

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Comments on NYM/2020/0710/FL - Case Officer Mrs H Saunders - Received from Dr Simon Gibbon at 37 Church Lane, Swainby, North Yorkshire, DL6 3EA
Date: 23 November 2020 13:58:52

I have been a resident of Swainby for 37 years and feel I should comment on what will be the single biggest change to the village's built environment in that period.

I support the provision of new housing for Swainby, but the granting of this inappropriate application would result in missing this rare opportunity to bring long term benefit to the North York Moors.

The objections are entirely around the minimal attention which has been paid to the sustainability of the proposal, which appears to have been justified by an inaccurate/selective description of the current / future Swainby.

Based on the National Planning Policy Framework, the proposal does almost the minimum possible to address the 3 objectives:

Economic - the impact is no more than just that of more people being present in the area, there is no additional economic benefit - basically commuter homes.

Social - none.

Environmental - while the trees on the site are to be kept, which is the minimum to be expected, there is no benefit beyond this, which is typified in the Predicted Energy Assessment where the houses only achieve a low B rating on the scale that was developed 2 decades ago. In 2020 it would be expected to achieve A+++ as with my new washing machine or new Passivehaus standard, such as is being used for 600 new homes in York. Surely to preserve the North York Moors unique environment any building should in fact be more sustainable than a contemporary city build.

It appears that rather than address the use of building materials based on environmental considerations i.e. ensuring the houses achieve Passivehaus status, instead choice has been based on the need to adhere to a selective vernacular of Swainby, i.e. stone and pantiles, while totally ignoring other important elements of the vernacular i.e. terraced. In reality Swainby has a far more diverse vernacular, the amount of brick building including 126 High Street (Arts & Crafts) adjoining the site, the amount of slate which has been used on many buildings with recent incorporation of photovoltaic and solar water heating panels. This area is rich in Arts & Crafts (Philip Webb), so for example an Arts & Crafts crescent would not be out of place for the area.

The vernacular of Swainby has been used to justify the proposal of effectively 6 old-style Yorkshire farmhouses (plus 2 stone dormer bungalows) in a single farm field, neither historically correct nor appropriate. This justification has effectively trumped almost all environmental considerations.

The proposal points out the site will not be seen from Swainby High Street and that the built components will not be in the conservation area, so planning environmental consideration should surely carry maximal weight in any aesthetic choices. So, it is even more that the properties are environmentally appropriate for 2020 not 2000, and they should still be environmentally appropriate for 2070 and beyond. The UK will by law be net zero in 2050, well within the expected life of these houses, so due to the inappropriate design of these houses, we can already see that they will have to be extensively retrofitted to meet minimal 2050 standards.

The proposal is incorrect in stating that Swainby has local amenities to which access is made possible by design. Swainby has minimal work, no school, no medical facilities, a post office only for 2 half days, a convenience store only open at weekends, buses between 8am-5pm 2 hourly 6 days a week, no entertainment beyond pubs, etc... So at a minimum the residents will require at least one vehicle - probably 2 for working families to cope with work, school and shopping. Hence the proposal will increase the number of car journeys up and down Swainby High Street to access the A172.

The provision of the car park will have little effect on parking in the High Street, as this is mainly by residents who without other measures will park outside their houses. If the car park is used by visitors to the village, then in order to access many additional car movements up/down Swainby High Street will occur. In fact due to its small size but adding to the perception that parking in Swainby is easy, it may well make the situation worse by attracting people to the village, as the limited car parking space at Sheep Wash / Cod Beck does with overflow happening all along the road.

Rather than building a traditional car park, could the space not be used for an electric car sharing scheme, which could materially reduce the number of cars in Swainby? As such address the issues with car parking at source, rather than make it easier to increase the number of cars in the village and hence cars going up / down the High Street. Additionally or alternatively it could be the site for a village electric minibus to both improve access to facilities for residents of the village and other close villages, but also further reduce the need for increased car parking.

No allowance appears to have been made for visitors to the village by bicycle.

While the proposal will reduce reliance on fossil fuels by installing air source heat pumps instead of oil boilers, these will use considerable electricity as the fabric energy efficiency is over 50kWh/m²/year more appropriate for oil heated properties built in the 1990's than 2020's. While installation of an air source heat will reduce reliance on fossil fuels (at least on site) there is no indication that the proposed houses are designed for air source heating, which would require considerably better insulation at a minimum.

The use of any other appropriate renewable energy measures appears to have been discounted due to aesthetics or ease of use. Deviation from "the vernacular of Swainby" would allow slate roofs with both PV and solar thermal panels, further deviation would allow the use of better building materials to reduce embodied carbon, external insulation and the use of mechanical heat recovery, truly reducing overall energy consumption. From the plans it looks like there will be little solar gain, due to the location of trees, placing of the houses with respect to each other and traditional fenestration, once again this should be addressed in 2020.

The presence of mature trees on the southern and western boundaries seems to be hardly referred to in the actual design of the houses, or the materials of construction of the roads. 5 of the houses will be shaded for considerable parts of the day based on the standard consideration of BRE 25degree daylighting. A more minor but possibly irritating point for residents, the mature trees will also lose large amounts of leaves in the autumn which will make the maintenance of the block paved roads either a major activity in autumn, or require the use of weedkiller throughout the year in order to suppress plant growth. Block paved roads while appropriate for an urban location are problematic for such a rural location.

As a resident, the name of Whorlton Meadows is romantic and ignores the more than 50 years for which this site was a school and the changes in the village which have occurred over that period. Surely something like School Close would be more appropriate? For most of its life the school was known as "Whorlton Parochial School", so in my mind "Whorlton School Close" would be very appropriate.

Thank you for reading my considered thoughts on the design, these are based on my sincere concern for Swainby and for our environment. Please don't hesitate to contact me if I have overlooked anything or can provide more details.

Comments made by Dr Simon Gibbon of 37 Church Lane, Swainby, North Yorkshire, DL6 3EA

Comment Type is Refuse

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Comments on NYM/2020/0710/FL - Case Officer Mrs H Saunders - Received from Mr Jonathan Skidmore at Brook House, High Street, Northallerton, United Kingdom, DL6 3DQ
Date: 06 November 2020 18:55:09

Dear Sirs,

I would like to offer the following comments in respect of this application.

Ref. Public Supporting Information part 4 of 5 (Landscape Visual Impact), drawing D001. The site plans are misleading as the proposed surface water run-off drain is shown joining Swainby Beck downstream of the weirs. This is within the property of Brook House and crosses the garden of the property. Also, the additional rainwater run-off would contribute to the flood risk of properties further down the High Street at a time of high risk during high rainfall events. There is a drain shown on the plan EXSW8803 which runs behind the properties of the High Street under the car park of the former Blacksmiths Arms and joins the beck at Goldgate Lane. We believe that this drain would be more appropriate in avoiding increased flood risk to properties along the High Street.

Ref. Public Supporting Information part 4 of 5 (Landscape Visual Impact), Viewpoint 9, Figure 13. The photograph at Figure 13 is misleading in its presentation and not representative of the current views of the Cleveland Hills as seen when heading South on the High Street over the existing school site. The school site is elevated relative to the High Street and the erection of two story buildings will obliterate the view of the Cleveland Hills which is an integral feature of Swainby. The landscape impact of this development as seen from the High Street around the junction of Claver Close will be significant. The conclusions within the statements in Sections 8.2 to 8.5 should be reappraised by the applicant to provide a more realistic assessment of the landscape impact of the development proposal.

Regards
Jonathan Skidmore

Comments made by Mr Jonathan Skidmore of Brook House, High Street, Northallerton, United Kingdom, DL6 3DQ

Comment Type is Raise Concerns

----- Original message -----

From: Richard Brant

Date: 01/11/2020 17:17 (GMT+00:00)

To: Hilary Saunders

Cc:

Subject: Fwd: Re: FW: New application post - NYM/2020/0710/FL - Swainby and Potto Church ff England Va Primary School, Claver Close, Swainby - Third Party

Dear Mrs Saunders

Based on the email below I wish to object to the development of the Swainby School site application NYM/2020/0710/FL bearing in mind the time frame regarding objections.

Yours sincerely

Richard & Catherine Brant

130 High Street
Swainby

Thank you for you response.

When looking at the amended drawing BH19002-A-220 version P3 which shows the modified street view I notice that it is still vastly incorrect.

Looking closely at drawing BH19002-A-010 it can be seen that the ground level where the corner of the house on plot 3 will be built is at an elevation of 85.14m. The height of the proposed house on plot 3 when scaled from drawing BH19002-A-102 measures 9.8m high, when added together gives a roof line elevation of that house of 94.94m.

Drawing BH19002-A-010 gives a roof line elevation of 130 High Street of 92.5m.

The revised drawing BH19002-A-220 elevation B-B clearly shows the roof line of the building on plot 3 to be significantly lower than that of 130 High street, when scaled approximately 1m lower.

Calculations show that the roof line of the building on plot 3 will in fact be 3.4m higher than depicted on the cross section B-B and 2.4m higher than the roof line of 130 high Street.

I have a question, Is it the intention of the builder to excavate the land level to achieve the roof line levels shown on drawing BH-1902-A-220?

The North York Moors National Park Authority Local Development Framework Design Guide Part 1: General Principles Supplementary Planning Document

<https://www.northyorkmoors.org.uk/planning/framework/spds/design-guide-part1.pdf>

States:

"The scale, height, massing, proportion, form, size, materials and design features of the proposal are compatible with surrounding buildings, and will not have an adverse effect upon the amenities of adjoining occupiers."

I am concerned that not only will the height of the proposed houses on the development be excessively overbearing, having an adverse effect on the street view from all directions but will also reduce the hours of direct sunshine enjoyed by my property.

If the level of the land was lowered prior to building this would not be so.

In my previous communication I mentioned that the corner of the building on plot 3 being within the conservation area, would you please advise whether there any comments from the planning authority on this.

I also notice that nothing has been posted at the development site informing the public about the planning permission being sought.

Yours sincerely

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Proposal NYM/2020/0710/FL
Date: 29 October 2020 14:05:28

Good afternoon.

I refer to the planning permission being sought for the development of the Swainby school site. NYM/2020/0710/FL.

On initially reviewing the application I have noticed a number of omissions.

1. The planning application does not include the plans for the four bedroom houses, there are going to be two of these on the site, I notice that there are two copies of the three bedroom house plans included, an error I guess.
2. The Topographical report on page 26 of the Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (Public supporting information part 4 of 5) states:

"The Application Site falls in a relatively even gradient the highest being the south at 85m lowering to the northern front of the site to approximately 83.27m."

The cross sections on the proposed street elevation drawing specifically section B-B does not reflect the fall in the land level which is 1.7m.

Unless the land is to be leveled which I very much doubt it would be the drawing does not represent a true street view, the houses to the south of the development will be significantly higher than depicted. I notice on the existing site section drawing that the gradient of the land is shown along with a scale on the left hand side indicating building heights, I feel that the scale and gradient should be included in the proposed street view drawing so that a fair comparison can be made.

3. The public support document part 1 of 5 page 16 section 8.10 states that the buildings do not enter the conservation area, when the drawings of the site and the conservation area are compared it seems to me that the corner of the building on plot 3 is within the conservation area.

I do support the development of the site however I feel that the documentation provided needs not only to be concise but also accurate, if the documentation isn't such the application should be refused until it is.

Would you please be kind enough to confirm that the plans will be amended and re-issued prior to any further progress of the application.

Yours sincerely

Richard Brant

Holgate House
130 High Street
Swainby.

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: NYM/2020/0710/FL
Date: 22 October 2020 19:08:50

Regarding the planning application for the primary school site at Swainby as the adjoining landowner we would prefer the fence between the school site and Scarth Wood Farm to be solid-6 feet high & not have the trellis top as indicated.

This would match the fence of our neighbour Mrs Bishop between her property & the school site & help to maintain the privacy & security of what is a working farm .

Thank you

w f hogg

Scarth Wood Farm
136 high street
swainby
northallerton
dl6 3dj