

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Comments on NYM/2022/0589 - Case Officer Mrs Hilary Saunders - Received from Mrs Amy Staples at East End Cottage, Egton, Whitby, North Yorkshire, YO21 1UF
Date: 07 September 2022 08:52:16

I am in full agreement with my neighbours at Hamelin Cottage and East Well cottage, with the same concerns over the application in general and water supply in particular. I would also be concerned by any discharges from the package treatment plant into pristine local watercourses.

The site is not "within the main built up area" (Strategic Policy M CO7 (2)) of Egton, as "considered" in the application. All these properties have full view of the rear of the proposed site. The argument that this development would be unviable as a result of a local occupancy constraint is risible.

I have seen a catastrophic decline in bat numbers around East End in recent years. Removing known roosts will certainly continue that trend. The long-term viability of bat boxes cannot be ensured.

Comments made by Mrs Amy Staples of East End Cottage, Egton, Whitby, North Yorkshire, YO21 1UF

Preferred Method of Contact is Post

Comment Type is Object with comments

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Comments on NYM/2022/0589 - Case Officer Mrs Hilary Saunders - Received from Miss Carol Jackson at Hamelin, Egton, Whitby, YO21 1UF
Date: 05 September 2022 14:58:31

I live next door but one to the site. I am concerned about the water supply to the proposed development. Pressure fluctuates as it is and an extra three households will exacerbate the problem. Has the applicant checked with Yorkshire Water that the correct pressure can be maintained ? I would also like reassurance that we will not be cut off if the project proceeds, as happened in 1983 I think it was when the applicant 'did not realise' we were connected and we had to rely on buckets of water for 5 nights (Thursday to Tuesday night) over the Easter weekend because their office wasn't open. ie the applicant knows that it is a private water supply and that the proposal may well have an adverse impact on neighbours.(page 36)

There are inaccuracies in the application.

The site has an Egton address but is not part of the village. It is a satellite outside the main core of the village, being separated by fields and a five minute walk. The range of services does indeed include two public houses but the Horseshoe's name changed to The Witching Post in 2017 and there hasn't been a general store since 2007. They have not spotted that Egton has a church. The applicant appears not to have visited the area and is using information FIFTEEN YEARS OUT OF DATE which to me casts doubt on the veracity of other 'facts' put forward in the application.

I think the proposal should be for those with a local connection and having bedrooms on the ground floor, would suit elderly residents so they do not have to leave the village. Make them wheel-chair friendly. This would help the Authority's objective to 'foster the economic and social well-being of the local community'. To help promote green infrastructure, could not part of the proposed generous grassed area for unit 1 be set aside for well-screened ground based solar panels? There is no provision for gas or oil tanks in the plan so presumably the units are entirely electric. I think they should have provision for multi-fuel stoves.

The buildings have glass tiles in the roof to augment light from the few small windows, but it appears from the plans that these are to be removed but not replaced with velux style rooflights. Why? Will the interior not be dark?

Unit 1 is to have a garage which seems to me to be an exaggeration - I cannot see how you access it with a car if the boundary between units 1 and 2 is as shown on the landscaping plan because of the wall and raised part to the east of unit 1, which the applicant has omitted from that and the plan of the proposed north elevation to give the impression there is a straight run in to the garage and parking available on the east of unit 1 - except you could not open the car doors to get out safely if you are perched on top of the raised part. ie there isn't really parking for 6 cars as plans stand at the moment.

Is the bedroom total in the market housing section not 3 but 5?

There doesn't seem to be any requirement to check for bombs. The property to the south of the site suffered bomb damage in WW2 and it would be prudent to be aware of the possibility when installing the septic tank unless it's going in the former slurry pit.

Comments made by Miss Carol Jackson of Hamelin, Egton, Whitby, YO21 1UF

Preferred Method of Contact is Post

Comment Type is Object with comments

Eastwell cottage

Egton

YO21 1UF

29th August 2022

Planning Application 2022/0589 – Eastend Farm, Egton, YO21 1UF.

We wish to make the following comments on the above application. The comments below deal firstly with how the planning application does not comply with the strategic policies of the local plan and secondly sets out our view on how the planning application does not comply with the sub policies.

Strategic Policy A – Achieving National Park Purposes and Sustainable Development

To support the function and vitality of communities by providing appropriate and accessible development to help meet local need for housing or services. There does not appear to be any additional requirement within the area of Egton for additional housing.

Egton has already contributed more new dwellings over the last 12 months than its required pro rata contribution to the Local Plan (2021- 2035) over the 19-year period. Further comments to support this will be discussed under Strategic Policy M- Housing and sub policies CO10 and CO12.

Strategic Policy B – The Spatial Strategy.

East End Farm is clearly sited outside the large village of Egton to the west, accessed by turning off the main Grosmont Road. It is not within the main built-up area of the village and is in fact in open countryside.

Therefore, the development cannot be considered as contributing to the service provision of the larger village of Egton by providing additional housing.

The proposed development should be categorised as being in open countryside. If so, the application does not meet the specific criteria as set out on page 39 of the Local Plan;

Development will only be permitted in open countryside if the development reuses buildings of architectural or historic interest (CO12).

Though East End Farm house was built in 1864, this is not part of the development. This house is being retained as a future tenancy and is not part of the planning application.

The outbuildings and barns do not have any architectural or historic interest and were clearly built later in the 1900's.

Bullet point 2 - Where there is an essential need for this development to meet forestry, farming and other rural enterprises. There is no evidence of this within this application.

Bullet point 3 – Where there are no other suitable alternatives for local housing – Mulgrave estates has recently submitted several applications which have been approved to provide housing within the local community of Egton.

- Red Farm Barn 2021/0835 & 2021/0832 Cross Farm building 2020/0605, large detached next to Mount pleasant 2021/0121, 12 Esk View - 2 houses 2020/0324.

As there is no need for additional housing in Egton and the application does not meet the criteria for building in open countryside, we feel the application should be refused on these grounds alone.

Strategic Policy C – Quality & Design of development

The Local Plan states any development should complement existing buildings enhancing views into and out of the site and create spaces around the building contributing to the character of its locality.

The design of Plot 1 provides a very large amenity space to the frontage of the property. The design has not suggested the erection of dry-stone walling which would be in symmetry with Eastwell Cottage, its immediate neighbour and its own road side boundary of dry-stone walling, which is currently in a state of disrepair. In addition, this large space could create a substantial verge again in keeping with the neighbours' properties (Eastwell & Hamelin Cottages) both have verges with verge masters erected to protect road users.

The proposal of wooden fencing as a boundary would be in conflict with the existing landscape. This is also supported by para 3.26 Local Plan, stating such fencing would look out of place in many National Park locations. We believe this type of boundary would not enhance the landscape. It will be clearly visible from the roadway and not in symmetry with the existing properties.

Our view is further supported by paragraph 3.25 Local Plan where traditional plot sizes, boundary lines and green spaces and verges should reflect local landscape. The design of the amenity space for Plot 1, is not in keeping with the neighbouring properties. This is further emphasised in the design guide page 6 point 1. We believe the character of the amenity space would in time be changed into a manicured garden. This will restrict the views across the landscape across to Esk valley and the moors when trees or shrubs mature.

The quality and design of the development as well as scale should not have any adverse impact on the amenities of the adjoining occupiers - bullet point 4.

The existing water provision is from a private water supply designed and created to supply 4 properties;

- Hamelin Cottage.
- East End Cottage
- Eastwell Cottage
- East End Farm.

The supply goes to all houses from a point outside Eastwell Cottage. This meets the water supply which goes across the roadway towards windy ridge and links to the mains in High Street, Egton.

All current occupiers of these properties and the previous tenant at East End Farm all experience low water pressure when demand is placed on the existing water system. This is currently manageable by positive and cohesive relationships between neighbours. Particularly key when properties are renovated, repaired or maintained.

The development seeks to place an additional substantial burden on the supply by adding 3 bathrooms, 1 wc and potentially the addition of other appliances requiring water of washing machines and dishwashers in the new premises.

The development on these grounds alone should be refused.

- *When we moved into Eastwell Cottage the previous tenants at East End Farm explained that during the previous renovations of our cottage there was considerable disruption to their quality of life. No water for showers or utilities within their household. As the new owners we were conscious to ensure this impact didn't happen again to our neighbours once further work happened at Eastwell Cottage.*

We believe an appropriate cause of action would be for the development, if approved to have its own water supply. This is possible by linking to the mains supply located on the main Grosmont Road in front of Hamelin Cottage.

Bullet point 8 requires the provision of adequate storage for the development. This is also in question. Plot 3 is designed as a studio which seems to have no outside storage facility at all or any space within its design. This is further mentioned in the design guide Development Policy 3, page 6 bullet point 4 as a requirement of new developments.

Strategic Policy E – Natural Environment

Eastend Farm is a farmstead and had a tenant till February 2022. The land and some of the buildings were being used to accommodate a variety of livery and livestock. The planning application states the buildings are not fit for agricultural use but we refute this suggestion based on recent use by their tenant.

This settlement can be clearly seen from across the Esk Valley from the moors and travelling down towards Grosmont. A unique landscape of the National Park.

We feel the natural environment and ambience of the area should be retained as a farmstead which would be lost if buildings were demolished and renovated. The applicant is clearly retaining the farmhouse for a future tenant which would will leave the occupier limited outside storage facilities with the loss of the renovated buildings.

To preserve and safeguard the tranquility of the landscape we feel the application should be refused.

Mulgrave Estates have by submitting this application ignored the opportunity to market the property as a farmstead and provide the existing land, property and landscape to remain as a working farm, this would retain the unique landscape within the moors.

In Policy BL5 para 6.18 it clearly outlines agriculture is characterised by small agricultural farmsteads settled in the landscape and these buildings form part of the National Parks special qualities. They are usually clustered around farmhouses and courtyards and often lend character to the local landscape.

We believe the design of this development and similar ones such as Red House Farm are losses of farmsteads and will have an intrusive and negative impact on the landscape and local connectivity to Egton.

Strategy Policy G – Landscape

This policy states that high quality diverse and distinctive landscapes of the North York's Moors will be conserved and enhanced. We feel the development would create a visually negative impact on the view from the roadway. It would change the feel of the neighbourhood with Plot 1 having a significant amenity space overseen by the road. This is a national cycle route and local residents of Egton and visitors regularly walk dogs and their families around this roadway.

Referring to the principles of the design guide – the relationship between the proposed development and existing features (page 26) would not avoid a large domestic ornamental planting or manicured garden / lawns that would compromise the integrity of the natural and open landscape along this roadway.

Plot 1 would not be in rhythm of the existing properties and their design, its visual impact and character of location, would not fit with the street scene. On this basis this design should be denied.

Privacy of neighbouring properties is outlined in section 3 page 28 of the design guide it should be attractive and provide a successful environment.

The amenity space of Plot 1 will be overlooking Eastwell Cottage - kitchen, sunroom (lounge), patio and garden.

Though the development states it will plant species in keeping with the area ie. Hawthorn, hazel holly etc. These species are not evergreen and during winter months will not provide any privacy between Plot 1 and Eastwell Cottage on the southside.

A condition of approval could be a substantial evergreen hedgerow be planted on Plot 1 land to mitigate this and provide privacy to both parties. The condition being planted on completion of the development and no later than the first growing season. Density of plant at least 6 per metre.

Any existing hedgerow removed or destroyed shall be replaced with similar size and species to ensure clear boundaries between properties and maximise privacy.

The application should have taken into consideration screening needs and reflect its function, purpose and location. This has been ignored by submission with inadequate thought and planning.

Referring to page 31 section 3 of design guide windows and doors are crucial to the success of any building and consider the impact on people.

Windows – Plot 1 Eastend Farm

The rear access and window from Plot 1 south elevation will be overlooking Eastwell Cottage - patio outside buildings and garden. This will be even more intrusive in winter months if the screening of the boundary is not appropriate when views will also be gained into the sunroom(lounge), patio, kitchen and garden.

Currently there is only a drystone wall, which we have erected on our land and no further screening in place. The height of the window allows a clear view into the privacy of our garden and access points to our buildings.

Windows - Plot 2 and Plot 3 Eastend Farm

These windows look directly into our field and the wildlife garden with pond we have created since purchasing the Eastwell Cottage property. A tranquil area we have designed to allow a natural wildlife habitat for animals and for us to use as an extension of our garden.

When we purchased Eastwell Cottage, it was with the view of having agricultural buildings next to us without the prospect of being overlooked and retain considerable privacy.

We would seek to retain the integrity of our property and value by seeking a condition of all windows overlooking our property to have opaque windows.

For all the above reasons we feel the application is poorly planned and has had no consideration for the impact on neighbours or the landscape. We feel for these reason alone the application should be refused.

Policy ENV1 – Trees, woodlands, traditional orchards and hedgerows.

This states there is a presumption of retaining and enhancing existing trees hedgerows etc.

We would wish to retain all existing hedgerow between the properties.

In particular, the boundary of Eastwell Cottage to Plot 1 on the Southside. If a garden is created here, it will directly look into the kitchen, sunroom, patio and garden of our premises. It is currently screened by hawthorn hedgerow but during winter months there will be no privacy provided.

Though the development states it will plant species in keeping with the area ie. Hawthorn, hazel holly etc. We would seek a condition on the application of evergreen species to be planted for the purpose of screening between the properties.

Strategic Policy H – Habitats, Wildlife.

This policy emphasis the conservation, restoration and enhancement of habitats and wildlife. Since moving into Eastwell Cottage, we have been actively creating an ideal wildlife habitat within our field and encouraging protected species.

In 2021/22 we erected a number of owl boxes to encourage barn owls and tawnies to breed. We have been successful in having a breeding tawny pair in 2022. We will continue to use our land to promote a habitat for the owls and encourage barn owls, our daily visitor to our buildings and other areas of our property.

We ask that suitable mitigation measures are put in place to avoid or reduce the harm or disturbance to these sites.

Policy ENV4 – Dark Night Skies

The darkness of the night skies above the National Park should be maintained. Any development in open countryside which involves external lighting will only be permitted if essential for safety and security of property. This is further emphasised in external lighting section 3 Design guide page 25.

If this development is approved, we seek a condition that any external lighting installed shall be to a minimum to avoid light pollution and impact on neighbouring properties.

Policy CO1 – Developer contributions and infrastructure.

Development will only be permitted where there is adequate infrastructure is in place.

The increase of demand on the existing water supply will create substantial difficulties for the existing residents. The application has not looked at the wider requirements of providing the necessary improvements to the water supply to provide an adequate infrastructure for the development.

In paragraph 7.7 contributions from developers may be sought to eliminate or mitigate the impact of any development. This has clearly been ignored which could be to the detriment of existing residents.

For this reason alone, the application should be refused.

Policy CO2 - Highways

This new development has not considered the creation of a verge on the local roadway to ensure safety of road users.

In keeping with its neighbours' verge masters should be erected and an appropriate grassed verge be created to ensure it meets the existing street scene.

The existing verge to the roadway is nonexistent. We would seek a condition of a verge be established with verge masters' posts erected, to protect pedestrians and other road users.

This would be in keeping with Hamelin Cottage and Eastwell Cottage verges along this roadway.

We would strongly object to any boundary on this West side being a wooden fence.

Drystone walls form part of the boundary of East End Farm running into its driveway. Eastwell Cottage also has drystone walling on its west side, roadside front garden and this joins the east side boundary behind its garage.

Strategic Policy M – Housing.

To help meet the needs of local communities a minimum of 551 new homes (29 per year) will be completed over the time period of this plan (2016 and 2035). Egton has already contributed above its pro rata.

There are other suitable alternatives for local housing – Mulgrave estates has recently submitted several applications which have been approved to provide housing within the local community of Egton.

- Red Farm Barn 2021/0835 & 2021/0832, Cross Farm building 2020/0605, large detached next to Mount pleasant 2021/0121, 12 Esk View - 2 houses 2020/0324.

Bullet point E – to protect open countryside, housing development should be to help meet the needs of agricultural, forestry and other essential land management workers. This is an exception for development of housing in the open countryside.

There is no mention in the application of any study has taken place to show there is an essential need for housing in this case, for the needs of these workers and thus the application clearly does not meet the criteria.

Policy CO10 – Housing in Open Countryside

In order to maintain the quality of the National Park landscape, housing in open countryside will only permitted in the following circumstances;

Where there is an essential need for a dwelling in the proposed location to support essential farming, forestry or other essential land management activities.

As mentioned earlier the application makes no mention of essential needs for housing in this location or for these workers. Thus, the criteria have not been met and the application should be refused.

In accordance with this sub policy bullet point 3, if the planners decide the outbuildings are of architectural or historic interest and are converted in accordance with CO12 then the occupancy of this development would be again restricted to agricultural, forestry and other essential land management workers.

Policy CO12 – Conversion of Existing Buildings in Open Countryside.

Mulgrave Estate intend to retain the main farmhouse, built in 1864, for tenancy, which may have met this criteria. They intend to repair and refurbish this property.

East End Farm outbuildings do not meet the criteria of buildings contributing to local history or culture or historical architectural style. They are similar in design to numerous barns across North York's Moors and have no distinguishing features that would make them architecturally or historic interest. In addition, only Plot 1 barn is seen from the roadway, the others are out of public view. Therefore, they do not meet the criteria under this sub policy and the application should be refused.

If the planners accept CO12 does apply we refer to bullet point 4. - The development will not have the necessary infrastructure, services and facilities it will require ie. Water supply. In para 7.67

allowing the conversion may result in an unacceptable impact on the amenity of existing adjacent occupiers and development should be resisted.

This was detailed earlier under Strategic Policy C.

For these reasons alone the application should be refused.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons we feel the planning application should be refused. The housing development doesn't not meet the strategic policies set out in the local plan nor does it meet the criteria set out in the sub policies.

The proposed development of these outbuildings is outside the main built-up area of the village and is clearly in the open countryside.

Egton has already contributed more new dwellings and proposed conversions over the last 12 months than its required pro rata contribution of the Local plan over the 19 year period.

Mulgrave Estate mentioned in the application it is not financially viable if a local connection condition is placed on the application. However, adhering to Policy CO10 and Policy CO12 there is clear criteria if the development went ahead housing should be for agricultural and forestry workers.

If this development were approved, CO12 Para 7.71 a planning condition or legal agreement should be imposed to ensure permanent residency takes place.

The dwellings shall be used for principal residency and for no other purpose. The main occupant shall reside for at least 80% of calendar year. Not a second home. For avoidance of doubt the property shall not be used as holiday letting accommodation.

The planning application lacks any balance and consideration of others in terms of scale, sensitivity of the impact on others. It has ignored the basic needs of the adjoining properties by its poor design and the effects on services and amenities to other adjoining properties.

We feel it is better to retain the agricultural premises to encourage the retention and opportunity to use the land and its buildings as an agricultural farmstead, retaining the historical and agricultural look of landscape. Mulgrave Estates may wish to consider selling the whole farmstead on the open market. This may be a better alternative than the development due to the comments we have made here.

We accept that some development is of course necessary within the National Park but this needs to be balanced with the needs of the existing residents, landscape and local communities.

We strongly recommend to the planning department the application should be refused.

Miss Alison Higgins & Miss Alison Leslie

Eastwell Cottage

Egton.

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Comments on NYM/2022/0589 - Case Officer Mrs Hilary Saunders - Received from Mrs Ruth Grayson at The Forge, High Street., Egton, yo21 1tz
Date: 20 August 2022 19:43:45

I have concerns regarding the proposed application. The private water supply to this site is not adequate to supply a further three dwellings. The owners of the dwellings fed by this supply already suffer from low water pressure and it is in my opinion that adding a further three dwellings to this supply, would cause further problems. A mains water supply is available and would need to be led into the proposed dwellings, to avoid further problems to the established dwellings. The private water supply, runs over privately owned land and permission would need to be granted to upgrade the present supply.

Comments made by Mrs Ruth Grayson of The Forge, High Street., Egton, yo21 1tz

Preferred Method of Contact is Post

Comment Type is Raise Concerns