YORKSHIRE DALES NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE 14 NOVEMBER 2023

Late Consultations Summary Sheet
(Received by 10 November 2023)

PLEASE NOTE: this is a brief summary of the additional comments received since the agenda was published and Members are advised to view consultee/neighbour comments on the website via the links below (then scroll down to responses)

Item 5

1	**C/52/57C**	**Land at Grosvenor Farm, Main Street, Long Preston, BD23 4PP** **Applicant –** Has submitted an amended plan which shows an amended route of the public footpath which passes through the site and then up the eastern side of the site which moves it away from the gardens of the adjoining neighbours. Has also amended the construction detail for the access road and has confirmed that the highway will be built to adoptable standards but will be privately owned and maintained. The proposed landscaping, trees and bird and boxes is expected to be in excess of £3000 the sum required by Policy W2 and therefore complies with this policy. Has confirmed that the applicant has considered 100% affordable units but the intensity of the development of the site was not initially supported by the Local Planning Authority and was withdrawn. **Strategic Housing (North Yorks Council)** Is willing to support this site for 100% affordable housing, if the owner would be interested in that. Given Homes England grant conditions, selling to an RP for a 100% affordable site can often bring in a better return than selling homes individually on the open market. **Neighbour –**Raises objection to routing of footpath adjacent to the boundary wall, concerns over traffic speeds and loss of informal parking area. **Objector -** Notes that Long Preston was surveyed in 2015-2018 but that the application site was not surveyed as access was refused. There is a possibility that the site may hold some archaeological information about the history of the village and suggests a survey be carried out. **Historic Environment Team -** Notes that the site is within land that was part of a medieval field system

		and suggests that an archaeological field evaluation be carried out to inform any planning applications and there are no major concerns over this development. Given the nature of the development and location of the site it does require archaeological field evaluation and any necessary recording of remains which this work identifies, in advance of development. The field evaluation should be conducted by a CIFA registered archaeological contracting organisation and should involve geophysical survey and trial trenching of any anomalies, and then any necessary subsequent recording work which may be necessary. A suitable condition has been suggested. **Applicant –** Is willing to accept a pre-commencement archaeological condition. **Historic England –** Has no further comments to make. **Long Preston Parish Council -** Suggest Members make a Site Visit to the site. The re-routing of the footpath is an improvement to the original proposal. The Parish Council's main objection is regarding vehicle access and egress onto the A65 and that the traffic survey is out of date. The Parish Council request a detailed condition to ensure an adequate drainage system for the site and also request two street lights be placed within the development. **Officer Comments –** *The Strategic Housing Officer remains interested in the site and meetings are planned to see if there is any compromise in the site density and the impact of the development. * The proposed route of the path has been moved to reduce the impact on neighbours and the issues of parking and traffic have been addressed with within the report. * The applicant has been advised of the condition requested by the Senior Archaeologist and views will reported at the meeting.
2	**C/54/79E**	**Holme Farm, Main Street, Malham, Skipton, BD23 4DA** A further letter of objection and photographs taken in April 2022 has been received from an adjoining owner, writing after the publication of the Officer's report. Summarised the points in it are as follows: 1) The development is contrary to the Design

		Guide and National Park purposes and refers to the Sandford Principle. 2) Questions the assertion that the visual impact of the development is limited. 3) Is concerned that the leylandii hedge goes against the aims of the Nature Recovery Plan and the Biodiversity Forums work in the Park. 4) Is contrary to the original 1997 planning permission. 5) Refers to the objection from the Parish Council. 6) Notes that views out from the garden have been lost. 7) States that the fence is visible from many rooms within the house. **Officer comments.** • The assessment of the visual impact of the fence has been addressed within the committee report. The recommendation has been made having been balanced against local and national planning policy and the Sandford Principle is not appropriate in this case. It should be noted that the photos submitted by the objector were taken in April 2022. • The hedge is not development and therefore does not need any form of approval from the Authority. • The conditions of the 1997 permission were not necessarily to prevent any further development but to ensure that the Authority remained control over aspects of the development so that an application would be submitted if further development was required, as has happened. • The loss of a view is not a material planning consideration.
5	R/56/358F	**Ingledene, Burtersett, Hawes, DL8 3PB** **Neighbour –**The report states that there will be no access directly onto the road and the door on the west elevation is shown as a dummy door. However the plan view still shows this as an access to the holiday let. Can you please ensure this is not the case and only the correct access is presented to avoid any future ambiguity.

Richard Graham
Head of Development Management