Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority

Planning Committee 20 May 2025

Late Consultations Summary Sheet
(Received by 16 May 2025)

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/44/181C**	**Colt Park Barn, Chapel Le Dale, CARNFORTH, LA6 3JF**
	Letter from a resident	The resident is concerned that there was no pre-application engagement by the applicant and reiterates concerns over the safety of the access.

Item 6

2	**R/52/243A**	**Thorns Farm, Marsett Lane, Countersett, DL8 3DE**
	Friends of the Dales	"Friends of the Dales has objected to this application and now wishes to make an additional comment …….We are concerned to read that the proposed facility is described 'potentially world class' in the Officer's Report. This description is entirely subjective and of course irrelevant as not a planning consideration. We urge Members not to be influenced by this description or the business interests of the applicant which are equally irrelevant to a planning decision."
3	**S/01/352A**	**Low Hall Farm Barn (GR:370879,487266), Hall Lane, Dent**
	Applicants	The applicants have provided a statement setting out their reasons for the withdrawal of planning application S/01/352 (the previous application, in 2024). The full statement is available to read online. In summary, the applicants' solicitors had advised that the draft s.106 agreement would be overly restrictive in the case of executing a will or gaining a mortgage, and would restrict the value of the property in perpetuity. Further, the applicants were concerned with the future profit in farming being volatile, that the need to

		supplement income would be acutely important, hence the proposed agreement was deemed too restrictive.
	Agent	The agent has forwarded a copy of a letter they received, from residents of Hugh Croft, Dent, which expresses support for the application.
5	**E/15/9B**	**Brockholes Farm, Tebay, Penrith, CA10 3XT**
	1 email from neighbour	The neighbour is satisfied that their earlier views have been considered and represented in the report and reiterates their concerns relating to the: Traffic/parking at Salterwath Bridge. Landscape impacts- including on the setting of the Roman fort and the views across the site from Westmorland Borrowdale. Impact on special qualities of YDNPA. Light pollution from the lights round the eaves of the properties. Impact on the ecosystem particularly the red listed birds in the riparian strip. Aesthetic clutter from many field shelters, new tracks and fencing. Impact on archaeology. Impact on small valley community from having a large tourism business operating here.

Richard Graham
Head of Development Management

Planning application C/52/38F 9 Main Street (Boars Head), Long Preston

An objector has submitted late representations that raise a number of technical points.

1. Loss of Community Facility

This issue is dealt with in the report however the objector asserts that : "*The Officer's acceptance of the loss is premature and unwarranted. The proper course would have been to require a full viability study and proof of exhaustive marketing."*

Policy C9 does not require 'a full viability study and proof of exhaustive marketing' rather that applications should 'be supported by appropriate and proportionate independent evidence'. Officers consider that the evidence set out in the report is both appropriate and proportionate in the circumstances.

2. Residential amenity and overdevelopment

This issue is addressed at length in the report. However the objector contends that "*The Officer's conclusions on amenity are based on abstract standards and do not adequately consider the real-world impact on 2 Todd Styles and other adjacent properties."* Officers have considered separation distances and the physical relationship between the proposed dwellings and existing properties. The rule of thumb separation distances and 25 degree sections are tools that have been developed and applied by the planning profession for many years and are generally accepted by developers, planning authorities and inspectors as a useful guide to avoid new development significantly affecting daylight, direct sunlight, overlooking and obstructing outlook. Nevertheless Officers have visited the site and considered these potential effects on the ground. The report sets out conclusions in respect of daylight/sunlight and overlooking but does not expressly refer to 'outlook'. Planning case law has established that although there is no 'right to a view' the effect of development on the outlook from principal windows can be a material consideration. Development that would completely obstruct the outlook from a principal window such that the development would have an overbearing or enclosing effect could adversely affect the residential amenity of the occupants of the affected property. In the case of this proposal it is considered that, given the separation distances, the relative position of the buildings, the open outlook across the access and parking areas, and the softening effect of landscape planting, the effect of the proposed dwelling at plot 5 would not so enclose or

obstruct the outlook from 2 Todd Styles that the residential amenity enjoyed by its occupants would be harmed to a degree that would warrant refusal of permission.
3. Legal right of way
The objector stresses that their right of way must be protected and that Committee should ensure that an approved scheme explicitly maintains the right of way. Members will see from the proposed drawings that vehicular and pedestrian access to 2 Todd Styles from the public highway is not prejudiced by the proposed development.
4. Highways and parking concerns
The objector contends that the level of traffic is underestimated and the parking provided is insufficient. This point is dealt with in the report. The parking and access proposed are considered to be appropriate for residents and visitors and the Highway Authority has no objection to the proposals.
5. Sewer infrastructure and drainage concerns.
The objector is concerned over the implications for damage to the sewerage system and the capacity of the drainage system. The objector is not satisfied that approval of details would be the subject of a condition which is considered to be appropriate and common practice given that neither the Lead Local Flood Authority or United Utilities have objected.
6. Housing mix and lack of affordable housing.
The objector considers that the applicant has avoided providing for affordable housing by reducing the number of dwellings from 6 to 5 to bring the proposal under the threshold prescribed by policy C1. Firstly the number of dwellings was reduced on the request of Officers to avoid an over development of the site. Secondly policy C1 would require a commuted sum rather than on-site affordable housing. The proposal secures 5 local occupancy dwellings on site, which could reduce the price of the dwellings by 20% for people with a local connection.

YORKSHIRE DALES NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

Note of Planning Committee Site Visit

Date & time of visit: 4th April 2025 at 10.30 am.
Application site: 9 Main Street (The Boars Head), Long Preston, Skipton, BD23 4ND
Application ref : C/52/38F

Present
Members – A Murday, D Ireton, D Noland, D Twine, I Mitchell (Chair), J Hutton, L Bateman, M Corner, R Heseltine, Y Peacock.

Officers – C Bland (Senior Planning Officer), R Graham (Head of Development Management).

IM Opened site visit, explained procedure and purpose of visit.

CB Explained plans showing copies of the drawings. CN pointed out:

- Access arrangements.
- Details of conversion of pub building including removal of porch.
- Position of proposed dwellings on plots 4 & 5.
- General parking arrangement explained.
- Extent of site ownership explained and right of access to properties on Todd Stiles although residents do not have right to park on the application site.
- Privately owned parcel of land next to site pointed out.
- Pavement route.

DN Asked whether pavement would be kerbed and if anything to stop parking on the site buy general public.

CB Explained that parking on private land is a civil matter. The proposals do not include any physical barrier preventing parking.

The group moved further into site next to plots 4&5

CB Explained plans showing proposed houses, design with lower ridge height and physical relationship with surrounding houses. The parking area was pointed out.

IP Queried ownership of the parking area.

CB Explained that the land associated with the pub has reduced over recent years as parcels have been sold off and developed for housing. The parking area is in the applicant's ownership but can not be developed due to an easement protecting the drainage system. Explained rough route of drainage system.

MC Queried which trees were to be removed/retained.

CB Pointed out trees for removal/retention and area for new planting to provide a biodiversity net gain and a buffer between the new houses and those on Todd Stiles.

Pointed out plot 5 position and proximity to properties at the rear and on Todd Stiles

Clarified which site buildings were to be removed.

LB Queried windows facing Todd Stiles properties.

CB Explained only bathroom and landing windows which would be glazed with obscured glass and fixed shut. This would be controlled by condition.

MC Queried solar panels and EV charging points.

CB Proposal doesn't include solar panels but does include EV charging points on the houses.

DI Queried enforcement on BNG contribution.

RG Explained that this would fall to the Authority to enforce over a 30 year period.

The group moved into the former pub building to view the rear part of the building, the lean-to and the neighbouring houses.

Site visit ended at 11.00am