

From: Dave Boland
Sent: 21 February 2012 16:44
To: Cheryl Ward
Subject: Application for Planning Permission at Stonegate, Lealholm

NYMNPA
21 FEB 2012
CS

Dear Ms Ward,

In case it is not clear from my e-mail yesterday, please be aware that the so far as I am aware, the property is owned by the husband of the person now seeking planning application. I believe that it is he who previously sought planning approval for a holiday cottage. His mainstream business interests relate to the building trade and he has been involved in property purchase and development for many years.

Yours Sincerely,

Dave Boland

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

The Cottage

Stonegate

Lealholm

North Yorkshire

YO21 2AB

26th February 2012



Dear Mrs Ward,

Comments on Application for Natural Therapies Centre at Stonegate, Lealholm

You will see from my enclosed comments that I am not in favour of the proposed change of use at Stonegate. I would be most grateful if you could make the Planning Committee aware of these views.

Yours Sincerely

Mrs Pamela Anderson

Comments on Application for Natural Therapies Centre at Stonegate, Lealholm

26th February 2012

With regard to the above application, I imagine that the present owners of this property were aware of its designation as a stable and garage when they split it off from the associated dwelling house several years ago, selling the latter on to a third party. Since that time the building seems to have been largely unused, incurring very little maintenance. It does not appear to have been used actively as a garage or stable during the last ten years.

Although there is strong demand for both stables and garages within the local population, I am not aware that the owners have offered the building out for rental or sale on this basis. I think that this option ought to be fully explored before conversion into an alternative use is even considered on a relatively recent building, which was given planning consent against such a specific use.

The concept of a natural therapies centre here in Stonegate seems wholly inappropriate to the way of life and threatens substantial environmental and noise pollution as a result of the increased activity arising.

I also make the point that the notification for this proposal has been positioned remote from the road and is not prominent. I doubt whether all eight resident families of Stonegate are aware of it, particularly the four of these who are part-time only and unlikely to be here at this time of the year.

NYMNPA
28 FEB 2012

Application for Natural Therapies Centre, Stonegate, Lealholm

NYM/2011/0587/FL

NYMNP/PA
-2 MAR 2012

Introduction

We write this note as the owners of the property adjacent to the proposed development and wish to present our views as to why the scheme should not go ahead.

Background Context

Stonegate consists of seven, traditional dwelling houses. This ancient hamlet is located in a relatively isolated part of the Park, not close to centres of population. For centuries, the way of life here, has been in support of agriculture, farming and associated outdoor activities, resulting in a distinctive character emerging, consistent with this rural outlook.

Within the last two decades, planning permission was given for one of the (then) existing occupants of Stonegate to create a stable and garage within the boundaries of their property. So far as we are aware, there was no local opposition to this venture, which not only stood to enhance the quality of life for one of our residents but at the same time, was entirely consistent with the character and lifestyle of the hamlet. It is only in more recent times that this property was sold, with the new owners then splitting up the holding - the dwelling house being sold onwards to a third party and the garage/stable being retained, presumably with a view to further development. In this context, permission for conversion to a holiday cottage was sought in 2003, but refused.

Our Objections

1. Conversion to a natural therapy centre is inappropriate for the location of the property within this peaceful and isolated community. Whilst some kind of agricultural or related use could be beneficial in the area, the proposed application neither aligns well with Park themes nor the priority needs of the local community. A more appropriate and effective location would be in an urban high street where such developments are needed urgently.
2. Taking into account the sparse population available for therapy treatment in the immediate environs, it is inevitable that a commercially successful outcome for the proposed venture will need to revolve around substantial comings and goings of clients from outside of the immediate vicinity - this significantly altering the character of this rural hamlet.
3. Vehicular access to, and departure from, the property will not be easy with the link road from the highway being in the form of a narrow, single track - this being unsuitable for use by a light car in all but the best of weather conditions.
4. There will be an environmental price to pay for local residents because;
 - a. The hamlet does not have street lighting and in winter there will be an absolute safety requirement for provision of external lighting on the garage/stable unit to enable clients to access the property. This lighting will create a considerable

nuisance value to other residents and may offer a dangerous distraction to passing motorists.

- b. The layout and configuration of the garage/stable imposes constraints on what new parking arrangements might be possible and there will be a need for manoeuvring of vehicles on-site and this, combined with associated slamming of car doors, can be expected to give rise to a substantial noise problem for other residents.
 - c. Increased traffic flows through the hamlet will also increase noise pollution.
5. The garage/stable unit is remote from potential users of natural therapies and will involve the majority of clients in journeys of considerable length. Compared with alternative locations, for example within a centre of population adjacent to the Park, it will give rise to transport inefficiencies (i.e. avoidable single person car journeys) and unnecessary carbon emissions.
 6. Access to the property will need to be across Court Leat land which is likely to impose restrictions on just what arrangements may be made. It is from a road where the traffic is fast-moving (60 mph limit) and where the junction will be in the middle of an (approximately) 100 meters stretch, on a steep hill, between a blind corner and the blind, brow of a hill. There have been collisions on this stretch in the past and given the introduction of a frequent flow of traffic through the new junction onto the main road (possibly with drivers unused to these local conditions), there will be potential for greatly increased road accidents and possibly deaths.
 7. The original garage/stable unit was environmentally harmonious because the surrounding land was used for grazing of the occupying pony. This land has been left to grow wild in recent times and there is no indication as to how this aspect will be addressed within the proposed new use.
 8. Following rejection of a previous planning application for a holiday cottage, there is a concern that the present application (this time, we believe by the owner's wife) could form part of a path eventually leading to domestic use. We stress that the property is of recent build, for a specific purpose and does not represent a building that has become redundant over a period of many years - rather, it has become available as the result of deliberate subdivision of an existing larger holding by the present owner (see background, above). In the circumstances, we are concerned that Park rules governing change of use of new buildings should be considered fully.

Concluding Remarks

It is difficult to assess fully, the intended scale, scope and impact of the proposed natural therapies centre from the information available to us. For example, we do not have insights into;

- the range of therapies to be applied
- the hours of business to be adopted,
- the number of customers to be treated
- additional scope such as café facilities
- whether any residential aspects are intended or foreseen for the future
- what plans have been laid for future expansion
- etc.

At the same time, we are not aware whether due consideration has been given to the alternative prospect of opening the centre in one of the several urban conurbations adjacent to the Park where there will exist the obvious advantages of;

- a concentrated population of potential clients
- ready availability of suitable high street premises
- ease of client access
- ease of client parking
- avoidance of Park complications
- etc.

We conclude that for a venture of the present nature, the preparation of a realistic business plan would be an essential pre-requisite to (1) assess commercial viability and practicality in the currently proposed location and (2) confirm the potential for greatly enhanced performance in a more urban location

It is crucial that there should be available for viewing, a copy of the business plan to understand more fully what is intended. Nevertheless, the objections, as listed above, may make this step unnecessary.

Dr David and Mrs Julia Boland

Stonegate Mill Farmhouse

Lealholm

North Yorkshire

YO21 2AB

NYMNP
- 2 MAR 2012

Wendy Strangeway

From: Dave Boland
Sent: 05 March 2012 09:25
To: Planning; Mark Hill
Cc: Cheryl Ward
Subject: RE: NYM/2011/0587/FL - Stonegate, Lealholm

NYM/NPA
- 5 MAR 2012
WS

Dear Mr Hill,

Thankyou for your letter of 21st February informing us of planning procedure.

The title of your letter refers to the "conversion of former agricultural building to holistic/natural therapy studio" . Unfortunately, this appears to include a misrepresentation of the building in question, which has never formed part of an agricultural holding or been used for farming purposes. Your records will show that consent was given in the relatively recent past to the domestic dwelling, Hilltop Cottage, for erection of a garage, stable and laundry on the small parcel of land owned by the cottage. Against this exacting specification, it is also difficult to imagine the resulting building being described as a "barn".

We're sorry to be pedantic but this point relates directly to aspects of the objections which we have raised and in our view needs attention before the Planning meeting. I'd be grateful if you could advise us as to whether you are able to make changes to the wording or whether we should also make reference to this aspect in our objections.

Yours Sincerely,

David and Julia Boland

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