Dawn Paton

From:

Bill Armstrong

Sent:

11 July 2010 18:29

To:

Development Control

Subject: Yoemans Hall

Dear Sir

As an owner of Flat 9 Woodlands I wish to register my objection to the proposed Planning Permission for neighbouring Yoemans Hall. I have already registered my objection but amtold this was not received. As time is running out for objections i wish to renotify you of my objection.

Your sincerely, W D Armstrong owner flat9

Scanned by MailDefender - managed email security from intY - www.maildefender.net



Dr and Mrs JA Tomenson, Flat 14, The Woodlands, Sleights, Whitby Yorkshire, YO21 1RY 9/7/2010

Your reference: NYM/2010/0381/CU/FL

Mark Hill,
Development Control Manager,
North York Moors National Park Authority,
The Old Vicarage,
Bondgate,
Helmsley,
York YO62 5BP.



Dear Mr Hill

Re: Application for change of use and extension of existing garage block to form relaxation spa (Use Classes D1 and D2) together with construction of a side extension, replacement windows and installation of 2 bay windows to ground floor of main house at Yeoman Hall Woodlands Sleights Grid reference 486105 507924.

Further to our previous letter, we have reviewed amended details/additional information available on your web site, including the Director of Planning's recommendation. We continue with our objection and wish to add further comments:

- 1) The Director of planning states that "The communal access and parking arrangements were an integral feature of the original permission and owners would have been aware of the additional access through to Yeoman Hall". Residents of Woodlands never envisaged that NYMNPA would sanction commercial usage on such a sensitive site." Responses by the NYMNPA to previous planning applications on this site have stressed the constraints LISTED BUILDING / AREA OF GREAT LANDSCAPE VALUE /AREA OF SPECIAL CONTROL FOR ADVERTISEMENTS. Unfortunately, these constraints no longer seem to apply. The increased traffic through the grounds of Woodlands House certainly represents a significant loss of amenity to Woodlands residents and, contrary to the director's statement, is in our opinion an "un-neighbourly" proposal."
- 2) The Director of Planning also states that "The Authority's Public Right of Way Officer has pointed out that a public bridleway runs along the western boundary of the application site as shown on the plans, however it does not run within the site so will not be affected by the proposal". This is clearly incorrect, as every customer of the Spa will drive along the bridleway, endangering the many walkers, cyclists and horse riders who use it, both local residents and visitors to the NYM.
- 3) It is also inaccurate to state "the operational works are little more than would be required to create a hobby room". It is clear that the costs of "the glazed hexagonal garden type enclosure", equipment costs (floatation tank, massage tables, sauna etc.) and structural works

are significant. The costs associated with this development are hardly those of "a small scale business venture" or "low level home based activity". Will the NYMNPA close the venture if it is successful in attracting customers from Scarborough, Pickering and Middlesbrough as the applicants hope, and there are many more than the promised 1 or 2 customers per day? In addition, much of the equipment in the Spa does not require specialist training to run and the applicants can clearly take on additional staff to maximize the use of the expensive equipment.

4) There has been inadequate public consultation. The notice posted on Woodlands Drive makes no reference to D1 or D2 or to commercial use. The many and frequent walkers, cyclists and horse riders over the Esk Way and bridleway will therefore be unaware of such proposed change of use, and may have objected had they known that this is not a relaxation spa for personal use.

Yours sincerely,

John and Barbara Tomenson.



Dawn Paton

From:

NYM Contact [web-server@northyorkmoors-npa.gov.uk]

Sent:

09 July 2010 16:48 Development Control

Subject:

North York Moors Feedback

NYMNPA

12 JUL 2010

BH

Planning Consultation Response Form

If you wish to make a comment on an application it must be in writing and will become a matter of public record available for inspection. The Authority can therefore not accept comments marked confidential as valid objections and any such documents will be returned to you.

* Please fill in as many of these fields as you know. Thank you.

Application Reference No:: NVM/2010/0381/CU/FL Your Email Address::

ephone No:

Your Address:: 13 Woodlands

Sleights North Yorkshire

YO21 1RY

Your Name:: R O'Donnell

Are you objecting to the proposal?: Yes

Your comments on The Proposal:: YEOMAN HALL EXTENSION AND COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

FURTHER OBJECTIONS

I refer to my previous objections to the above which I strongly believe are still relevant and would incorporate these again by reference.

I refer to the Amended PDF and would make the following additional points:

INADEQUATE CONSULTATION

The notice posted on Woodlands Drive makes no reference to D1 or D2 or to commercial use. The many and frequent walkers, cyclists and horse riders over the Esk Way and bridleway may therefore be unaware of such proposed change of use assuming continued domestic use only. Consequently they may have been, albeit unintentionally, misled and could have been more concerned had they been in possession of the full facts. They may then have objected.

The consultation process should be repeated to address this important omission.

SAFETY

The Highways Statement raises more questions than it answers. For example:

 $\hat{a} \in \$ Where is the commercial and economic logic of a development of this size if the intention is to service only 1 or 2 customers a day?

âC¢ If that is the intention the proposed scale of the development should be significantly reduced

 $\hat{a} \in \mathcal{C}$ If the intention was to operate limited hours per the Amended PDF why did the original application seek year round use including weekends and bank holidays from 1000 util1930 (1600 Sundays and Bank Holidays)? Is the application going to have the opening hours amended?

 \hat{a} \$\infty\$ What is there to prevent the owners of the business changing their intentions and increasing use, perhaps significantly, over and above that in the Highways Statement if the development is approved and in place?

 $\hat{a} \in \$ Similarly what is there to prevent the employment of additional staff increasing capacity and consequently vehicular traffic?

 $\hat{a}\in \mathcal{C}$ Even if it is the NYPNPA $\hat{a}\in \mathcal{C}^{m}$ s intention to place restraints on use etc how could these be policed and enforced?

• Once the development is in place there will be "walk inâ€ \square customers traffic without an appointment seeking to use the facility which has not been taken into account

SUMMARY

7 As previously stated this is an inappropriate development of a relatively new property in the North Yorkshire Moors National Park. Consultation has been inadequate and the information in the Amended PDF seeks to deflect concerns rather than properly address the safety risk and the loss of amenity arising from increased vehicle traffic. Even if restrictions were imposed they will be impossible to maintain and enforce.

If the request for change of use and to extend the garage is not to be refused at this stage the consultation process should be repeated."

CORRESPONDENCE

It would be appreciated if correspondence could be by e-mail to rather than by post.

* Application Location:: Yeoman Hall Woodlands

Sleights

* Application Description:: Extension to garage, change of use to commercial

* LPA Reference:: NYM/2010/0381/CU/FL

Are you happy for us to use your email address as the preferred method of communication on this matter?: 1

http://www.NorthYorkMoors-npa.gov.uk

Scanned by MailDefender - managed email security from intY - www.maildefender.net

NYMNPA 1 2 JUL 2010