

North York Moors National Park Authority

District/Borough: Scarborough Borough Council
(North)
Parish: Eskdaleside-Cum-Ugglebarnby

Application No. NYM/2015/0891/FL

Proposal: construction of 4 no. dwellings with associated amenity space, access, parking and landscaping works

**Location: Land west of Coach Road
Sleights**

Decision Date: 10 February 2016

Consultations

Parish - OBJECT for the following reasons:

- Incongruous with the rest of the village street scene; dwellings too close to the road; majority of houses are natural stone and any more brick in this area will change the whole aspect of the entrance to the village giving the impression of an isolated and separate estate instead of the integral individual houses we have in the rest of the village.
- The dwellings are much taller than the surrounding properties due to the additional accommodation in the roof space. Their overall height should be reduced to single storey with dormers.
- Additional loading onto an already overloaded sewage system
- Destabilisation of the road – The houses are constructed very close to the road and future disturbance is highly likely due to the high volume of heavy vehicles passing so close.
- Dangerous location due to the possibility of run-away heavy goods vehicles descending Blue Bank
- The site is overdeveloped; the houses should be smaller in height and set back from the roadside.
- Application has pantiled roofs throughout, should change some to slates.

Highways -

Yorkshire Water – No comments

Environmental Health Officer – No objections but would require construction works condition.

North Yorkshire Police – Designing Out Crime Officer – No comments required.

Site Notice Expiry Date – 25 January 2016

[Handwritten signature]
5/5/16

Application Number: NYM/2015/0891/FL

Others –

Dr Roger Turner, 13 Mentone Road, Poole, Dorset – Object. The proposed property may be 2/3 storey from Coach Road, from below it is effectively 4 storey taking into account the garages on the north side. This is an imposing overlooking aspect for both Windsor Cottage and other dwellings on Eskdaleside. Am also concerned that access onto Coach Road from the 9 dwellings will be unsafe and dangerous to both residents, traffic and pedestrians

The scale of these dwellings and elevation at which they are located on the hill side is overdevelopment on this sensitive site on the outskirts of a pretty rural village within the NYMNP.

Height of revised plans would still be overwhelming.

Su Hood, 5 Eton Gardens, Bournemouth – Very concerned at the scale of the development above Windsor Cottage. Due to their height and position, they will overlook Windsor Cottage. Surely a more sensitive approach would be to build 2 storey buildings which would fit in more readily with the local environment.

Mr and Mrs KA Brown, Dr P Brown and Miss L Brown, 173 Coach Road, Sleights – Strong objections on several grounds:

1. Too high - will overlook our bedrooms and overshadow our house, make the area look too built up and obstruct the views that we enjoy across the valley.
2. This area is a well-known traffic black spot. We would be concerned that there are implications for highway safety, and there will be increased traffic on an already busy road caused by initially builders and then residents. We would also be concerned that there would be insufficient parking for the residents.
3. Out of keeping – other houses directly around us are built from local sandstone with either a slate or a pantile roof, these are brick and as such are an eyesore and are a negative point upon the landscape.
4. Multiple, mature trees will need to be cut down to facilitate the building of these house which will have adverse consequences on the habitat of birds and animals.

John Mead, 3 Eskdaleside, Sleights – Object. No further development should be continued until the previous 5 dwellings have been sold. If there are eventually 9 properties where are they all going to park. It states in the proposed 4 dwellings that the houses to the east of Coach road are more elevated, looking at the plans and the area it looks almost the other way, with the houses being so high they will be looking down on those to the east of Coach road especially with Velux windows in the roofs.

Revised plans are a step in the right direction, but 2 houses rather than 4 would be better..f

Nick Turner, Fourways, East Ashling, Chichester, West Sussex - I am shocked and saddened to have seen the extent of the building work, both underway and planned for the immediate area. What seems to have been missed here, are the elevations of the proposed buildings. Not only are they high at 4 storeys, but also the land is on a steep gradient and so they will sit in a greatly elevated position above Windsor Cottage. The effect will be to have huge buildings towering above what was once a beautifully scaled cottage in a village setting.

Application Number: NYM/2015/029/FL

These building are simply too big, too overbearing and take no account of the future development of the land adjacent to Windsor Cottage.

Need to retain some of the aspects of village life that are important in rural communities, having a degree of continuity and harmony. The proposal fails to take account of its overbearing position and the effect on those people both present and future, who will sit in its shadow.

Richard Hunter, 29 Selstone Crescent, Sleights – Sleights is in real need for new housing at realistic prices and I hope these further houses meet with approval and make use of what for many years has been an unkempt waste garden land.

Mr Niels Grayson, 11 Eskdaleside, Sleights – The dwellings would greatly overlook Windsor Cottage and nearby houses lower down the Eskdaleside.

Mark Teasdale, 58 St Andrew's Road, Whitby – Support the scheme due to the need for housing to retain younger to middle aged residents and this proposal would positively impact on Coach Road.

Director of Planning's Recommendation

Refuse for the following reasons:

1.	In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated, through the submission of a valid financial viability assessment, that an affordable housing contribution cannot be included within part of the development proposal. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Policies B and J which require the provision of a proportion of affordable housing in new housing developments within the service villages, of which Sleights is one, unless a viability assessment demonstrates that the provision of affordable housing is not financially viable.
2.	In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the scale, height, massing and density of the proposed dwellings would result in an overbearing impact on both the street scene of Coach Road and the residential amenities enjoyed by neighbouring properties, to the detriment of the character of the immediate and wider area. The development would therefore be contrary to Development Policy 3 of the Local Development Plan which seeks to maintain and enhance the distinctive character of the National Park by ensuring that the scale, height, massing, and design are compatible with surrounding buildings; and that the standards of design details are high and complement that of the local vernacular.

M. G.
5th May 2016.

Application Number: NYM/2015/0891/FL

Background

The application site is located adjacent to Coach Road in Sleights at the northern eastern edge of the National Park. The site is bounded to the east by the A169, Coach Road and to the south by a development of 5 houses currently under construction and The Plough Inn. To the west and north are a number of residential properties. The site is steeply sloping with the frontage being at road level, abutting the pavement of Coach Road and sloping down towards Eskdaleside.

Planning permission was granted in 2014 for the development of five open market houses and associated access and parking, immediately to the south. This development is currently under construction, although the amendments that have been undertaken during building works do not yet have the benefit of Planning Permission. This approval was also subject to a Section 106 legal agreement which required the payment of a financial contribution for affordable housing in the locality. However, although this sum was meant to be paid upon the commencement of development, the sum has not yet been received.

This current application seeks permission for a second phase of development adjacent to that currently under construction. 4 dwellings are proposed in the form of two pairs of semi-detached dwellings with access being shared from phase 1. The dwellings would all be 3 bedroomed, with the third bedrooms being provided within the roof space. As originally submitted, garaging was proposed at basement level, but in an effort to reduce the height of the proposed dwellings, these were omitted and consequently, a total of 7 parking spaces would be provided to serve the 4 dwellings. None of the properties would have any external amenity space; the rear would be entirely hard surfaced to provide parking and access.


The footprint of each pair of dwellings would be 10.55m wide x 8m deep with height to the eaves on the front elevation of 5m and to the ridge of 8.8m and at the rear of 6.3m to eaves and 10m to ridge. The dwellings would be set down between 0.9m and 0.2m below pavement level and the ridge line would be stepped down between each dwelling in line with the slope of the land.

It was proposed that the dwellings be brick faced with either slate or pantile roofs. The applicant's agent was advised that stone would be required on the front and gable elevations at minimum and the agent has indicated that this would be likely to be acceptable.

Main Issues**Policy considerations**

Core Policy B of the Local Development Plan sets out the strategy to meet the needs of people in the National Park based upon improving the sustainability of local communities by improving and consolidating existing services and facilities and includes a settlement hierarchy of local service centres, service villages, local service villages, other villages and the open countryside. This Core Policy sets out that in the Service Villages, of which Sleights is one, new housing will include both open market and affordable housing.

Core Policy CPJ of the Local Development Plan seeks to ensure the provision of a mixture of housing types and tenure to maintain the vitality of local communities, consolidate support for services and facilities and support the delivery of more affordable housing. It states that this is to be achieved through locating all open market housing, including new build and



Application Number: NYM/2015/0891/FL

converted units to the Local Service Centre of Helmsley and the Service Villages, and requiring an element of affordable housing provision within open market housing schemes, unless a viability assessment demonstrates that this would make a scheme financially unviable.

Development Policy 3 seeks to maintain and enhance the distinctive character of the National Park by ensuring that the siting, layout and density of development preserves or enhances views into and out of the site; that the scale, height, massing, materials and design are compatible with surrounding buildings; and that the standards of design details are high and complements that of the local vernacular.

Affordable Housing Contributions

The applicant's agent has advised that the figures submitted for the viability assessment in relation to affordable housing contributions may not be accurate and should be not be relied upon.

No affordable housing contributions are proposed as part of this application and consequently, on the basis that there is no evidence to suggest otherwise, the scheme is considered to be contrary to both Core Policies B and J of the Local Development Plan which require a 40% affordable housing contribution, either in the form of the dwellings constructed, or in the form of a financial contribution towards affordable housing provision elsewhere in the locality.

Scale of Development and Amenity

It is considered that the height and density of the development proposed would be out of keeping with the locality and have an overbearing impact on the occupiers of neighboring properties, both the immediate and wider street scene and the wider locality, as well as providing unsatisfactory amenity space for the occupants of the proposed dwellings due to the lack of external amenity space. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Development Policy 3.

Parking

In 2015, North Yorkshire County Highways produced Interim Guidance on Transport issues, including Parking Standards. These standards set a minimum parking standard for 3 bed dwellings as two spaces per dwelling. This scheme falls short of that by one space but the Highway Authority have advised that the parking layout could be revised to incorporate one extra space so wouldn't recommend refusal on that basis.

Explanation of how the Authority has Worked Positively with the Applicant/Agent**Refusal (No Amendments Requested/Departure from Development Plan)**

The Authority's Officers have appraised the scheme against the Development Plan and other material considerations and concluded that the scheme represents a form of development so far removed from the vision of the sustainable development supported in the Development Plan that no changes could be negotiated to render the scheme acceptable and thus no changes were requested.

