

# North York Moors National Park Authority

## 22 July 2021 Planning Committee members update sheet

### Item 9, Castleton Conservation Area Article 4 Direction

Amended officer recommendation

That in response to the request from Danby Group Parish Council to amend specific elements of the existing Article 4 Directions, members agree to the order being amended to exclude:

permitted development rights in relation to the installation of satellite dish/aerial; and  
the painting/staining of windows and doors

with such changes to be made as part of the Conservation Area boundary changes in due course.

### Plans List

#### Item 1, NYM/2020/0962/FL

Please note amendments to reason for refusal set out in the committee report and an additional two further reasons for refusal.

1. The Local Planning Authority considers this to be an unsustainable form of industrial development that does not require a remote rural location within a National Park. As such it does not represent a form of rural diversification that is linked to or benefits National Park purposes and is therefore contrary to NYM Local Plan Strategic Policy B, which requires inter alia, that development is essential for ; rural land management or meets a social or community need where there are no other suitable locations within settlements. Furthermore it would conflict with NYM Management Plan policies B8 & B20 which seek to encourage diversification and economic development which is related to the NYM National Park's special qualities.
2. The proposal would generate unnecessary additional car and van traffic movements into and through the National Park leading to additional traffic, in particular along 'High Street' which is a narrow country lane. Such an increase would be harmful to the amenities of the locality and is not considered to amount to sustainable development and would be contrary to NYM Local Plan Strategic Policy A, which requires that development builds resilience to climate change.
3. The proposal is premised on the use of repurposed shipping containers, which by reason of their angular, geometric and utilitarian appearance would represent poor quality design in the context of development in a protected landscape. The nature and scale of the containers represents an industrial intensification which is incongruous and harmful to the character of the rural open countryside locality which is visible from surrounding public viewpoints. As such the proposal would be

contrary to the provisions of NYM Local Plan Strategic Policy C and G and Rural Diversification Policy BL3 which requires schemes to be of a high quality design and to respect and enhance the local landscape character.

### Item 3, NYM/2020/0218/FL

The applicant's agent wishes to draw members' attention to the several pages of positive reviews of customers of the unauthorised shepherd's hut on the [Pitch Up website](#).

### Item 4, NYM/2021/0175/FL

The agent has emailed with the following information:

Apologies for the late email regarding presentation of this application to committee but we had hoped to receive a reply to our letter emailed to your Authority on the 25 June.

Having not received a reply and read the committee agenda item we feel the following points are relevant and should be made available to members:

- Our letter to you offered the opportunity to discuss alternatives to the design, this was not replied to.
- As noted within our letter we feel it is very unusual to prevent a non designated heritage asset from being extended in any way which seems to be your authority's stance.
- The extension is set back from the front to ensure the outline of the main elevation including Buttresses presents its original appearance.

### Item 6, NYM/2021/0182/FL

Traci Connorton, 27 Hinderwell Lane, Runswick Bay has submitted images showing road blockages resulting from the caravan and camping park.

### Item 7, NYM/2021/0168/CU

Mr David Lee, Mowbray House, Byland Abbey, York - Wish to submit further and ongoing evidence regarding the parking issues at Byland Abbey and the impact of further traffic.

It has been a considerable frustration that no response has been received from the Highways Agency, despite being sent photographic evidence of the issues and despite follow up phone calls. Perhaps unsurprisingly, we disagree with the view of the Highways Agency!

The extent to which the issue is both real and ongoing is perhaps demonstrated by events in the past week.

Yesterday, Tuesday 20 July, cars were being directed by Abbey Inn staff to park on the Byland Abbey-Oldstead road. It was apparent that a wedding event was happening and there was a wish to reduce parking in the Abbey Inn car park - we assume to allow arrival

Members update sheet July 2021

of the wedding party. Mr Peckitt of the adjacent farm was unable to manoeuvre his tractor and trailer from the farm to collect freshly harvested hay. Only when Mr Peckitt informed a guest that the police would be called, were the cars moved from the road to park on the Abbey Inn lawn - in the same area as proposed for the camping development! My adjoining property has a restrictive covenant precluding parking on the garden for the sole reason of protecting the scheduled monument.

Should the problems of road, verge and farm access parking be addressed, this is, however, the only alternative parking available.

On Wednesday 14 July, there was a medical emergency but the ambulance on arrival, if it had needed to, was unable to directly access the grounds, due to overflow parking blocking gate access to Byland Abbey. This is immediately next to the field access we have referred to previously. Both gate accesses are clearly signed regarding the need for access.

It is certainly reasonable to state that, if Mr Peckitt could not manoeuvre a farm vehicle past parked traffic yesterday, an emergency vehicle may have been unable to attend an incident via the Byland Abbey- Oldstead road.

It is clear that the lack of objection by the Highways Agency pre-dated both our objection and the photographic evidence of issues that affect road and pedestrian safety, blocking of farm accesses, impacts on animal welfare and access for emergency vehicles. It is disappointing that, despite forwarding this evidence to the Highways Agency, we have received no response to either emails or telephone calls.

Would it be reasonable to ask that any decision is deferred until confirmation is received from the Highways Agency that have considered the evidence contrary to their letter and that they do not consider the issues raised to be of concern to them?