

From: Cllr. Guy Coulson

Sent: 23 March 2022 19:33

To: Mark Hill

Subject: Re: New application post - NYM/2021/0175/FL - 2 Railway Cottages, Goathland - Ward Member

Hello Mark many thanks for your reply

Part of my support for this project is the build design which I feel lends itself into what possibly the property would have looked if had been built larger originally

I feel roof angles etc fit in with existing ridge line.

And this actually make the property fit for purpose for the applicant to be able to remain here to live

Guy

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: NYM/2021/0175/FL
Date: 20 March 2022 19:22:40

Tao attention of Planning Officers
North Yorkshire Moors National Park Authority
Re NYM/2021/0175/FL
Planning application

Application for alterations, construction of single storey side extension and replacement detached garage at 2 Railway Cottages, Goathland

I am writing to yourselves to show my support for the proposed alterations and development.

After studying the plans and knowing the site in Goathland,

I would like to voice my support for the above ..

If you can keep me updated

Many thanks

Guy

Cllr Guy Coulson

Ward Councillor Esk Valley SBC

Chairman of Places and Futures overview and scrutiny

Sent from my iPad

From:
To:
Subject: Comments on NYM/2021/0175/FL 2 Railway cottages, Goathland
Date: 25 May 2021 22:10:21

The property is one half a pair of railway cottages associated with the Whitby to Pickering Railway (WPR). The railway cottages are situated along the alignment of the first and second phase of the WPR railway which took in an incline between Beck Hole and Goathland Bank Top. This railway was established in the 1830s as a horse drawn railway designed by George Stephenson. The railway line was later bought by George Hudson in 1846 as part of the York North Midland Railway. At this time the line was converted to lightweight locomotive which required that the line be substantially altered to accommodate locomotives. As locomotive technology progressed there was less need for an incline. The incline between Beck Hole and Goathland was perilous and following an accident it was closed and the deviation line was constructed in 1865. The 1865 deviation line connected with the early line between Grosmont and Esk Valley to the north and 2km south of Goathland to the south. As such the former line that passed through Goathland became redundant.

The property exhibits architectural qualities that are typical of railway architecture. However, more specifically it has certain features such as the relieving arches which are typical of known railway architect GT Andrews. Very similar architectural features are exhibited on nearby Grosmont Railway Station which is known to be designed by GT Andrews as part of the upgrading of the line by George Hudson in the 1840s. Given the design elements and the geographical location it is reasonable to conclude that the building was part of the 1845 developments of the line and has association with George Hudson and GT Andrews.

None of the above appears to have been assessed or is even discussed in the heritage statement, nor are the historic environment local polices referenced. The minimum requirement for heritage statements in the NPPF is that the Historic Environment record be consulted, this also does not appear to have been complied with. A heritage statement should not be a tick box exercise but a way of understanding our heritage assets and their significance in order to facilitate sympathetic development.

The building derives historical significance from its association with railway heritage, the association of railway heritage and the importance it plays within the Goathland Conservation Area and the wider heritage railway network that comprises the NYMR. It has evidential value as dating to a small period in time.

It also derives significance from its architectural and artistic interest from its form and the symmetry between this building and that of the adjoining cottage, the pallet of materials and the modest proportions of the time. Although there have been some unsympathetic additions that appear to date from the latter half of the 20th century these are quite minor and do not interrupt appreciation of the buildings as a pair. The buildings as a pair are heritage asset in themselves (although undesignated) but they also make a positive contribution to and occupy a prominent position within the Goathland CA which is a designated heritage asset. They also make a positive contribution to the setting of other nearby heritage assets associated with the historical railway.

The proposal seeks to install a single storey wrap around extension to the rear and side, alongside the rebuilding of the garage. Regarding the extension – the proposals, although seeking to use a traditional pallet of materials are quite poor in design and not what would be typical of a conservation area. The development at the side is particularly harmful as it upsets the balance with the neighbouring property. However, design elements aside given the architectural design of the existing building, its modest proportions, symmetry and features; any extension would harm the special qualities of the building and its significance. Any outbuilding associated historically with the buildings were tucked behind the main buildings in order that they not be visible from the railway line and ruin the aesthetic of the cottages. This harm that would result from this development would be classed as less than substantial. I object to the proposal on design terms, and also I object to the principle of extension on grounds that any extension would upset the balance of the pair of cottages and their design intent; this design intent (particularly that visible from the railway) was clearly considered more important than providing space for the inhabitants. Although the visibility of the site from the former railway line is significant; it should be remembered that that conservation area designation applies in equal force to all elevations, regardless of visibility.

I raise no objection to the rebuilding of the garage as the existing makes no positive contribution to the CA, and the replacement with a similar building will have an equal impact on the conservation area, therefore there will be no harm.

In the exercise of its planning functions with regards to development which affects a Conservation Areas or its setting, Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that the Authority shall pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. The proposals as a whole are contra to

the NPPF and SPI of the local plan, both of which state that great weight should be given to the conservation of the asset irrespective of the level of harm. They also state that where a development would lead to less than substantial harm of a designated heritage asset then these must weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. SPI goes further to state that where there are no public benefits the Authority will refuse consent. The benefits of the proposal are purely private and therefore offer no justification to the resulting harm to the heritage asset. Unfortunately, I therefore recommend the application for refusal.

From: planning@northyorkmoors.org.uk
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Comments on NYM/2021/0175/FL - Case Officer Mrs Ailsa Teasdale - Received from Building Conservation at The Old Vicarage, Bondgate, Helmsley, York, YO62 5BP,
Date: 25 May 2021 22:05:27

Please see comments to case officer

Comments made by Building Conservation of The Old Vicarage
Bondgate
Helmsley
York
YO62 5BP

Comment Type is Objection
Letter ID: 565446

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Re: NYM/2021/0175/FL
Date: 05 May 2021 20:01:03

Dear Planning

Further to the application for 2 Railway Cottages, I would like to confirm the Parish Council support this application with no objections.

Kind regards

Connie

Mrs Connie Wiggins
Clerk, Goathland Parish Council
Moorgarth
Mill Green Way
Goathland
Whitby
YO22 5LZ

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: NYM/2021/0175/FL 2 Railway Cottages, Goathland
Date: 05 May 2021 08:26:25

NYM/2021/0175/FL 2 Railway Cottages, Goathland

The proposals appear to be in close proximity to a group of mature trees on adjacent property. The applicant has said there are no trees within falling distance of the development but the aerial photography would indicate otherwise. The new garage is located nearer to these trees than the existing structure.

The trees form a prominent group within the conservation area.

Tree survey and arboricultural impact assessment is required. If there is an overlap of the development and the trees root protection areas an arboricultural method statement and tree protection plan is likely to be required also.

Mark Antcliff
Woodland Officer
North York Moors National Park Authority

www.northyorkmoors.org.uk

Date: 04 May 2021
Our ref: 350964
Your ref: NYM/2021/0175/FL



Mrs Ailsa Teasdale
North York Moors National Park Authority
planning@northyorkmoors.org.uk

Hornbeam House
Crewe Business Park
Electra Way
Crewe
Cheshire
CW1 6GJ

BY EMAIL ONLY

Dear Mrs Teasdale

**Planning consultation: Application for alterations, construction of single storey side extension and replacement detached garage
Location: 2 Railway Cottages, Goathland**

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 22 April 2021 which was received by Natural England on 22 April 2021

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

SUMMARY OF NATURAL ENGLAND'S ADVICE

NO OBJECTION

Based on the plans submitted, Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on statutorily protected nature conservation sites.

Natural England's generic advice on other natural environment issues is set out at Annex A.

Sites of Special Scientific Interest

Based on the plans submitted, Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have likely significant effects on statutorily protected sites and has no objection to the proposed development.

Sites of Special Scientific Interest Impact Risk Zones

The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 requires local planning authorities to consult Natural England on "Development in or likely to affect a Site of Special Scientific Interest" (Schedule 4, w). Our SSSI Impact Risk Zones are a GIS dataset designed to be used during the planning application validation process to help local planning authorities decide when to consult Natural England on developments likely to affect a SSSI. The dataset and user guidance can be accessed from the data.gov.uk website

Further general advice on the consideration of protected species and other natural environment issues is provided at Annex A.

We would be happy to comment further should the need arise but if in the meantime you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.

For any queries regarding this letter, for new consultations, or to provide further information on this consultation please send your correspondences to

Yours sincerely

Dominic Rogers
Consultations Team

Annex - Generic advice on natural environment impacts and opportunities

Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs)

Local authorities have responsibilities for the conservation of SSSIs under s28G of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 175c) states that development likely to have an adverse effect on SSSIs should not normally be permitted. Natural England's SSSI Impact Risk Zones are a GIS dataset designed to be used during the planning application validation process to help local planning authorities decide when to consult Natural England on developments likely to affect a SSSI. The dataset and user guidance can be accessed from the Natural England Open Data Geoportal.

Biodiversity duty

Your authority has a duty to have regard to conserving biodiversity as part of your decision making. Conserving biodiversity can also include restoration or enhancement to a population or habitat. Further information is available here.

Protected Species

Natural England has produced standing advice¹ to help planning authorities understand the impact of particular developments on protected species. We advise you to refer to this advice. Natural England will only provide bespoke advice on protected species where they form part of a SSSI or in exceptional circumstances.

Local sites and priority habitats and species

You should consider the impacts of the proposed development on any local wildlife or geodiversity sites, in line with paragraphs 171 and 174 of the NPPF and any relevant development plan policy. There may also be opportunities to enhance local sites and improve their connectivity. Natural England does not hold locally specific information on local sites and recommends further information is obtained from appropriate bodies such as the local records centre, wildlife trust, geoconservation groups or recording societies.

Priority habitats and Species are of particular importance for nature conservation and included in the England Biodiversity List published under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. Most priority habitats will be mapped either as Sites of Special Scientific Interest, on the Magic website or as Local Wildlife Sites. The list of priority habitats and species can be found here². Natural England does not routinely hold species data, such data should be collected when impacts on priority habitats or species are considered likely. Consideration should also be given to the potential environmental value of brownfield sites, often found in urban areas and former industrial land, further information including links to the open mosaic habitats inventory can be found here.

Ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees

You should consider any impacts on ancient woodland and ancient and veteran trees in line with paragraph 175 of the NPPF. Natural England maintains the Ancient Woodland Inventory which can help identify ancient woodland. Natural England and the Forestry Commission have produced standing advice for planning authorities in relation to ancient woodland and ancient and veteran trees. It should be taken into account by planning authorities when determining relevant planning applications. Natural England will only provide bespoke advice on ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees where they form part of a SSSI or in exceptional circumstances.

¹ <https://www.gov.uk/protected-species-and-sites-how-to-review-planning-proposals>

² <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140711133551/http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/biodiversity/protectandmanage/habsandspeciesimportance.aspx>

Protected landscapes

For developments within or within the setting of a National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), we advise you to apply national and local policies, together with local landscape expertise and information to determine the proposal. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (paragraph 172) provides the highest status of protection for the landscape and scenic beauty of National Parks and AONBs. It also sets out a 'major developments test' to determine whether major developments should be exceptionally be permitted within the designated landscape. We advise you to consult the relevant AONB Partnership or Conservation Board or relevant National Park landscape or other advisor who will have local knowledge and information to assist in the determination of the proposal. The statutory management plan and any local landscape character assessments may also provide valuable information.

Public bodies have a duty to have regard to the statutory purposes of designation in carrying out their functions (under (section 11 A(2) of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 (as amended) for National Parks and S85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act, 2000 for AONBs). The Planning Practice Guidance confirms that this duty also applies to proposals outside the designated area but impacting on its natural beauty.

Heritage Coasts are protected under paragraph 173 of the NPPF. Development should be consistent the special character of Heritage Coasts and the importance of its conservation.

Landscape

Paragraph 170 of the NPPF highlights the need to protect and enhance valued landscapes through the planning system. This application may present opportunities to protect and enhance locally valued landscapes, including any local landscape designations. You may want to consider whether any local landscape features or characteristics (such as ponds, woodland or dry stone walls) could be incorporated into the development in order to respect and enhance local landscape character and distinctiveness, in line with any local landscape character assessments. Where the impacts of development are likely to be significant, a Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment should be provided with the proposal to inform decision making. We refer you to the [Landscape Institute Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment](#) for further guidance.

Best and most versatile agricultural land and soils

Local planning authorities are responsible for ensuring that they have sufficient detailed agricultural land classification (ALC) information to apply NPPF policies (Paragraphs 170 and 171). This is the case regardless of whether the proposed development is sufficiently large to consult Natural England. Further information is contained in [GOV.UK guidance](#). Agricultural Land Classification information is available on the [Magic](#) website on the [Data.Gov.uk](#) website. If you consider the proposal has significant implications for further loss of 'best and most versatile' agricultural land, we would be pleased to discuss the matter further.

Guidance on soil protection is available in the Defra [*Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites*](#), and we recommend its use in the design and construction of development, including any planning conditions. Should the development proceed, we advise that the developer uses an appropriately experienced soil specialist to advise on, and supervise soil handling, including identifying when soils are dry enough to be handled and how to make the best use of soils on site.

Access and Recreation

Natural England encourages any proposal to incorporate measures to help improve people's access to the natural environment. Measures such as reinstating existing footpaths together with the creation of new footpaths and bridleways should be considered. Links to other green networks and, where appropriate, urban fringe areas should also be explored to help promote the creation of wider green infrastructure. Relevant aspects of local authority green infrastructure strategies should be delivered where appropriate.

Rights of Way, Access land, Coastal access and National Trails

Paragraphs 98 and 170 of the NPPF highlights the important of public rights of way and access. Development should consider potential impacts on access land, common land, rights of way, coastal access routes and coastal margin in the vicinity of the development and the scope to mitigate any adverse impacts. Consideration should also be given to the potential impacts on any nearby National Trails, including the England Coast Path. The National Trails website www.nationaltrail.co.uk provides information including contact details for the National Trail Officer.

Environmental enhancement

Development provides opportunities to secure net gains for biodiversity and wider environmental gains, as outlined in the NPPF (paragraphs 8, 72, 102, 118, 170, 171, 174 and 175). We advise you to follow the mitigation hierarchy as set out in paragraph 175 of the NPPF and firstly consider what existing environmental features on and around the site can be retained or enhanced or what new features could be incorporated into the development proposal. Where onsite measures are not possible, you should consider off site measures. Opportunities for enhancement might include:

- Providing a new footpath through the new development to link into existing rights of way.
- Restoring a neglected hedgerow.
- Creating a new pond as an attractive feature on the site.
- Planting trees characteristic to the local area to make a positive contribution to the local landscape.
- Using native plants in landscaping schemes for better nectar and seed sources for bees and birds.
- Incorporating swift boxes or bat boxes into the design of new buildings.
- Designing lighting to encourage wildlife.
- Adding a green roof to new buildings.

You could also consider how the proposed development can contribute to the wider environment and help implement elements of any Landscape, Green Infrastructure or Biodiversity Strategy in place in your area. For example:

- Links to existing greenspace and/or opportunities to enhance and improve access.
 - Identifying opportunities for new greenspace and managing existing (and new) public spaces to be more wildlife friendly (e.g. by sowing wild flower strips)
 - Planting additional street trees.
 - Identifying any improvements to the existing public right of way network or using the opportunity of new development to extend the network to create missing links.
- Restoring neglected environmental features (e.g. coppicing a prominent hedge that is in poor condition or clearing away an eyesore).

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Bird, bat and Swift informatives 19.04.2021-25.04.2021
Date: 30 April 2021 14:13:16

Hi Planning,

If the following planning applications are approved please can a **bat informative** be included within the decision notice

NYM/2021/ 0207/LB - May Cottage, 8 Castlegate, East Ayton
0287/AD - Lockton Tea Rooms and Gallery, Hudgin Lane, Lockton
0283/FL - Beulah House, Cold KirbyBeulah House, Cold Kirby
0259/FL- 2 Rose Cottage, Carlton in Cleveland
0175/FL - 2 Railway Cottages, Goathland

If the following planning applications are approved please can a **bird informative** be included within the decision notice

NYM/2021/ 0207/LB - May Cottage, 8 Castlegate, East Ayton
0283/FL - Beulah House, Cold KirbyBeulah House, Cold Kirby
0259/FL- 2 Rose Cottage, Carlton in Cleveland

If the following planning applications are approved please can a **Swift informative** be included within the decision notice

NYM/2021/ 0207/LB - May Cottage, 8 Castlegate, East Ayton
0283/FL - Beulah House, Cold KirbyBeulah House, Cold Kirby
0259/FL- 2 Rose Cottage, Carlton in Cleveland

Thanks,
Victoria

[Victoria Franklin](#)
[Graduate Conservation Trainee](#)

[North York Moors National Park Authority](#)
[The Old Vicarage](#)
[Bondgate](#)
[Helmsley](#)
[York](#)
[YO62 5BP](#)

[Tel: 01439772700](tel:01439772700)
www.northyorkmoors.org.uk