

MMO 2/5/14 JC

OBJECT

Marishes Parish Meeting
Bellafax Grange
Marishes
Malton
North Yorkshire
YO17 6UG

RYEDALE DM

-2 MAY 2014

DEVELOPMENT
MANAGEMENT

29 April 2014

Karen Hood
Managing Development Team Leader
Ryedale District Council
Ryedale House
Malton
YO17 7HH

Dear Madam

Application No.: 14/00358/FUL

Development Description: Change of use and alterations of outbuilding to form a two bedroom dwelling to include formation of vehicular access and associated parking and amenity area

The Marishes Parish Meeting object to the proposed scheme for the following reasons:

This building cannot be regarded as redundant; a storage container has recently been delivered to site. Presumably to compensate for the storage space lost through wilful neglect and partial demolition of the building subject to this application.

Proposed drainage details have not been provided.

The proposed alterations and extensions are not sympathetic, overly domestic in character and unnecessary. A forward projecting gable creates a domestic appearance and should not be supported in a conversion scheme. Front extensions are usually resisted on residential properties due to the harmful impact they have and there should be no exception in this case.

Using the redevelopment of the School House Inn as an example, it is very unlikely that the appearance of the streetscene would be dramatically more appealing following conversion of this building. On the contrary, the appearance and quality of the village centre has been dramatically reduced as a result of the previous developments at this site.

Has a structural survey (completed by an appropriately qualified surveyor) been submitted? The applicants removed the roof of this building over the Christmas period

and exposure to the elements will have compromised the structural integrity of the building. Therefore, the building may not be capable of conversion but instead may require rebuilding. If this is so, the application is essentially for a new dwelling (which is contrary to the adopted planning policies).

Included within the 'red line' is land which is believed to be in the ownership of another individual and land believed to belong to the Highway Authority. You are urged to compare the location plan with earlier applications and ensure that the correct ownership certificates have been signed and the requisite notice has been served on other interested parties. Without this additional land, the proposal lacks satisfactory amenity space.

The applicants refer to SP21 (Occupancy Restriction), state that they are in housing need due to age or infirmity and there is an inference that they intend to live in the proposed dwelling. However, the application does not contain sufficient information to demonstrate their compliance with the Council's Local Occupancy Condition. The applicants have not permanently resided in the Parish or adjoining parishes; have not had a previous period of residence of over three years, presumably will not be taking up full time permanent employment in an established business due to their age and infirmity and do not have relatives who have been permanently resident within the District for at least the previous three years.

Following the redevelopment of the pub and through the lack of public transport and other facilities, the village of Low Marishes has become an unsustainable location for new housing; particularly for the elderly and infirm.

Since the loss of the School House Inn the opportunity for local residents to meet and socialise within their own Parish has vanished. It is indisputable that the quality of life previously enjoyed by residents of High and Low Marishes has fallen and so too has the vitality of the community. The Parish meeting wish to make it known that this building is the **ONLY** existing and vacant building on Marishes suitable for community use. A village hall here would be compatible in nature with the surroundings and be of great benefit to this community who have endured more upheaval in the last five years than could be reasonably expected of any neighbourhood. SP19 states, amongst other things, 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 or use etc.*** It is therefore proposed that the development would harm the community by reason of the fact it removes the opportunity to provide an essential community facility and result in over-development of the site, harming the visual amenity of the area. Since the approval of two dwellings there is an argument to be made that the community need now outweighs the individual's need. The apparent housing need of the previous and current applicants has been satisfied.

Members of the Parish Meeting do not consider that this proposal raises the quality of the environment of Low Marishes and does not represent a good quality development that respects local distinctiveness. Yet again, we are presented with a further proposal which achieves little other than further attrition of the landmark School House site and the sense

of pride that generations of Marishes residents have in living here. Instead it is proposed to be replaced with another ill-conceived, cramped and poor quality development.

It is for the reasons above we wish to object to the proposal and urge you to refuse the application. Further comments (many of which have previously been voiced are attached to this letter as an appendix).

Yours faithfully

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.