

object

mno

Marishes Parish Meeting
Belafax Grange
Marishes
Malton
YO17 6UG

RYEDALE DM

- 5 JAN 2015

DEVELOPMENT
IMAGES

5/1/15 - LM

Mr M Mortonson
Planning Officer
Ryedale District Council
Ryedale House
Malton
YO17 7HH

31 December 2014

Dear Mr Mortonson

Ref. No: 14/01327/HOUSE
Construction of a Conservatory at Hedera, Low Marishes

Thank you for the consultation documents in connection with the above application. Having considered the matter at the Parish Meeting of 17 December 2014, I would be grateful to receive your full and considered response to the following points:

1. Although this building is not listed, it forms an important part of the built environment of Low Marishes. It was the former village forge and is also host to the Victorian village post box. It is prominent within the street scene and should retain its original character (Condition No. 14 to be carried out in strict accordance with approved plans and elevations MSR 3 of 5). The front elevation, the east elevation and most of the west elevation were demolished before 'conversion' works began; the scheme is now therefore a new build project for which planning permission has not been granted by the Council. The Parish Meeting raised the question of whether the building was structurally sound and capable of conversion without the need for significant rebuilding. Why was a full structural survey not requested? Why has the applicant not been required to submit an application for a new dwelling?
2. The development is now considerably higher than the original building. The humble, utilitarian character has been lost despite the applicant's assurance that the scheme you considered originally would require minimal alterations. The windows now have formal lintel and sill details, there are additional courses or bricks between the lintel and eaves and the fenestration detail differs from the original approval. It is noted that the 'existing' plans submitted with this application may match the building on site but do not match the plans which were approved and conditioned. Please explain the Council's opinion on this matter/these discrepancies.
3. The applicant has signed Certificate of Ownership A stating that they are the owner of the land. It is the understanding of the Parish Meeting that the building in question remains part of Fullerton House Land Registry document, title number NYK155496 which is registered in the names of Matthew John Richardson and Sarah Elizabeth Richardson. You will be aware that an incorrect certificate renders the application invalid.
4. The boundaries as shown on the plans submitted with this application differ significantly from those for which approval has been granted under ref.: 14/00358/FUL and which were conditioned to be carried out in accordance with the plans submitted. Will the Council be monitoring the development/pursuing enforcement action to ensure compliance with the imposed conditions?

5. The Council and Highway Authority also specified by condition that the crossing of the highway verge should be completed in accordance with Highway Authority standard details before building works commenced. This has not taken place. Why not?

The Parish Meeting formally object to the proposal at this time for the following reasons:

1. Inaccurate and incomplete application. Having particular regard to the ownership certificates, boundary lines, conflict between the appearance of the property/approved plans and the fact the block plan shows the 'garage' marked up for conversion (including large extension) which were omitted from the previous application. The block plan is therefore inaccurate and misleading.
2. The building which is subject to this application is not in accordance with the approved details and therefore a further application cannot be fully and justly considered.
3. Design under Policy SP16. The proposal represents an incongruous and alien domestic feature on a development which was granted as a conversion scheme. The relevant Ryedale Local Plan Policies require a high standard of design and in wider open countryside conversions must result in an enhancement to the immediate setting. At the very least development should have a neutral impact in terms of use and appearance; the previous scheme failed to meet these requirements and the current scheme for an 'off-the-shelf', standard conservatory also fails to meet these requirements in terms of design, materials and use.
4. Overdevelopment of the host building and wider site under Policies SP16 and SP19. This proposal confirms the comments made by the Parish Meeting in relation to the fact the building was not of sufficient size to accommodate its proposed new use. Extensions and domestic style extensions in particular are not appropriate for conversions (or simple modest dwellings) and are contrary to your policies. The proposal represents a harmful, urbanising effect on the host building and its setting (the structure would be prominent in the approach from the east). A more sympathetic, well detailed and simple extension would gain more support.
5. Loss of associate amenity space. The conservatory is proposed to occupy a large proportion of the land designated as garden space. This would be detrimental to residential amenity.

For a more detailed explanation of our concerns, I would refer you to the Parish correspondence, submitted in connection with the previous application. A copy is enclosed with those sections which are still relevant to this application highlighted.

We trust that these comments will be taken into account in reaching your decision and look forward to receiving your response to points 1 to 5 on page one of this letter so they can be reported back to residents at the next Parish Meeting and prior to the determination of this application.

Yours sincerely

D Beal
Chair Marishes Parish Meeting

Appendix 1

In addition to the above, the following observations are made:

Once more, the applicant claims in their supporting statement that by reason of the fact the building has not yet been converted to holiday letting accommodation it is proven to be an unviable option. Once more the Parish Members contests this and query the applicant's financial calculations. It is important to note the business Mr R McCoy (Inspector) was in fact referring to was that of a public house. No attempts to find suitable alternative and economic uses have been explored.

Conflict with the Local Plan Strategy

SP16: Design

This proposal does not comply with SP16. This policy states that:

Extensions and alterations to existing buildings will be appropriate and sympathetic to the character and appearance of the host building in terms of scale, form and use of materials and in considering proposals for the alteration, re-use or extension of individual historic buildings the Council will seek to ensure that:

- *A building is capable of conversion to the use proposed without the need for extensions or alterations that would detrimental to its character*
- *Proposed extensions and alterations, considered acceptable in principle are of an architectural style which complements the traditional character of the main building*
- *Appropriate materials and traditional construction methods and techniques are used*

The proposal does not respect the character of the former forge. The creation of a forward projecting gable creates a domestic appearance and should not be supported in a scheme proposing the conversion of a rural building. Front extensions are usually resisted for residential properties due to the harmful impact they have and there should be no exception in this case. The extension would be detrimental to the streetscene and to the traditional built heritage of Marishes.

SP19 Generic Development Management Issues

SP19 reinforces the design requirements of SP16 stating that:

The design of new development will follow the principles established in Policy SP16. Extensions or alterations to existing buildings will be appropriate and sympathetic to the character and appearance of the existing building in terms of scale, form, and use of materials.

This scheme does not meet these requirements.

SP19 requires that acceptable levels of amenity and safety are retained. It states that

New development will not have a material adverse impact on the amenity of present or future occupants, the users or occupants of neighbouring land and buildings or the wider community by virtue of its design, use, location and proximity to neighbouring land uses. Impacts on amenity can include, for example, noise, dust, odour, light flicker, loss of privacy or natural daylight or be an overbearing presence.

The proposed block plan shows another awkward arrangement and yet again, over development of the site. Land ownership issues aside, this scheme does not give proper consideration to the requirements of outdoor domestic storage or general character of the immediate locality. The scheme does not therefore contribute positively to the local environment.

It is noted (again) that the applicants have not provided any details of proposed drainage.

SP19 also requires acceptable access and parking. As villagers and parishioners who use the road past the property more than once a day, we know the difficulties of this particular stretch. The road is narrow and the proposed accesses are close to a bend. This presents many highway safety issues. Since the occupation of Hope Cottage, motorists are regularly faced with children playing close to and crossing the road on bicycles and mini-motor bikes despite having a substantial garden to play in. A further dwelling is being developed and if this scheme is also granted, the number of individuals will increase as the available amenity space decreases leading to further pressure at the site and further hazards for motorists.

The applicant claims that there is a need for homes in the Thornton Dale Ward, and in particular a need for homes for the elderly. The housing needs survey was carried out in 2006, eight years ago. Since that time, a number of new homes have been built in and around Thornton Dale. Larger schemes include the high class development near Castle Close and a more affordable scheme of 12 units on Westgate. The Parish Meeting also note that works are currently being carried out on the Lady Lumley's Almshouses (aimed specifically at the elderly) in the village centre. Not to mention two retirement villages planned Pickering. These developments are located in settlements with good access to shops, doctors, services and other community facilities. Unfortunately, Marishes is not

Conflict with the NPPF

Section 6: Delivering a Wide Choice of High Quality Homes

In paragraph 55 the NPPF is clear that in order to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality or rural communities but local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are exceptional circumstances such as essential rural workers

dwellings or where the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and would lead to an enhancement of the setting. This 'conversion' scheme would not lead to an enhancement of the setting by reason of the harmful domestic effect it would have on the host building and rural setting.

Section 8. Promoting Healthy Communities

Currently there are no opportunities for social interaction within the village of Low Marishes other than private gatherings or outdoor events (which are weather dependant). Our pub has been redeveloped and we do not have a shop, school or village hall. Public transport is unreliable. Meeting day to day needs are wholly reliant upon the car. New housing in a location such as this is therefore unsustainable, particularly for the elderly and infirm.