
From: David Lee

Sent: 21 July 2021 13:21

To: Planning

Subject: For the attention of Mrs Saunders

Application for use of land at Byland Abbey for 12no fixed bell tents

Good morning Mrs Saunders.

Many thanks for returning my call.

The primary reason for the call was with regard to submitting further and ongoing evidence regarding the parking issues at Byland Abbey and the impact of further traffic. I appreciate that the opportunity to submit evidence is based on 'fresh issues', but am concerned that the real impact is recognised from parking.

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 20th July, Mr Peckitt of College Farm called at my house to tell me that cars were being directed by Abbey Inn staff to park on the 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 of the wedding party.

Mr Peckitt was unable to manoeuvre his tractor and trailer from the farm to collect freshly harvested hay, the sole winter feed for his stock. 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!

I am unsure as to the restrictions regarding parking in that area but am aware that 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 14th July, a member of the grass cutting team at Byland Abbey suffered cardiac arrest while working at the Abbey.

I cannot praise the efforts of the tearoom staff enough in the efforts to assist.

However, the ambulance on arrival was unable to directly access the grounds, should it have needed to do so, 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.

The member of the grass cutting team sadly died before the arrival of the air ambulance.

It would be wrong to state that ambulance access on to the Abbey grounds was definitely needed - that is for the emergency services to conclude- but it is sadly indicative of the risks and consequences of parking in excess of the capacity at the Abbey Inn.

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?

With thanks for your further consideration in this matter.

Yours sincerely

David Lee

Malise Forbes Adam
Brook House
Byland Abbey
York
N Yorkshire
YO61 4BD

Thursday 13th May 2021

Dear Planning Officer,

Re - proposed campsite at Abbey Inn, Byland Abbey

I am writing to seek your support because we object in the strongest terms to the proposal to put 12 bell tents in the garden of the Abbey Inn. We live at Brook House, next to Abbey Inn a few yards from the campsite.

Our objections are as follows.

1. Loss of privacy because people can see into our garden
2. This is a National Park, and a campsite would totally change the character of this beautiful and unspoilt area. It is inappropriate and out of keeping- can you imagine putting a campsite near Fountains Abbey or Riveaulx Abbey?
3. Traffic would increase on the already busy road between Coxwold and Wass
4. The site itself is unsuitable because the ingress and egress of the campsite could only be on a much smaller road which runs from Byland and Oldstead.

I look forward to your support and to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,

Malise Forbes Adam (Lady)

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: NYM/2021/0168/CU
Date: 24 April 2021 14:37:14

Attention of Mrs H Saunders

Dear Mrs Saunders.

We have previously submitted an objection to the above application. Whilst our concerns are primarily regarding the visual impact, risk and target market for the campsite, we had raised issues also regarding the inadequacy of parking at the site. This results in parking on verges and the roadside on the 'caravan and HGV route' avoiding Sutton Bank.

We were surprised that no objection was raised by the Highways Agency and indeed forwarded a copy of our objection to them for comment and suggestions as to where overflow parking can safely occur. It is clear that the police consider the parking to be unsafe given previous action to move vehicles. To date we have had no response.

To confirm the issue, please see below. Original copies can be provided confirming the time and date, Sat 24th April.

There has been one instance today involving a tractor and four wheel trailer narrowly avoiding a car pulling off the verge. It is perhaps a question of when an accident will occur rather than if, without the added parking required by the proposed campsite.

With thanks again for your consideration.

Yours sincerely

David Lee

cc. Vicki Orange, Highways Agency





Brook House,
Byland Abbey,
Coxwold,
York, YO61 4BD

North York Moors National Park Authority,
The Old Vicarage,
Bondgate,
Helmsley,
York, YO61 5BP

Thursday 15th April 2021

For the Attention of Mrs H Saunders
Ref: NYM/2021/0168/CU

Dear Madam,

A few days ago, my wife and I took advantage of a pleasant evening to walk along the streams bank to the area marked "for camping". Our reaction was one of despair at the thought of several small tents and their occupants.

The question that all concerned should ask themselves is why? Confronted by a pleasant grass field you do not have to do anything. (It would not be the income the tents would generate)

You will have realised the consternation caused by the increased noise generated by the number of cars which will descend on the area throughout all the summer months. The traffic is increasing year by year and the whole idea is compromising one of the most beautiful Abbeys in the British Isles and turning it into a noisy totally inappropriate environment.

The presence of the Abbey must be preserved.

Yours Sincerely

Sir Nigel and Lady Forbes Adam



College Farm
Byland Abbey
York
YO61 4BD

12th April 2021

Dear Mrs Saunders

I am writing with regard to the planning application for tents at the Abbey Inn, Byland Abbey. I wish to object to the application.

I occupy the farm which adjoins the Abbey Inn, the farmyard being across the stream from the proposed tents, with cattle and a straw yard within 10 yards of the site.

I have been a key-holder for the Abbey for many years on behalf of English Heritage and I am familiar with both the site and it's risk of flooding after rain. The site is opposite an underground culvert which drains a large area of land on the Byland Abbey to Oldstead Road which adds to the risk after heavy rain. The site is also downstream of the septic tank discharge of the Abbey Inn.

The farmyard is occupied by cows with calves and bulls, which are a danger to unauthorised entrants. The barn next to the stream is used for the storage of hay and straw, which is a fire risk and which can cause serious injury if climbed on. This barn is next to a Grade 1 listed farm building and the cattle sheds. Farm machinery is stored in these buildings also.

The road entrance to the farm is gated but access from the proposed campsite is across Long Beck, which would not prevent unauthorised access and which cannot be seen from the farm or from the Abbey Inn. For young children, Long Beck is dangerous, having a deep silt base in which it is easy to be trapped.

To secure the farm would require at least solid fencing, clearly seen from the Abbey and Abbey Inn, and floodlighting. Floodlights would impact on the welfare of the cattle, the campsite and the bats which live in the farm buildings. Lighting would contravene the dark skies policy and would also add to the visibility of the site.

Car parking is limited and on the last Bank Holiday, when the Abbey Inn was closed, cars were parked on road verges and blocking access to the land I farm

alongside the Abbey. This results in welfare issues for my cattle and a danger to other road users. The Abbey Inn car park can hold around 20 cars, with a further 5 cars in the car park opposite the Abbey Inn. This was clearly insufficient, with the Abbey Inn closed and without the campsite.

During the autumn, when the tearoom was open, there was advertising in the window for stag parties and hen nights. This is the only attraction for a campsite in the Abbey Inn grounds.

I do not believe that assurances by the tenants of the Abbey Inn provide any comfort. A low quality campsite, on wet ground, is not an attraction for high end glamping. The site is not visible from any windows of the Abbey Inn and it is not possible to control activities after dark or prevent access to the farm. The presence of evening groups at the Abbey Inn, during lockdown, does not reassure me that the site can or will be adequately managed.

If Mr Hunt had spoken to me I would have been happy to explain the issues with the site and the impact on my farm.

I am happy to discuss the issues on site and will be happy to show you both the ground conditions, the issues that will affect Byland Abbey and the farm.

Yours sincerely

Frank Peckitt

From: planning@northyorkmoors.org.uk
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Comments on NYM/2021/0168/CU - Case Officer Mrs H Saunders - Received from Mr Tim Porritt at Abbey House, Byland abbey, Coxwold, YORK, Yo614bd
Date: 10 April 2021 17:00:42

Planning Application NYM/2021/0168CU
8 April, 2021

Application for use of land for the siting of 12 tents for holiday letting purposes at Abbey Inn, Byland Abbey.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

We understand that the applicant is trying to add an important income stream to his business however we feel the proposed site is not suitable for a campsite for numerous reasons but mainly due to a lack of sufficient parking, road safety, potential damage to bats habitat, the visual impact and the proximity to a working farm.. We would like to raise the following objections/comments;

Pedestrian and Vehicle access, Roads and Rights of Way

Currently there is a provision for a maximum of 20 cars in the site car park (not 50 as included in the application). If there are 3 rooms in the abbey inn, 12 tents and 6 full-time members of staff and 4 part-time members of staff this means all the parking spaces will be full leaving no space for abbey visitors or those wanting to visit the pub for a meal or drink. It should also be noted that English Heritage in partnership with VIREZONE Ltd are commencing new games in the abbey from 28 May to September (11am-6pm Tues-Sun and 8pm Fri/sat) with 10 participants in each hour-long session, starting every half-hour meaning a requirement to find upto 20 additional car parking spaces every hour!

There is no overflow parking available on verges. The nearest layby is approx ½ mile away towards Coxwold. Please can you explain how this issue will be overcome?

Road safety

The lack of parking will inevitably lead to illegal parking which in turn creates a road safety issue. It is already difficult to cross the road on the bend from the Abbey Inn to the entrance to the Abbey. The combination of increased footfall and parked cars will certainly increase the risk of a road traffic accident unless traffic control measures are introduced as a condition of the application. We suggest a traffic survey is completed to assess the capacity of the road to Oldstead (when The Black Swan reopens) and to review if the turnout onto the Coxwold/Wass road is suitable for the increased traffic volumes arising from the new Virezone activities at the Abbey, the Abbey inn visitors and the additional traffic created from the proposed campsite.

Deed of grant of Easement

The applicant should be aware that there is a critical land drain running directly below the proposed site for the tents. The mains water supply to the Byland houses also runs under the proposed site for the tents. A plan can be provided on request. Therefore, it is essential that no ground penetration is made and access is available should these services require any maintenance.

Employment

The application claims the campsite will employ 6 full-time and 4 part-time employees. An increase from the existing 3 full-time and 2 part-time employees. This would seem to be a very high staffing level for the site and further clarification should be obtained on the figures provided.

Biodiversity and geological conservation

Byland has a very healthy bat population so steps should be taken to prevent any damage to their habitat. Over the years bats have been seen swarming during late summer/early autumn in the area therefore a potential mating site.

We ask that a full bat survey is completed in late summer/early autumn (before any activities are undertaken on the site) and the appropriate licence with the relevant conditions regarding habitat preservation (light pollution

being critical) are taken into account. It is essential that the proposed campsite does not contravene Regulation 60 (1) of the conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

In addition it should be noted that the proposed camp site is to be positioned on a scheduled monument.

Noise

Given the tranquil location we want to reiterate the importance of maintaining the existing noise levels and ensure that if these are breached planning will be withdrawn immediately resulting in cancelled bookings etc.

Animals

The site is surrounded by working farms so it is imperative that visitors are made aware of this fact. Due to recent dog attacks on livestock it is important that dogs are kept under strict control. The incident resulted in a heifer being chased and then attacked when it became stuck in the deep silt bed of the stream. The preference would be to make the application subject to not accepting pets however if this is not possible or practical then pet owners must be instructed to keep their animals on a lead at all times. It should also be clear to visitors (perhaps with signage) that there is no permitted access to the surrounding farmland unless on a public footpath.

The proximity to a working farm creates a serious potential health & safety issue to children being tempted to climb bales, watch farm machinery in operation and get close to cows with calves which can be very dangerous.

Water hazard

It is important to maintain the stream flow to prevent flooding in the village of Wass and the highway. The stream has a deep silt base which would be hazardous for children to play in.

Litter

The applicant should be responsible for cleaning up any litter (within 12 hours of a reported issue) in the local area (car parks, roadside, stream, surrounding fields etc).

Fire risk

The application should have a defined condition that no fires are permitted at any time and there should be a clear action plan to deal with any occurrence.

Disabled use

What reasonable adjustments is the applicant making to the facilities and site to allow disabled users to access it?

Copies sent to English Heritage and the North York Moors Authority

Comments made by Mr Tim Porritt of Abbey House, Byland abbey, Coxwold, YORK, Yo614bd

Comment Type is Adverse Comments



Mowbray House
Byland Abbey
York
YO61 4BD

6th April 2021

Your ref: NYM/2021/0168CU

Application for use of land for the siting of 12no tents for holiday letting purposes at Abbey Inn, Byland Abbey

Dear Mrs Saunders

I am writing in response to your letter of the 30 March 2021 with regard to the above. Thank you for your correspondence.

We wish to object in the strongest terms to the application for the following reasons, summarised below.

- The proposed development is entirely out of keeping with the environment at Byland Abbey, being visible from the Abbey grounds, adjoining roads and adjoining property
- The proposed development is within 10 metres of a working farm and housed livestock with no fencing or security preventing unwanted access. The proximity carries potential welfare issues for cattle and calves and risk to people entering the farm.
- The proposed development adjoins Long Beck which carries a risk to children, being unfenced and with a deeply silted base.
- The provision of secure fencing would require consent under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979.
- The proposed development is on a Scheduled Monument.
- The proposed development is on land which is subject to waterlogging after heavy rain throughout the year. Tents could not be safely erected on this land without substantial ground anchors.
- Ground conditions after rain would require 'hard landscaping' or paths.

- External facilities at the Abbey Inn are insufficient for the proposed development. There are no washing/shower facilities, a requirement under Campsite Toilet Regulations.
- The proposed development comprises basic 'bell tents with mattresses' and does not fulfil any criteria of 'upmarket' glamping as stated within the application.
- The proposed density of development (12 camping pitches) would require siting of tents immediately adjoining both Long Beck and the post and rail fence of Mowbray House, resulting in a substantial loss of privacy.
- The proposed density of the development is over twice the maximum limit allowed by a Camping Club site (10 units per half acre)
- Current permissions for the use of the Abbey Inn garden as a wedding venue are limited to a 12pm music license and vacation of the site. The proposed development, for 24hr occupation, carries significant risk of noise nuisance.
- Car parking facilities are wholly inadequate. Under the previous management, the car park was frequently full with day guests and visitors to Byland Abbey. This has resulted in parking on the road adjoining the Abbey which carries a substantial risk to pedestrians and motorists and has resulted in police action to move vehicles.
- The stated benefit within the application of additional employment of three full time and two part time employees, as a result of 12 tents is neither plausible nor realistic. We note that at no time in the history of the Abbey Inn, as an established pub or tearoom has this been achieved.

In response to the submissions and statements made within the planning application, we provide further comment below.

Heritage Risk and Flood Risk Assessment

Planning Policy and Relevance

4.1d . '...our offer will be in complete symbiosis with the natural surrounds'

'Planning Consideration'

5.1 'The proposalswill cause minimal to zero impact on Byland Abbey itself as the entirety of any activity will be limited to a discreet area....shielded from public view and away from neighbours'

5.2 'The proposed area is already well shielded from the public, neighbours and existing patrons'

6.3 'Minor visibility from the road. Not noticeable from the asset'

8.4. 'There will be no impact on traffic or neighbours.'

We enclose below photographs of the proposed site.

The development can be seen directly from Byland Abbey grounds, from the Byland Abbey-Wass Road and from the Byland Abbey-Oldstead Road. The development is immediately adjoining College Farm and can be seen directly from both Mowbray House and it's garden.

Visibility of proposed development from Byland Abbey grounds, Byland-Wass Road, Byland-Oldstead Road and Mowbray House



Development site from Byland-Wass Road



Development site from Byland Abbey historic monument grounds



Development site from Byland Abbey – Oldstead Road



Proximity to livestock and buildings – College Farm



View from proposed development to Mowbray House



View from Mowbray House to proposed development

In view of the above, we consider the development to be in direct breach of the requirement (4.1c) that the proposal does not detract from the character, tranquillity or visual attractiveness of the area.

Mitigants to visual impact

The proposed site is clearly visible from Byland Abbey, adjoining roads and from Mowbray House.

The application states that the development would have '*a leave no trace ethos*' and '*with no need for any extensive alterations*'.

The application further states (Planning Considerations 5.1) that *'we will invest in further screening as and when required to ensure that no one is adversely affected by the application'* although *'no ground penetration will be made'*.

Whilst the proposed development is clearly visible from the English Heritage site and adjoins Mowbray House separated only by a post and rail fence, it is not possible to provide screening, without ground penetration in a *'leave no trace'* manner.

Heritage Impact and Flood Risk Assessment

Planning Policy and Relevance

Requirement 4.1d The accommodation is of a high quality design which complements its surroundings

Within the application, the development is described as *'high quality bell tents', 'higher end of the staycation market'* and *'luxury camping'*.

The proposal for 12 units, at the boundary of the tea room garden, does not offer high quality design, being closely spaced *'scout tents with a mattress'*. We refer to the example provided by the applicants (Heritage Impact and Flood Risk Assessment 1.4). Whilst the application clearly wishes to avoid the planning requirements for larger glamping units, this highly visible and closely spaced development cannot be described as *'high quality design'* or complimentary to the surroundings of an historic abbey which directly overlooks the site.

The proposed density of the development, on a scheduled monument, is **2.1x the maximum density** that would be permitted by an approved Camping Club site.

Heritage Impact and Flood Risk Assessment

Description of Site and Proposed Development

4.1 'We will work to ensure that any installation of tents will be entirely temporary with no need for extensive alterations and in line with our commitment to 'leave no trace'.

6.4 . Ensuring weights and non-invasive tethers are used to secure the tents'

7.3. Our proposed tents will be on platforms 300mm raised above the ground'

7.5 'We will close the camping and cancel all bookings at the first sign of heavy rain and/or high winds.

7.6 'No non permeable and no permanent materials will be used on the camping site'.

The ground conditions within the proposed site are identical to those at Mowbray House adjoining Long Beck.

The low lying land adjoining Long Beck is prone to waterlogging after rain and has flooded on two occasions in the past 10 years as a result of the underlying glacial clay. No lateral drains exist, the sole drain being the outflow of the Abbey Inn septic tank immediately upstream of the proposed development

The tenants appear to be unaware of the ground conditions.

Without ground anchorage, tents would be at significant risk. The land surrounding the 'high end' bell tents will readily waterlog and be unsuitable for foot traffic without hard landscaping or 'duckboards'.

Insofar as rainfall is not limited to daytime hours, we consider a commitment to close the site to be wholly inadequate as a means of protecting both the site and the occupants.

Long Beck provides a habitat for eels and native crayfish, with clear risks from pollution.

Application for Planning Permission, Town and Country Planning Act, 1990.

13. Foul Sewage

Please state how foul sewage will be disposed of - Package Treatment Plant

Current facilities to service the proposed development are limited to externally accessed toilets without washing/shower facilities.

The applicants have previously advertised camping, without planning permission and prior to this application. At this time, tents were pitched nearer to the two toilets.

Despite this, and to our disgust, it was more convenient for the campers to use the bushes adjoining our boundary as a latrine. Given the distance of the proposed tents from the inadequate toilet facilities and the proximity to both Long Beck and our boundary, we consider the outcome of a 'late night need' to be inevitable.



Alternative toilet arrangements at fence-line between Abbey Inn and Mowbray House

Campsite Toilet Regulations require 'for sites with up to 120 pitches, there should be 2 toilet facilities for women, 1 toilet facility and urinal for men, per 30 pitches. *There should be 2 showers with hot and cold water. The recommended scale is two each for men and women per sixty pitches*'.

'Modern day toilets will also need baby changing facilities'.

The site does not comply with this requirement, with no washing or shower facilities available for a site which is proposed to serve the '*higher end of the staycation market*'.

Site safety.

The photographs provided demonstrate the proximity of the proposed development to Long Beck and the livestock buildings and hay barn of College Farm.

It can be seen from the photographs that Long Beck is not fenced on either side of the stream. This allows access to the stream, the farmyard and the livestock on the farm.

On behalf of Frank Peckitt (College Farm) Sir Nigel and Lady Forbes Adam (Brook House) and Mr and Mrs Porritt (Abbey House), we undertake to clear Long Beck of debris and branches to maintain water flow. We can confirm that the stream base is very dangerous to children tempted to enter the water, with between 20cm and 50cm of silt resulting in the risk of being trapped and injury.

For elder children, who may cross the stream, there is a substantial risk from falling bales and suckler cows, which are highly protective of their calves. The farm also owns three breeding bulls. The above photographs show these livestock immediately across the stream.

The temptation of water or a farmyard to explore provides considerable concern to Mr Peckitt. Neither he nor any employee of the Abbey Inn would have direct sight of children attempting to play in the stream.

Mr Peckitt clearly has further concerns for his stock's welfare regarding entry by pets, access to high value farm machinery, the risk of fire and the subsequent risk to Grade I listed buildings within the farmyard.

Car parking

The application states:

Heritage Risk and Flood Risk Assessment

5.3.1 'We have a surfeit of parking and do not foresee any issues arising from encouraging new visitors'

8.4. 'There will be no impact on traffic or neighbours.....'

We note that the applicants have occupied the premises only since 2 October 2020. For much of the time since occupation, Covid restrictions have limited movements and the tearoom has been predominantly closed.

Despite this, and without the attraction of a tearoom, it has been common for overflow parking to occur along the Byland Abbey-Coxwold verge, once the Abbey Inn car park is full. This traffic, on a verge marked 'No parking on verges' carries a clear danger to both vehicles and pedestrians. Further parking has occurred in the vehicle access gateway to Byland Abbey, shared with farm access for Mr Peckitt. This has prevented access to calving cows and potential welfare issues. The police have on one occasion intervened as a result of complaints.

With the potential for 12 additional vehicles, in addition to visitors to Byland Abbey and guests at the tearoom once restrictions ease, car parking is clearly inadequate.

We would consider the practical limit of the Abbey Inn car park to be 18-20 vehicles, of which up to 12 spaces could be lost as a result of the proposed development. Any enforcement of parking restrictions can only be to the detriment of visitors to the English Heritage site.

We enclose below photographs of the Abbey Inn car park on Sunday 4th April 2021 and the roadside verge used for parking when the Abbey Inn car park was full.

On this date, the Abbey Tea Room was closed due to Covid restrictions!



Sign at Byland Abbey – Coxwold to Wass Road



Full Car Park – Sunday 4th April 2021



Full car park – Sunday 4th April 2021



Verge used for overflow parking – Sunday 4th April 2021



Van parked on road bend – Sunday 4th April 2021

The above bend is extremely dangerous when cars must pass wide of parked vehicles, meeting traffic 'cutting' the corner in the direction of Byland Abbey.

(Original copies of all photographs can be provided which carry a 'date and time stamp')

Commercial need

We fully accept the need for a viable business at the Abbey Inn.

To date, commercial activity has been limited to a brief period of operation as a tea room, with no restaurant operation and no legal occupation of letting rooms by guests.

The application states that, as a result of the camping operation (12 tents), employment will increase by three full time and two part time employees. We do not believe this to be realistic.

The development, furthermore, limits the opportunity for income from the current permissions as a wedding venue, the proposed campsite directly adjoining, and in direct site of, the land used for that purpose. There is no active marketing as a wedding venue other than a board on the car-park hedge-line, left by the previous management.

It is clear that a primary issue for the applicants is the loss of all or part of the income from the current three letting rooms.

The application states *that 'a duty manager will be on site 24hrs per day when guests are present'*, reducing the availability of one room.

In practise and despite closure, the Abbey Inn is currently a home to no less than two directors/employees, with family/guests occupying the remaining room.

The application thus appears to look to substitute some or all of the long standing guest accommodation to a home for staff, including the duty manager, with new accommodation from the proposed campsite.

We would reject as implausible the suggested benefits of 4 full time equivalent employees as a result of 12 tents.

The application does not offer *'high end'* accommodation, which is amply provided by a compliant campsite within 0.5 miles, a glamping site (Newburgh Priory) within 1.5 miles and pubs in Ampleforth and Coxwold. As proposed, the basic accommodation can only attract 'sleepover' camping for party groups, with the commensurate risk both to the Scheduled Monument, adjoining farm and nuisance to neighbours immediately adjoining the development.

Summary

It is clear that the proposed campsite within the Abbey Inn garden is highly visible from the English Heritage site (Byland Abbey), the road and two adjoining houses. The proposed siting is clearly not *'in complete symbiosis with the natural surroundings'*

The site occupies an area prone to waterlogging, day or night throughout the year, which would *'close... and cancel all bookings at the first sign of heavy rain and/or high winds.'*

Without hard landscaping and as a result of waterlogging, the area (a Scheduled Monument) will inevitably suffer damage from foot traffic.

The site is serviced by inadequate sanitary facilities, which do not comply with Campsite Toilet Regulations. It is inevitable, as occurred during the

unauthorised period of camping, that 'alternative toilet facilities' will be found on the site, which might include Long Back.

Parking is wholly inadequate for the additional cars which could be expected, with overflow traffic at this time parking on the roadside, despite 'No parking on verges' signage and during a period of closure of the Abbey Inn tearoom.

The site immediately borders a stream which provides a hazard for young children but does not provide an effective barrier for older children to a dangerous farmyard and hazardous machinery.

The proposed development, on a scheduled monument, does not constitute a '*a high quality design which complements its surroundings*', for the '*higher end of the staycation market*' and '*luxury camping*'. The proposal is for a high density campsite, of double the density approved by the Caravan Club for tents, on ground which will waterlog and without shower facilities

The development is proposed to adjoin a boundary fence to Mowbray House, with substantial visual impact and potential for noise nuisance, with no screening.

The development is stated to bring employment benefits to the area. While no current marketing has been undertaken as a wedding venue, for which approval exists, the claimed employment benefits are implausible and at the expense of the amenity value of a Scheduled Monument.

We remain surprised that an application has been made by a tenant of English Heritage, given the clear detriment to a Scheduled Monument, managed by a statutory body whose role is to protect local heritage.

We would be happy at any time to discuss the matter and provide access to our property to show the impact of the proposed campsite.

The planning application notes Mowbray House and College Farm as neighbours of the proposed development. The proposed development is also visible from Brook House (Sir Nigel and Lady Forbes Adam). We understand that, as interested parties and as an ex-regional Chairman of the National Trust, they would also wish to submit their views. The proposed development, as stated above, is clearly visible from Byland Abbey, an English Heritage site.

As a further neighbour to the proposed development, a copy of this letter will be provided to English Heritage, for their attention.

David and Sandra Lee

Mowbray House

cc. English Heritage, 37, Tanner Row, York, YO1 6WP.