were deemed to be necessary.

The proposed site and orientation of the replacement house disregards the building lines, with respect to Back Lane and other properties, that that the North Yorkshire Moors Authority has insisted other houses have had to conform to.

The overall design, planning, construction details, and location of this proposed property do not sit harmoniously with it's neighbouring properties on Back Lane.

These are the main points that we would put forward at this time in opposing the construction of this new house proposal; but we do have other concerns that we may well raise at a later date.

Yours Sincerely,

David & Barbara Kitchen

7, Back Lane,
Osmotherley DL6 3BJ

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Application for planning at Oakdale House, 9 Back Lane, Osmotherley
Date: 17 August 2019 16:21:23

Dear Sir/Madam,

Having looked at the plans for the proposed demolition and rebuild of 9 Back Lane I have the following concerns which I hope you will address:

- A. The use of materials for the roof and walls that is not in keeping with the buildings in the area. The roof should be pantile and the walls Yorkshire sandstone to fit in with the other houses in the village.
- B. The house is being moved back from the road which sets a precedent for others to do the same and encourages expansion of the village into the National Park.
- C. The front of the house and car park facing other houses in the road.

I do not think that it is necessary to demolish the existing house and build one not in keeping with the local area.

Regards
Mike Shuttleworth
5b Back Lane
Osmotherley
DL6 3BJ.
Sent from my iPad