

**From:**  
**To:**  
**Subject:** NYM/2021/0472/FL- conditions  
**Date:** 14 October 2021 22:05:19

---

FAO Chris France

Dear Chris

We were pretty shocked by the decision of the planning meeting to approve an application that you recommended should not be approved and is quite contrary to the National Park Policies. We will send you a separate email regarding various aspects of the process which alarmed us.

If it is possible, we would be very grateful if you could ensure that the conditions attached to the planning permission include:

1. No huts are to be put on the site until the Highways requirements of additional passing places and better access to the site have actually been completed to the Highways satisfaction;
2. That the contents of the composting toilets must not be put onto the site but must be professionally emptied with some proof/evidence that this will actually be carried out - perhaps in the form of a contract or at least the name and contact details of contractor. The reason for this is that what is a very wet site drains into Sutherland Beck and if the land is contaminated then the beck and the river Seven will be polluted as well. Proof/evidence is crucial as the applicants are economical with the truth;
3. No parking to be allowed on Sutherland Road by the occupants of the huts or any visitors to the site. This is a narrow road and there must be sufficient space for emergency vehicles at all times;
4. The huts are varnished or painted in such a way as to minimise their visual impact;
5. The huts must only stay on the site for six months of the year and must then be located elsewhere but not on the land outside the applicants' lambing shed;
6. Because of a significant fire risk in a hot dry summer in a field that is not mown or grazed, the applicants should ensure that no bonfires, firepits or barbecues are allowed and no cigarette ends or glass are thrown onto the grass;
7. The applicants are to enforce their stated rules including those regarding, noise, lighting, visitors, external paraphernalia and number of cars per hut;
8. Not only should there be no noise after 9pm, the noise from the huts must not be such that it disturbs local residents at any time;

### **Lyme's Disease**

You may not be aware that there are a great many ticks in this locality and some of them may carry LYME'S Disease which is a very nasty condition if not recognised and treated promptly. Visitors may be totally unaware of the risks and what to look for if they are bitten. We think that a notice should be put in each hut describing what the occupants should look for if they are bitten and what to do about it. You might think this is worth adding as a condition.

Kind Regards

Bob and Miriam Alcock

**From:**  
**To:** [Planning](#)  
**Subject:** NYM/2021/0472/FL  
**Date:** 13 October 2021 11:55:40

---

Dear Sir

1. We are writing again in relation to the above planning application for three shepherds huts as it is clearly contrary to policy UE2 of the Planning Committee's recently drawn up Local Plan.  
The proposal is for an isolated development in open countryside.

2. It should be noted that there was a significant error in the presentation at the site meeting on 1st October regarding Cropton Parish Council's position.

While it is true that there were initially no objections from the Council, Park officers and planning committee members will remember that two parish council members did indeed attend the September planning meeting and spoke there to voice the council's objections.

3. It was clear from the site visit that the winter storage site proposed in the application for the three huts is inadequate. The roof of the chicken hut-style former lambing sheds would need to be raised and external groundworks would be essential to enable access.

If the huts were to be parked on the adjacent land outside for six months of the year this would constitute an eyesore for the local residents and for users of the public footpath that follows the lane.

4. It seems naive that this planning application does not include the necessary infrastructure that would be required

a) to level the proposed shepherds huts on the sloping site

b) to allow holiday makers' vehicles to access the field, manoeuvre and park up in the spaces provided and

c) to move the huts on or off site twice a year as the applicants propose,

given the ground conditions that can occur on these fields in anything but the driest weather.

5. It is a matter of great concern that although this application is only for 3 huts, if it were granted then this could rise to 12 in the future.

There have been articles in the national press recently raising concerns about the over- provision of 'staycation' holiday accommodation - particularly in national parks - which will be surplus to requirements in a few years once foreign travel returns and public confidence in holidaying abroad is restored.

For all the above reasons it is to be hoped that this application will be refused at the October planning meeting.

Yours faithfully

Rod and Liz Cole

---

-----Original Message-----

From: ELIZABETH COLE

Sent: 24 September 2021 12:48

To: Planning

Cc: Miriam Alcock

Subject: Local residents' representative for site visit ref NYM/2021/0472/FL

Re: Application NYM/2021/0472/FL for three shepherds huts at Sutherland near Cropton

Good morning

Thank you for the letter dated 20th September 2021 which is signed by Mark Hill advising us of the date and time of the Planning Committee members' site visit.

I have been nominated as the representative for the objectors so wish to attend at 10 am on Friday 1st October. Could you please confirm that this is acceptable and that no one else has already registered an interest?

Can I check that there are to be two parts to this site visit?

Firstly, of course, the committee members will look at the two grazing fields where it is proposed the three huts would be sited but secondly it is important that they also look at the former lambing shed - closer to the applicants' bungalow - which is proposed as the winter storage site.

I look forward to hearing from you again in due course.

Kind regards,

Liz Cole

(Mrs Elizabeth Cole)

**From:**

**Subject:** FW: Planning application NYM/2021/0472/FL  
**Date:** 31 August 2021 16:37:26

---

**From:** Miriam Alcock

**Sent:** 31 August 2021 16:11

**To:** Planning

**Subject:** Planning application NYM/2021/0472/FL

Please forward to members of the Planning Committee before September 2nd as part of the update sheet process.

Thank you

Miriam Alcock

**The majority of local residents object to this misleading planning application because it does not comply with strategic policies B, E, G and H, policies UE2 and ENV2 and points 5.10 and 6.12 of the local plan.**

The application site is an undeveloped greenfield site in the open countryside, currently used for grazing sheep. The huts and their occupants, who may well spend a considerable time outside in fine weather, will **not** be situated behind established dense woodland to the east and will be clearly visible from Sutherland Road where there are few trees. In addition, all the trees around the site are not under the applicants' control as they belong to Forestry England and may be felled in the future. It will take years for the proposed hardwood trees to mature sufficiently to provide effective screening. The area is currently extremely quiet and a haven for a wide range of wildlife including turtle doves, barn owls, pine marten, and otters. If this application for three shepherd huts plus car parking was granted it would detract from the character, tranquillity and visual attractiveness of the landscape. It would not conserve, restore or enhance the wildlife or biodiversity and would undermine the quality of life of the local residents.

The site on which the huts would be situated is isolated from the residential unit which will be used to manage the accommodation; there are two houses, two areas of woodland, fields, and a road in between the managing dwelling (that is the applicants' house) and the application site. Parcels of land isolated from the managing unit are not considered to be suitable locations for development: there needs to be adequate and active management of the site to prevent noise or other disturbance. The presence of three huts on this field will mean groups of people may stay at the same time (regardless of any 'rules') leading to increased noise levels as they socialise outside, particularly in good weather. No rules can overcome this problem. In addition the applicants cannot demonstrate that this application intends to supplement their core business: in reality, holiday accommodation would supplant the core business of sheep grazing.

The arrangements for storing the three shepherd huts during the winter are totally unsatisfactory. The applicants claim they will store them in their 'barn' but the latter is actually a lambing shed with attached Nissen hut which isn't high enough internally to house the huts and would be extremely difficult to access from the track. If these huts are stored instead on the grassy area in front of the shed, where there is no screening whatsoever, they will be plainly visible to all walkers and drivers using this track.

As the Planning Committee report points out it would be difficult to prevent the number of huts on the application site increasing in the future and in principle this development would have a detrimental impact on the landscape of the National Park.

**From:**  
**To:** [Planning](#)  
**Subject:** NYM/2021/0472/FL  
**Date:** 20 August 2021 15:08:04

---

To a member of the Development Management Administration Team

This is to confirm that I would like to speak at the Planning Committee meeting to be held on September 2nd 2021 as an objector to the planning application NYM/2021/0472/FL.

Yours faithfully

Miriam Alcock

**From:**

**Subject:** Comments on NYM/2021/0472/FL - Case Officer Mrs Hilary Saunders - Received from Mr James Lloyd at Fall Rigg, 2 Forestry Bungalows, Sutherland, Cropton, North Yorkshire, YO188EU  
**Date:** 22 July 2021 22:10:00

---

## Planning Application NYM/2021/0472/FL

We object to the above application on the following basis:

1) This is an extremely sensitive area for biodiversity arising from organic, low intervention or uncultivated meadows dispersed with woodland within Cropton Forest. It is incongruous for the application to speak of increased biodiversity in the local area which already must have one of the largest range of native flora/fauna and animals in the country, including pine marten, otters, adders, red deer and birds such from barn owls to turtle doves. Any development, will in, fact be of adverse impact on such environment contrary to policies E and H of the Local Plan.

2) The development is contrary to policy UE2 and ENV2 of the Local Plan in that it is not 'screened by existing topography, buildings or adequate well established vegetation'. The site is presently an open field and the arrangements for future planting do not satisfy the express requirement of 'well established' vegetation. As such, the huts will be visible from the public bridleway for some years to come contrary to the intention of the Local Plan.

3) The application will be contrary to strategic policy G of the Local Plan as the land presently presents a vista between the trees to the uncultivated fields and woodland with the tabular hills beyond and represents a natural environment of some beauty within the forest setting. Furthermore such car-parking and line of visual huts will detract from the character of the immediate area which is open countryside of meadows surrounded by woodland. The dwellings/smallholdings in the local area are only noticeable if you turn off Sutherland Road, which most passers-by do not.

4) It is not accepted that the presence of three huts will enable the tranquillity of the local area to be maintained, and this will be contrary to policy ENV2.

The area is very quiet indeed, and whilst one hut may only have a double bed, three will enable groups of people to stay with the prospect of louder sociability arising. Even a 'no-group' booking policy will not remedy separate bookings by groups. Any such, noise will have a very wide impact in such a sensitive environment, including on the amenity of the first signatories' house and garden and those of our immediate neighbour which are between the applicant's house and the site, as well as the amenity land of the second signatory which is only 60m from the application site.

Neither do we consider a 9pm quiet rule to be an appropriate solution. Any noise arising through the day will impact on the extreme tranquillity of the local area and the enforceability of any such rule into the evening from the distance of the applicant's dwelling is highly questionable. The site is too great a distance from the applicant's residence in the local context where woods, two landowners and a road are between the site and the applicant's residence. The applicants' submission in respect of control of the site is not realistic as they will not be able to see or tell the users of the site are there or what they are doing from their residence.

5) The application contains no evidence of the permission for intensification of user of the private right of way over the forest track owned by the Forestry Commission - where the public highway ends at Sutherland Beck. Such right of way is presently for agricultural purposes only unless in connection with the applicant's dwelling and brings into question the applicability of the car parking arrangements proposed.

6) In considering this application the authority should be aware the applicants do not 'operate their main agricultural business' from their property. They do not practically operate any agricultural business; they have non-agricultural employment and allow a third party to graze sheep on the application land under a grazing licence. As such, this application is not for necessary diversification from an existing agricultural enterprise, as the quote implies.

James Lloyd  
Imogen Lloyd  
of Fall Rigg, Sutherland

James Lloyd  
for and on behalf of the Trustees of the Dentons SIPP – J M Lloyd  
Adjoining landowner

Comments made by Mr James Lloyd of Fall Rigg, 2 Forestry Bungalows, Sutherland, Cropton, North Yorkshire, YO188EU

Comment Type is Object with comments



**From:**  
**To:** [Planning](#)  
**Subject:** FW: FW: New application post - NYM/2021/0472/FL - Land off Sutherland Road, Cropton - Third Party  
**Date:** 30 July 2021 14:00:29

---

Please upload as public to third party comments

Thanks

Hilary

Mrs Hilary Saunders MRTPI  
Planning Team Leader (Development Management)  
North York Moors National Park  
The Old Vicarage  
Bondgate  
Helmsley  
York  
YO62 5BP

Direct Dial :- 01439 772559  
Customer Services: 01439 772700

[www.northyorkmoors.org.uk](http://www.northyorkmoors.org.uk)

**Sent:** 30 July 2021 13:26

**To:** Hilary Saunders

**Subject:** Re: FW: New application post - NYM/2021/0472/FL - Land off Sutherland Road, Cropton - Third Party

Planning Application NYM/2021/0472/FL

Dear Hilary

Thank you for your response from the planning agent regarding our queries. They were very helpful. Please find our comments in response to your email. I am using the same headings as before for ease of use.

### **Agricultural Business**

We appreciate that, from the point of view of the Rural Payments Agency, the Basic Payment Scheme and the allocation of a SBI number, the definition of a farmer includes someone who keeps some land in a state suitable for grazing, which the applicants undoubtedly do. *However, according to point 6.12 of the latest North York Moors National Park Authority Local Plan dated July 2020, 'proposals will be expected to supplement the core business and not supplant it'.* The core business of supplying grazing land for sheep will be supplanted **not** supplemented if this planning application succeeds. The applicant's main business is that of a surveyor.

### **Distance from applicant's home to site**

We walked the distance again yesterday from the applicants' house gate to the field gate at a very brisk pace and it took 4 minutes 33 seconds, **not** the 2-3 minutes stated by the applicants. When we measured the distance from the applicant's house to the entrance gate to the field site using maps provided by Forestry England when they regraded the road and when my husband

was involved in surveying the local turtle dove population, we found the distance to be 389m **not** the 282m quoted by the applicants in their planning application. We were very puzzled by this discrepancy, given the accuracy of Google maps, until we realised the applicants were only measuring the distance from the edge of their property, **not** their house, and **not** the full distance to the field gate. We also used the same maps to measure the distance from the applicants' house to the two furthest huts which came out as 559m, which would take approximately another 2 minutes to walk. We consider these distances to be significant and, as this land **is** isolated from the applicant's house, there is no way that they can ensure that there is adequate and active management of the site to prevent any noise or disturbance to us, the nearest residents. In fact as the nearest house, we are the ones most likely to be disturbed not only by any noise but also by requests from the holidaymakers for more water, new batteries or any other problems relating to the huts. *According to point 5.10 of the Local Plan, 'parcels of land isolated from the managing unit are not considered to be suitable locations for development'.*

## **Water**

We are pleased that there will be no waste water running into the field. However we believe that 6 people walking on this field when it is wet will leave a muddy mess as will cars attempting to drive through the gate and up the incline onto the parking mats. Cars will also have to drive over the ground when they wish to turn round in order to leave the field. Perhaps due to climate change, we can get a considerable amount of rain in the summer and this field, like all the fields around here, does not drain well.

## **Composting Toilet**

We are very pleased that the applicants say the waste from these toilets will be emptied and removed off site by licensed professionals. However we spent a considerable amount of time yesterday trying to find someone who would carry out this work and were unable to find anyone. *Please ask the applicants who they intend to use.*

## **View from Sutherland Road**

The applicants' planning statement (section 3.5) says that 'It is proposed to situate the huts behind the established dense woodland to the eastern boundary which will provide highly effective screening in the summer months...' **This is not true** as the huts will be situated **in front** of these trees when viewed from Sutherland Road. It is the view from Sutherland Road, which lies on the western boundary of the site, which really matters. Although there are a few trees at this point on Sutherland Road, the huts would be plainly visible from the road (as will the parked cars) until the proposed new planting has had time to mature, which will take several years. *According to policy UE2 section 2 of the local plan 'In order to respect the sensitivity of the local landscape character type all sites must be screened by existing topography, buildings or adequate well-established vegetation which is within the applicant's control and where arrangements for its long term maintenance can be maintained'.* Not only is the site poorly screened from Sutherland Road but the trees belong to Forestry England not the applicants. The trees on the northern boundary are largely conifer plantations, not mature hardwood trees and could be felled whenever Forestry England chooses.

**It is really important that someone from the planning office comes to the site to see for themselves (1) how little screening actually exists along Sutherland Road (2) where the applicants intend to park the huts in the winter (3) how far the applicant's house is from the proposed huts and (4) how long it takes to walk from the applicants' house to the huts.**

## **Noise**

The applicants write about their noise policy and having a set of rules in each hut including a strict no visitor rule. *Please ask the applicants what their rules will be and how, when and who will enforce these rules. They did not answer the previous questions 1a and 1b about how and who would enforce the noise rule.*

Even if there are no visitors the presence of three huts will encourage groups of friends, or families with grown up children, to make a block booking. This may lead to more noise outside.

## Winter

The applicants state that the huts will be stored on their property in the winter. *Please ask the applicants exactly where this would be.* If it will be on the grassy area near to their Nissan hut, where there is no screening whatsoever, the huts will be plainly visible to all walkers and drivers using this track, which leads to four resident's houses as well as several local footpaths.

## Site Management

*Please ask the applicants exactly how they plan to introduce yellow rattle onto the site.*

It is very unlikely that their simple method of cutting back the field in the autumn/winter will create a wild flower meadow unless approximately 50% of the grass is also totally removed in order to achieve sufficient bare soil for the yellow rattle to germinate. Even if this is done, yellow rattle struggles to grow in soils that are more acidic than pH 5 (which is the case for all the soil in this area) and also prefers a drier environment: flooding can kill the seedlings. In order for the seed to germinate in future years, maintenance must ensure that bare soil remains in the vicinity of the original plants. Restoring grassland to a wild flower meadow is a very time consuming business and the applicants' simplistic response does nothing to convince us that their method will be successful.

If the huts are occupied by three couples who are friends they may well play sports on the field. Although bonfires will not be allowed, what about barbecues? I would suggest these are very likely to be used when people are on holiday and staying in such small huts. If we have a very dry spell, using these on a field with long grass will be a significant fire risk to the surrounding forest and, if the trees catch fire, to us as the nearest residents. We never have bonfires or light barbecues on a grassy area in very dry conditions as we are very aware of the risk of fire, living as we do in a forest.

The applicants say that our statement that they left the field in a terrible mess after their wedding 'is completely false and not relevant to the application'. Not only is our statement true but it can be confirmed by any of the local residents. Yes it **is** very relevant to the application as, based on this behaviour, we have no confidence that the applicants will manage the site properly if they are allowed to have huts on it.

The applicants say that food waste will be composted in their own compost bins situated in their garden. We approve of this but if the waste includes meat and cooked food the compost will attract rats. If the huts are occupied by cyclists or walkers arriving without a car they can't be expected to remove their own recycling.

To summarise:

We believe this application does **not** meet the requirements of Policy UE2 or Policy BL3 of the North York Moors Authority Local Plan of July 2020 for the following reasons:

1. The site is isolated from the residential unit that will be used to manage the accommodation, with two houses belonging to local residents between the applicants' house and the site. For this reason the applicants will be unable to adequately manage any noise or disturbance on the site and we, not them, will be the ones most likely to be impacted.
2. The huts will **not** be screened by existing well-established vegetation and the trees that do exist around the site are **not** within the applicant's control.

3. The core business of supplying grazing land for sheep will be supplanted **not** supplemented.

Kind Regards

Miriam

Pinewood  
off Sutherland Road  
1 Forestry Bungalows  
Cropton  
Pickering  
YO18 8EU

## Planning Application NYM/2021/0472/FL

It seems that there are four significant criteria which the above application for the siting of three off-grid Shepherds Huts does not satisfy.

Firstly it is based on the premise that an established agricultural business exists already from which to diversify.

This is not the case as the applicants do not carry out (and have never carried out) any farming activity themselves at Sutherland. A local farmer grazes the two fields intermittently for a total of several weeks or months a year and has made hay one summer.

Secondly the application for this very visible open field site does not meet the requirements of the NYM Local Plan for development in open countryside (Policy UE2).

This states (as per paragraph 6.7 of the KVA Planning Consultancy Supporting Information document) that

“In order to respect the sensitivity of the local landscape character type, all sites must be screened by existing topography.... or adequate well-established vegetation which is within the applicants’ control....”

The slope of the fields does nothing to hide the proposed sites of the three shepherds huts and all the existing well-established vegetation in the vicinity belongs to Forestry England.

The denser trees to the north and south are commercial conifer plantings which may well be scheduled for felling in their rotational plan.

Thirdly the application relies on a previous successful planning application for Sutherland Lodge (NYM/2012/0529/FL) to create adequate access. This earlier Sutherland Lodge application has a condition (16ii) attached for the construction of two passing places on the narrow lane north of Skelton Banks Farm. May it be assumed that any permission for the proposed shepherds huts will be conditional upon these two (2) new passing places being created?

Fourthly the ground conditions in the two traditional permanent pasture fields of the proposed business development, like the others at Sutherland, are some of the worst in the area because they lie on a thick layer of clay subsoil which makes drainage an ever-present issue. The application’s proposals to site and recover the huts annually and to transport supplies and luggage by wheelbarrow without additional infrastructure are therefore somewhat naïve. The poor drainage may well have implications for the proposed disposal of composted toilet waste and grey water. Vehicle access in wet conditions is likely to be a problem without engineering works including hardcore and other infrastructure.

Other concerns include the lack of detail about the following:-

- Where the huts will be parked out of season

- Arrangements for storage of gas supplies, spare batteries, extra water, wheelbarrows etc

- On site/in hut repositories for rubbish and sorted recycling

- How the huts will be levelled without new groundworks given the slope of the fields

- How the proposed wild flower meadow and woodland planting will be established and maintained successfully

- Enforcement of rules: eg ‘no external paraphernalia’ (tables/chairs etc); lighting; 9 pm ‘curfew’

**From:**

[Planning](#)

**Subject:**

Comments on NYM/2021/0472/FL - Case Officer Mrs Hilary Saunders - Received from Mr Clive Ainley at Sutherland Lodge Cottage, Sutherland Road, Cropton, YO188ET

**Date:**

22 July 2021 16:38:56

---

Dear Planning,

I would like to strongly appeal against the planning proposal for 3 shepherds huts and additional parking. The proposed developers moved recently in to the area to start a agricultural business, this is clearly not part of agricultural business and more moving towards developing the beautiful landscape that we all treasure, respect and love. He is an architect working from home full time and she recently gave up her job as a art teacher at the local school

There a combination of issues I would like to have addressed

As a local resident for many years, moving to this location to get away from the hustle and bustle of everyday life and been part of nature.

Living a quiet and tranquil life style.

With the proposal of 3 additional holiday homes this has highlighted a number of issues listed below.

1, I do fear for myself and other residents if planning is approved this will set a president for the whole area, we will soon be inundated with applications for all kinds of disruptive aspects, camping/caravans/glaping/ect. With this been an area of natural beauty it should be kept as such, making sure this is not abused by people moving in to the area and wanting to change the tranquil aspects of such a location and have the life style of long term residents disrupted..

2, There's been no independent ecology survey which needs to be carried out long before planning permission is even considered, as, if something is found, then ecologists will have to agree an approach to mitigate for any impact to the habitats or species. There's nesting Tawny Owls, Barn Owls and a recent spotted Little Owls all residing in the forest, not to forget Badgers and roaming deer and the recent addition of a pair of Breeding Beavers.

Recently there's been a royalty visit (Prince Charles) who not just approved the millions on pounds of investment for the introduction of Breeding Beavers in the area (with in 400yds of the proposed development location) which is a wonderful ecological addition to the area. This is all part of the big plan to reduce flooding in locations like York, Charles also personally commented on how beautiful and tranquil the area is, a perfect quiet location for the Beavers to be released in to the environment. Please also note there's Great Crested Newts sharing the same location as the Beavers, these are both protected species.

A consultation with Natural England I feel is imperative as there's definitely a possible impact to

- Site of special scientific interest
- Environmental impact
- Appropriate assessment under the habitats regulations

3, Noise pollution and waste pollution is a massive factor that's also been over looked.

Noise also to the local residents, not to mention to the local environment, animals that reside close by.

- How do the applicants intend to patrol and police the noise policy after 9pm when they live so far away (aprox 500 meters) from the location they will not be able to respond to any excess noise. We all know that no matter what, there will always be people that don't follow the rules laid down. Groups of people will book all 3 shepherds huts at the same time creating a party area and no doubt open fires and BBQ's

4, There's a mention in the planning that they intend to compost the waste/soils at another location on the land, this needs to be highlighted and also protection put in place, something to alleviate the smells produced by open air composting of human waste. Even if a sealed unit is used there's always that risk of contamination and over flow. There's a chance of leakage in to the local water course, polluting the waters that are currently used by the Beavers and Great crested newts, natural leakage is one of the issues and as the area is subject to future flooding since the Beavers have been introduce to build natural dams in the area this is a risk that should not be

overlooked.

5, All the many years I've lived in the area I have not once seen a 4x4 on this agricultural field at any time, this is not used by the proposed developers, it has always been used by the local farmer for grazing sheep, even the previous owner never used the field. It's always been maintained by the local farmer for grazing. Which bring me to another issue over looked. Parking, cars are not going to be able to drive on the field as it boggy and wet for most of the year, will the proposed developers expect their customers will have permission to park on Sutherland road, a single track forestry road. There's also been no engagement with the Forestry Commission. In doing so this clearly will disrupt the tranquil environment.

-There's definitely no hard standings either for the 3 shepherds huts and these will sink and then become a permanent fixtures in the field, even if rubber mats are used the huts will need digging out each year. Clearly this land is not suitable.

Where and how do they intend on moving the huts during the winter months for storage? what dates do they intend on using them during the year? all of which have not been clearly outlined and defined.

6, The propose carriage way and passing points have not been put in to place from previous planning applications, there's also no mention when and if they will ever be implemented by Sutherland Lodge. There is clearly not 11 current passing places on Sutherland road, this need to be clearly defined by the highways agency. Section 3.16 – 3.18 are very misleading.

6.13 works have NOT started on Sutherland Road as a result of Proposals at Sutherland Lodge Activity Centre, this again is miss leading.

7, Last years they held a party on this land, they never cleared up after themselves, bunting draped over fencing – across the road and trees, flags, balloons and general waste was just left not only in the field but also on Sutherland road, it was only the prudence and good will from local residents having to clean up weeks after them was the beauty and tranquility of the area maintain. To be honest it was discussing mess.

How do they intend on police the rubbish generated by 3 holiday lets? When they can't even clean up after themselves after a party they host. Will they collect it on a daily visit, weekly visit. Do they intend on using the local bin service that arrives once every two weeks or a commercial solution?

8, Water, there's no water to this site and the proposed developers propose water containers to be used and refilled. How do they intend on maintaining the cleanliness of the water containers during the summer months when bacteria and other water bound deceases are very active. There's no mention of a water testing plan, type of containers, what chemicals they intend on using to maintain the water cleanliness.. Then there's also the chance of chemical spillage and contamination.

No mention of a risk assessment plan if this is to occur.

9, There's no mention of the colour of the 3 shepherd huts as these come in vivid colours and need to blend in to the local environment if planning is passed.

10, Currently there's no tree screen, the developers propose planting hundreds of trees.... These will take a long time (years) to get established and create a wall of trees to block out to proposed development. A condition of size the trees that are to be planted would at least start to create a barrier, a propose minimum height of 6ft trees to be used.

What trees do they intend on planning? This will need to be in keeping with that area of the forest? I propose a tree study would be prudent to gauge to most suitable trees for that wet boggy area and to fit in with the environment.

11, currently there's lots of bog grass in these fields, the whole field would need to be stripped back and removed before thinking about creating a wild flower meadow, soil testing to be carried out to find out what would be the best combination of wild flowers to grow.

Totally impractical to house 3 structures and up to 6 cars on this area. The proposal of these wild meadows has got to be a leverage angle against the planning application and will never implemented correctly. It would take years for the works to be undertaken and a wild meadow to be sustained.

There's plenty of local holiday locations with in minuets walk of this new holiday site proposed.

Pete Rigg

Keldy Cabins

Cropton Cabins

Sutherland Lodge

4 x Caravan and camping sites within 1 mile

Cropton New Inn and holiday lets with in the village.

These are but a few locations with in minuets walk off each other.

Are we trying to saturate an area of natural beauty ? we should be trying to maintain areas of natural beauty in the North Yorkshire Nation Park

I would like planning to take on-board all concerns and views of my family, visiting naturalist and walkers alike that I've spoken to in this area, regarding this planning application. It should not be approved.

If things are to move forward there's got to be reassurance that the highlighted issues above have all been addressed, with a guarantee no impact as pre the government guidance of preparing planning proposal to avoid harm or disturbance to residents and or protected species.

Thank you

Comments made by Mr Clive Ainley of Sutherland Lodge Cottage, Sutherland Road, Cropton, YO188ET

Comment Type is Refuse



**From:**

**To:** [Planning](#)

**Subject:** Comments on NYM/2021/0472/FL - Case Officer Mrs Hilary Saunders - Received from Mrs Elissa Cummings at 5 Forestry Bungalows, Cropton, PICKERING, United Kingdom, YO18 8EU

**Date:** 22 July 2021 13:22:52

---

My husband and myself would like to raise several matters of concern regarding the proposed planning permission for no 3 shepherds huts.

Access into the forest is always an issue due to narrow road and the steep drop on the Peat Rigg side. Also the road is not maintained regularly as quoted in the planning permission. Yes it was regraded in March of this year, but that was only because of timber harvest and extraction. We have lived here for 30 years and during that time it has probably been regraded at the very most half a dozen times.

Where are these huts going to be stored when removed from the land ? and how are they going to be removed ?

But our main concern is the maintenance of this area. The applicants at present do not maintain the drainage ditches at their field edges in front and at the side of their house and in the heavy rain earlier this year as these ditches field side and track side where not cleared their field was flooded along with the track we have to drive along. A resident therefore approached the contractor who was regrading the road and asked him if they could clear the ditches, which he agreed to do at no cost. Also the field in the planning permission was used as their wedding venue, rubbish, bottles bunting etc was not cleared away immediately, therefore being cleared by a resident. This raises concern after holiday makers have stayed in the huts.

Lastly does this planning permission therefore set a precedent for other residents who let their land for sheep grazing be able to apply for more shepherds huts.

Comments made by Mrs Elissa Cummings of 5 Forestry Bungalows, Cropton, PICKERING, United Kingdom, YO18 8EU

Comment Type is Object with comments

**From:** [planning@northyorkmoors.org.uk](mailto:planning@northyorkmoors.org.uk)  
**To:** [Planning](#)  
**Subject:** Comments on NYM/2021/0472/FL - Case Officer Mrs H Saunders - Received from Dr Miriam Alcock at local resident, Pinewood, off Sutherland Road, 1 Forestry Bungalows, Cropton, Pickering, United Kingdom, YO18 8EU  
**Date:** 22 July 2021 09:12:37

---

We are very concerned with the proposed planning application which we believe to be misleading as well as lacking in sufficient detail to enable its true environmental impact to be ascertained. As we understand it, the 3 shepherds huts on this particular site will have a significant environmental impact on the surrounding area and are quite inappropriate for such a tranquil situation. Our comments and queries are as follows:

#### Agricultural Business

The applicants state that they have an agricultural business which they want to diversify from due to proposed changes in land management following Brexit. We believe this is a misleading statement as in reality they only own the land which they then rent out to farmers. The applicants don't access their field daily with a tractor to assist with grazing and other livestock related activities. Only the farmers look after the sheep and they will lose access to this grazing field if this application goes through. The farmer has an agricultural business, the applicants don't appear to have one.

#### Distance from applicants' home to site

We have walked from the applicants' home to the site and found: (a) it took 6 minutes to the gate to the site and approximately 9 minutes to the proposed position of one of the huts, not circa 2 mins as stated in the planning application and (b) the distance to the gate is over 400m and approximately 500 m to the proposed position of one of the huts not the 282m stated in the planning application.

#### Water

1. Water provided in plastic drums will be a health hazard and unsafe to drink in hot weather as bacteria etc. breed. Please ask the applicants (a) how they propose to ensure the water remains safe to drink (b) how often they will change the water.

2. This field can be very wet and surface water regularly flows out of the field into the road and then into Sutherland Beck before ultimately entering the river Seven which then goes through Sinnington. There are probably land drains in this field and these will also direct water into the same beck. The ford over the beck has flooded regularly and can be impassable which is why the residents have keys to come into the forest via Cropton cabins. The occupiers of the huts may not have keys and would be unable to access their huts if the ford flooded. There is no footbridge. Please ask the applicants where the water used by the occupants of the huts for drinking, washing and cooking will drain to. If this runs onto the field it will add to the water that flows into Sutherland Beck and it will be dirty water rather than clean rainwater.

3. People walking regularly over this field when it is very wet will leave a muddy mess as well as compacting the soil which makes it very difficult for grass or a wild flower meadow to grow.

#### Composting Toilet

1. There are many types of composting toilet but most of them require electricity to power a fan. Please ask the applicants (a) what make of composting toilet they propose to buy (b) will it need power and will the batteries they are supplying for lights be used to power the fan (c) how often the batteries will be recharged (d) whether an on-site generator will be used to recharge the batteries. These can be noisy. If the batteries run out of charge the toilets will smell, attract flies and be a health hazard.

2. Unless the composting toilets are well maintained there will be a very unpleasant smell coming from the site. Please ask the applicants (a) how they will maintain the toilets and (b) how often they will carry this out.

3. Please ask the applicants (a) where the toilet contents will be disposed of and (b) will it be into a sealed container? If not, the smell will be most unpleasant and attract flies. Human faeces take about a year to degrade.

#### View from Sutherland Road:

The established dense woodland to the eastern boundary of the site is irrelevant because Sutherland Road is to the west of the site. There is very little tree screening currently along Sutherland Road so, until the proposed hard wood planting has grown (which will take many years), the huts will be plainly visible from the road. For this reason we believe the application does not respect the sensitivity of the total landscape.

## Noise

This is currently a very quiet area which is why we moved here. We believe that there is a significant risk that with 3 huts in this field our peace and quiet will be threatened in the summer months when we spend a great deal of time outside. Holiday makers do not have the investment we have in keeping this place a quiet haven. We live far nearer to this site than the applicants and will therefore be much more affected by any noise generated by the occupants of the huts.

1. We believe that the applicants are being very naïve thinking that all the people renting their huts will obey the applicants' rules and there won't be any noise after 9pm. We all know there were many people who broke the recent lockdown rules. Please ask the applicants (a) how they propose to enforce this rule given that they are much further from the site than we are and we are the ones most likely to be impacted by any noise. Will we be expected to phone them every time we are woken up or can't go to sleep? Will they patrol the field every evening? (b) Who will enforce this rule when the applicants are away themselves.

2. Noise at any time in such a peaceful area in the National Park must be considered to be environmentally unacceptable. Please ask the applicants what they will be able to do about noise before 9pm. Shouting, laughter, radios outside, dogs barking, people drinking and enjoying themselves outside are all part and parcel of a holiday. With friends and family visiting there could be a lot of people at any one time in the field and in good weather they will be likely to spend their time outside rather than in the small huts.

## Sutherland Road

1. The part of the road owned by the Forestry Commission is usually in a pretty terrible state and is rarely maintained. Yes it was upgraded recently but this was only to enable trucks carrying felled logs to use the road safely. Based on previous experience (and we have lived here over 22 years) the road will gradually get worse and worse and it will be years before it is upgraded again. There are some potholes in it already.

2. Although there should be only three cars at a time belonging to the occupants of the huts there will be nothing to stop anyone visiting them in a vehicle. Please ask the applicants where these cars will be parked. Will it be on the verges on Sutherland Road which won't be hidden and will detract from the sensitive character of the place.

## Winter

Please ask the applicants exactly where they intend to take the three huts in the winter.

## Site Management

1. Please ask the applicants how they propose to plant the wildflower meadow. It takes a great deal of work to produce a decent wildflower meadow and the ground may be too stony to bring machinery in to remove the grass.

2. Please ask the applicants exactly where this meadow will be located and how big it will be.

3. Please ask the applicants how they propose to maintain the wildflower meadow, also a very time consuming process.

4. Please ask the applicants (a) whether the holiday makers and their friends will be able to walk, sit, play sports, use barbecues, light bonfires etc on this meadow and (b) how will the applicants stop this type of behaviour.

5. When the applicants had a party in the field after they were married they left it in a terrible mess for some considerable period of time until others had to clear it up. This gives us no confidence whatsoever that this site will be well looked after. This has been pasture land for many years and has always been well maintained because of the grazing sheep. It will be very sad to see this site, which is located in the National Park, deteriorate.

6. If no hard core is used, the weight of three cars on the rubber mats when the ground is wet will make the mats sink into the ground. Please ask the applicants if they intend to dig out the mats, roll the ground and then put the mats back. If this isn't done when required the residents of the huts will find somewhere else to park e.g. on the verges of Sutherland Road.

7. Please ask the applicants (a) where they propose to take the rubbish generated by the residents of the huts (b)

whether they will acquire a commercial licence to have the waste removed (c) whether they will add it to their household waste for the council to remove (d) whether they will take all the rubbish to the local dump.

#### Precedent

We believe granting planning permission for such a development will set a very unfortunate precedent which means the current or future occupants of our bungalows may also apply to put shepherds huts in their fields which will completely spoil this peaceful place. This area is not short of good holiday accommodation with proper access, mains water and electricity. There is no need to allow such risky development with its undoubted environmental impact.

Please send us a copy of the applicants' responses to our questions or Pinewood,  
1 Forestry Bungalows, off Sutherland Road, Cropton, Pickering YO18 8EU.

Comments made by Dr Miriam Alcock of local resident, Pinewood, off Sutherland Road, 1 Forestry  
Bungalows, Cropton, Pickering, United Kingdom, YO18 8EU

Comment Type is Adverse Comments