

**From:**  
**To:**  
**Subject:** Comments on NYM/2024/0200 - Case Officer Miss Emily Jackson - Received from Mrs Ruby Tildsley at Hilltop cottage, Suffield, Scarborough, YO13 0BJ  
**Date:** 11 April 2024 21:59:34

---

We would hope that the plans which include a new track through the field to access the proposed barn, do not compromise the integrity of the iconic (and very old) sycamore tree which is situated in the gateway to the field.

Comments made by Mrs Ruby Tildsley of Hilltop cottage, Suffield, Scarborough, YO13 0BJ

Preferred Method of Contact is Email

Comment Type is Comment

**From:**

**To:**

**Subject:** Comments on NYM/2024/0200 - Case Officer Miss Emily Jackson - Received from Mrs Doreen Kay at Northfield Farm, Suffield, Scarborough, North Yorkshire, YO13 0BJ

**Date:** 11 April 2024 21:16:44

---

I would like to raise my objections and make comments regarding the proposed development which is next to my home, a Grade 2 listed building.

Firstly the proposed location of the agricultural shed would be better placed next to the applicants current agricultural shed where it is not so close to and visible from our home and also to members of the public passing through the village.

I would also suggest that the construction of the barn is more in keeping with the others on site to be constructed of blocks and Yorkshire boarding rather than stone which is not in keeping with the other agricultural sheds.

I have reservations regarding the access route being proposed for the agricultural shed and I have strong objections to the potential harm and removal of the sycamore tree that will be required to facilitate access to the shed by the applicants.

I also have concern regarding the detriment the development of the land will have to the curtilage of our Grade 2 listed property due to its close proximity and due to the fact that it would be such a significant new development.

Comments made by Mrs Doreen Kay of Northfield Farm, Suffield, Scarborough, North Yorkshire, YO13 0BJ

Preferred Method of Contact is Post

Comment Type is Object with comments

**From:**  
**To:** [Planning](#)  
**Subject:** Comments on NYM/2024/0200 - Case Officer Miss Emily Jackson - Received from Mrs Christine Maw at Northfield Farm, Suffield, Scarborough, North Yorkshire, YO13 0BJ  
**Date:** 11 April 2024 21:07:35

---

Dear North York Moors (NYM) Planning authority.

We would like to make comments and express our concerns pertaining to NYM/2024/0200 planning application as long-term owners and residents of Northfield Granary, curtilage to Northfield Farm which the planning application is adjacent to and imposing upon.

I want to firstly highlight the negative impact this construction will have upon our homes in terms of natural light, curtilage and visibility which is understandably causing us immense concern. We wholly disagree with the statement made by the applicant that the proposed plan "... has no material adverse effect upon existing amenities or surrounding properties" and that "the location of the proposed building has been chosen for its close proximity to the existing agricultural building and other structures at the site to provide natural, existing screening for the proposed new building". The building is roughly 5 meters from the boundary of our land. The height and size of the building will obscure natural light into the converted barn closest to the proposed structure and will completely obscure the view of the open countryside from both the closest converted barn and the bedroom of Northfield Granary having an incredibly detrimental impact upon our homes and business. I am at a loss to understand why the building would be sited to obscure our views and light rather than be placed 180 degrees around to the opposite side of the applicant's current agricultural structure where the impact to our homes and visibility from the roadside would be greatly reduced. I am struggling to identify how there is any natural, existing screening for the proposed new building. NYM planning department are already aware, following a site visit in December 2023, that we are intending on applying for planning permission to remove the dilapidated barns that we own, thus, this proposed building will be even more visible from the roadside and neighbouring properties whereas if it were to be located behind the applicants existing barn, as proposed above, this visibility would be reduced.

Moreover, in terms of light I would like to understand what outside lighting would be in place for this proposed construction as this will also impact upon the dark skies we currently enjoy at night. I am concerned with the nature of farming that there will be increased traffic, noise and light on the site in the evening. Furthermore, in terms of noise, I am concerned that the growth of the farm, which is currently one agricultural shed recently purchased in 2023 by the applicant and now apparently named as "Holly Farm", will be significant due to the increase in heavy, large machinery potentially using the site.

Referring to the comments made by your conservation officer stating that "the construction would have no adverse effect on Northfield Farm, a Grade 2 listed building" I would like to clarify if the conservation officer is aware that the applicant for the construction of this barn is not the owner of Northfield Farm and I am concerned that the construction of this building and naming of it as "Holly farm" is an attempt to create a new farmstead close to Northfield Farm which will significantly impact the curtilage of the listed property. The citing of the proposed building to create an almost court yard space in front of it, along with its construct of stone cladding, I believe is an attempt to circumvent planning law in the long term and the applicant will apply for a change of use to the building such as a home/holiday let type facility which will be at even more detriment to Northfield Farm as a listed building. I would like to suggest that if NYM planning department authorises this development that they give consideration to the materials being proposed to construct the building so as to match the existing agricultural sheds and omit the likelihood of a change of use in future. A construct consisting of concrete blocks and Yorkshire boarding will match the existing agricultural sheds on the site.

There are several significant errors and omissions in the details provided to NYM planning department. Firstly, the plans submitted with the application are not accurate as the blue outline perimeter is not correct. It does not account for the fact that I own some of the field next to the proposed building and thus the hectarage of the site in question will also be reduced. The physical fence boundary is yet to be changed but should be completed in due course when the applicant agrees a mutual date for this work to take place. Again, the proposed development also then overlooks this land and will significantly affect sunlight depending upon the time of day. I would suggest that NYM planning department request accurate plans from the applicant.

The access noted on the plans submitted by the applicant is inaccurate and at present access to the current agricultural shed is limited and for light use only. This is because access used to be via a driveway owned by

myself which was released via deed of release by the applicant in 2023. Thus, the rationale behind why the current agricultural shed is currently used to store smaller farm implements. The proposed access route is wholly inappropriate for use by large machinery on a more frequent basis, especially for trailers/wagons needed to transfer straw/hay/corn/fertiliser. Increased access via this route by large farm machinery will cause significant safety issues to pedestrians and other road users. The gate would need widening to allow for the turning circle required for large machinery. There is no hardcore base so it will not allow for heavy duty access, especially given the gradient of the field being proposed as an access route and thus there is a risk of increased mud on the road causing a hazard to road users who travel through the Hamlet, especially those travelling at speed. In addition to this the proposed driveway is within a short distance of a significant bend in the road and I understand the North Yorkshire Highways department will not allow for the creation of a new access road, in line with their policies, due to the hazard that this will pose to road users. I assume that NYM planning department are aware that this is not an established driveway to the proposed site and will be requesting consultation with the Highways Department regarding the development of this. Moreover, there is an established sycamore tree which would likely need removing in order to facilitate the construction of a new driveway, I would like to understand the Parish Council and NYM planning departments views regarding the potential removal of this tree, should the driveway construction be allowed, given that it is an iconic part of Suffield, home to an abundance of wildlife.

A further omission/error in the detail that the applicant has provided is the omission of factual detail regarding the agricultural buildings and land that they lease/own. Suffield Heights Farm has been omitted from the application and this is on a long-term lease by the applicants. I am at a loss as to why further agricultural storage needs to be created in such a beautiful place, on a greenfield site when there are plenty of other agricultural buildings owned/leased by the applicant at both Suffield Farm and Suffield Heights Farm as well as space to construct further buildings on their existing farmsteads. I also refer to the large agricultural barn at coordinates 54°18'04.4"N 0°29'18.8"W which experienced a fire in the year of approximately 2006 and has not been rebuilt to its original size which is double the size of the proposed barn and is significantly a more appropriate brownfield site for an agricultural building. Thus, I am confident that under Part 6. A , (a) of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning Order 2015 there is not reasonable legal necessity for the purposes of a new agricultural building as proposed.

The final error noted on the application is that the area the proposed barn is to be built on is named as a yard. I refer to historic documents we hold from when this land was originally purchased by ourselves in 1986 which details the area as being a sheep holding area, it is not a yard but unfortunately recently has been used to store animal waste and waste building materials thus giving it an allusion of being a yard. I note that the citing of the proposed shed also overlaps in to the adjacent field.

From our local knowledge from living at this site for 39 years we can confidently and strongly disagree with the applicants statement that "The building will have no adverse effect on the wildlife value or natural environment surrounding." The current building owned by the applicant creates a significant foul water surface run off on to our land and the applicants land which are both waterlogged, this is due to inadequate drainage, an issue which needs resolving in due course and which this construction will further compound. I also note that the surface run off drains in to a pond owned by myself. I am concerned that this planning application will increase the run off of foul draining water in to this pond and my garden. Given that there is animal waste on the applicants land and they intend to store fertiliser this is of even greater concern in turns of nutrient impact.

For the past 12 months the applicants land which they are proposing to build on has not been farmed. During this time there has been a positive impact upon the biodiversity of the local eco-system and we have noted a drastic reduction in vermin and a diverse increase with new wildlife such as newts, bats, owls and swallows, photographic evidence can be provided of this if required. In addition to this, this site is within 250 metres of three ponds one of which is named as Suffield mere and the site that the applicant is proposing to build upon is a greenfield site. Under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 I assume that NYM planning department will be requesting that a thorough ecological survey takes place prior to any potential development? Incidentally I had already discussed with Emily Jackson, Planning Officer and a Conservation Officer in December 2023 during a site visit to my home the positive impacts I had noted since farming at the site had ceased.

I look forward to your reply in relation to my above queries and I will also be raising my concerns regarding this application with my local Parish Council.

Kind Regards

Comments made by Mrs Christine Maw of Northfield Farm, Suffield, Scarborough, North Yorkshire, YO13 0BJ

Preferred Method of Contact is Email

Comment Type is Object with comments