

**RYEDALE DISTRICT COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Item Number: 6
Application No: 19/01002/MFUL
Parish: Pickering Town Council
Appn. Type: Full Application Major
Applicant: Persimmon Homes Teesside (Mr Ben Stephenson)
Proposal: Erection of 46no. four bedroom dwellings, 67no. three bedroom dwellings, 32no. two bedroom dwellings and 16no. one bedroom dwellings with associated access, garaging, infrastructure and landscaping (revised scheme to refusal 17/01536/MFUL dated 31.08.2018)
Location: Land South Of Firthland Road Pickering North Yorkshire

CONSULTATIONS:

Environmental Health Officer	Unable to support
Archaeology Section	No additional comments
Pickering Town Council	Maintain comments from previous application
Yorkshire Housing	
Yorkshire Water Land Use Planning	
NYCC Natural Services	
Flood Risk	Further information required
Vale Of Pickering Internal Drainage Boards	Maintains comments from previous application
Public Rights Of Way	Recommend informative
Designing Out Crime Officer (DOCO)	No comments
Archaeology Section	Recommend conditions
Housing Services	Concerns
North Yorkshire Education Authority	Comments
Highways North Yorkshire	No objection but concerns with layout

Neighbour responses: Mr Adrian Marshall, Mr Liam McCormack, Miss Katherine Worth, Mr David Hutchinson, DM Treeby, Miss Amanda Fields, Mr Don Treeby, Mr Christopher Baker, Kevin And Dawn Morrison, Mrs S Russell, Mr And Mrs Holtby, Mr Alwyne Smith, Mr A Turner, A & L Keld, Mr W A Stead, Mr Paul Simpson, Mrs Rosemary Holt, Mr Bruce Corfe, Mr Richard Kimmings, Mrs Sarah Russell,

1.0 SITE:

- 1.1 The site extent comprises 6.14 ha and is formed from a series of five fields which are situated outside of the Development Limits of Pickering, on the south western area of the settlement. This proposal is to the immediate south of the planning permission granted in September 2017, which provides the access to this proposal, and which is under construction. This earlier permission abuts Firthland Road and sits behind a series of bungalows. The developer has both sites under an option agreement. The land is formed from a series of identified strip fields. To the south of the site is agricultural land. To the west is Westgate Carr Industrial Estate, which is largely operated by Rosti Automotive, a manufacturer of vehicle components. To the west is the residential development, built in the 1970s and 80s with the street known as Greenlands Road, which leads onto Garden Way which are made up of two-storey, detached dwellings. The prevailing landform is flat, with views of Pickering, and the rising land to the north can be seen from the site.

2.0 PROPOSAL:

- 2.1 The proposal seeks full permission for the development of 161 dwellings: made up of 46 no. four bedroom dwellings, 67no. three bedroom dwellings, 32 no. two bedroom dwellings and 16 no. one bedroom dwellings with associated access, garaging, parking, infrastructure, landscaping and public open space.
- 2.2 The proposal is a resubmission of planning application 17/01536/MFUL which was refused 31 August 2018. This application has not been subject to pre-application advice, although the applicant was advised of the current status of the Development Plan, and was aware of the refusal of the previous application. The application was validated on the 23 August 2019. A range of documentation has been submitted for the purpose of considering the application.

Design and Access Statement;

Consultation Statement*;

Planning Statement;

Proposed site layout plan;

Landscaping plan;

Materials layout plan;

Plans for the proposed dwellings in elevation and plan form;

With the following technical reports:

Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment*

Geo-environmental Appraisal*;

Agricultural land survey*;

Air Quality Assessment*;

Noise Assessment*

Ecological assessment *

Flood risk assessment and drainage strategy*;

Odour Assessment*;

A transport assessment* and Travel Plan* with pedestrian and cycle routes review;

An archaeological survey is submitted utilising geophysical survey and trial trenching*;

Reports marked * are those which were submitted for the previous application and are without amendment. The documents referred to above, are discussed in the appraisal section of the report.

- 2.3 The following elements have changed from the refused scheme:
- The change in the numbers of the unit's sizes and their corresponding number of bedrooms: 46 (previously 28) no. four bedroom dwellings, 67no. (Previously 76) three bedroom dwellings, 32 (previously 43)no. two bedroom dwellings and 16 (previously 14)no. one bedroom dwellings
 - The layout has changed, and frontages are more linear;
 - No loop road is provided;
 - The dwelling types have changed;
 - The public open space has reduced in quantity and range;
 - The overall site area, and the properties have moved marginally closer to the western boundary of the site.
- 2.4 For context, this application is submitted by Persimmon (North East), who are based at Teesside, and they are rolling out the scheme to the north. The previous application was submitted by Persimmon (Yorkshire).

3.0 HISTORY:

- 3.1 17/01536/MFUL Permission for 161 dwellings with associated access, garaging, infrastructure and landscaping. Refused 31.08.2018. The reasons for this and how they relate to this application are considered later in the report. In summary they related to lack of consistency with the adopted and emerging Development Plan, and harm to the strip field systems.
- 3.2 Conditional planning permission was granted in for 52 dwellings on land to the immediate north of the site (Planning application reference 14/01259/MFUL). That Application was approved in principle 10 May 2016 and determined 27 September 2017 with the signing of the s.106 agreement. It is this permission which provides the access to the site subject of this application from Firthland Road, both for principal access and emergency access. Work has commenced on the construction of the site and is well under way.

4.0 POLICY:

- 4.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 confirms that the determination of any planning application must be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Development Plan comprises:

The Ryedale Plan- Local Plan Strategy (2013)
The Policies Map (2019)
The Ryedale Plan – Local Plan Sites Document (2019)

The Yorkshire and Humber Plan (Regional Spatial Strategy)- York Green Belt Policies (YH9 and Y1)

(The Regional Spatial Strategy is not considered as part of the determination of this proposal)

The Ryedale Plan - Local Plan Strategy (5 September 2013)

Policy SP1 General Location of Development and Settlement Hierarchy

Policy SP2 Delivery and Distribution of New housing

Policy SP3 Affordable Housing

Policy SP4 Type and Mix of New Housing

Policy SP10 Physical Infrastructure

Policy SP11 Community Facilities and Services

Policy SP12 Heritage

Policy SP13 Landscapes

Policy SP14 Biodiversity

Policy SP15 Green Infrastructure

Policy SP16 Design

Policy SP17 Managing Air Quality, Land and Water Resources

Policy SP18 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy

Policy SP19 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy SP20 Generic Development Management Issues

Policy SP22 Planning Obligations, Developer Contributions and the Community Infrastructure Levy

Ryedale Plan- Local Plan Sites Document (2019)

Policy SD2 Residential Land Allocations

Material Considerations:

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019), in particular Paragraphs 11 and 12: 'Presumption in favour of sustainable development' and paragraph 73 of the NPPF concerning delivery of housing and housing land supply.

National Planning Practice Guidance

The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 s.40.

5.0 CONSULTATIONS:

- 5.1 A brief summary of the position of statutory and non-statutory consultees is included on the front sheet of the report and issues raised are addressed in the relevant appraisal sections of the report. All consultation responses are available for Members to view on the public access webpage, and referred to in the report accordingly.
- 5.2 Four of the supporting documents: Design and Access Statement; Planning Statement; Consultation Statement and Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment were not viewable on the Consultation portal. A 21-day re-consultation was undertaken, and this has now expired.

5.3 Pickering Town Council have raised objections to the proposal:

Objections raised in February 2018 still stand:
Concerns regarding access to the site;
Harm to archaeology;
Loss of the historic strip field system.

The site was not a preferred site in the Local Plan, and over-delivery of housing in Pickering could have a detrimental impact on infrastructure and services in the town; The Council understands that there is now a robust supply of affordable housing in the town.

In response to consultation on the additional supporting information:

Councillors do not believe there are any material amendments to these plans and the previous comments made by the council remain unchanged.

5.4 In terms of neighbour responses, 19no. letters have been received from individuals.

In summary, the responses are concerned with the following matters:

- Traffic levels are already difficult Firthland Road is narrow and there are parked cars and bends;
- Noise from construction of existing site will only get worse;
- Increased prevalence of children crossing roads to school;
- Concerns regarding infrastructural capacity =electric/water/sewerage;
- Loss of evening sunlight on Greenlands Road if properties are more than bungalows;
- Not clear whether properties are bungalows;
- Substantial harm to hedgerows and wildlife- loss of small mammals;
- Previous application was refused;
- The situation remains the same- was not allocated for residential use in the Development Plan;
- Devalue existing property prices through loss of amenity and so many new houses to buy;
- The issues with the last application – having being refused, there must have been problems;
- Pressure on existing doctor's surgery;
- Loss of productive farmland;
- Loss of privacy and security to existing houses on Greenlands Road;
- Mediaeval fields and wells;
- Lack of information about the heights of the dwellings;
- Drainage and sewerage capacity issues;
- Loss of privacy and light to the properties on Firthland Road;
- There is a scheme for more than 250 homes of Whitby Road;
- Congested streets (Firthland Road and Manor Drive) although Manor Drive could be widened;
- Spotted three types of owl, great and common newts, field mice, hedgehogs, deer and song birds- the land needs a protected status;
- Green Belt land- we were told that no-one could build on it;
- Where will all these families send their children to school?

- Firthland road and Manor Drive are used a rat run in the summer
- Extra traffic means extra pollution
- Manor Drive experiences too much traffic, it has a higher number of children in proximity due to the play area;
- The Manor Drive/A170 junction has poor visibility
- Bats roost in to-be demolished barn- ecological implications;
- The ecological measures don't go far enough to protect the barn owls due to the levels of disturbance;
- The proximity of the Rosti Automotive site is closer than the plans suggest, less than 50m away with the new building operates fork lifts 24/7;
- Where will all the new residents work?;
- The access onto the A170 in either direction will be inadequate for the volume of traffic this scheme would generate;
- There are no multiple surgeries, nor a cinema, and a new school is not required for the foreseeable future;
- Proposed new housing allocations, and approved scheme at Whitby Road;
- The character of the southern edge of Pickering would be adversely affected;
- Loss of valued views;
- Numbers 49 and 91 Firthland Road should be compensated for the noise and disruption of the existing scheme;
- Firthland Road is used by learner tractor drivers;
- More cars equals more crime, more pollution, more risk of accidents, bigger carbon footprint;
- Even in the scheme brought about the delivery of a new school that in itself would increase the amount of disruption and increase traffic movements;
- Availability of employment- Pickering has a strong tourist offer- seasonal work;
- The tourist offer undermines the ability for local residents and so they are attracted to Scarborough/York the internet for shopping.
- The trees and hedgerows play a vital role in the ecology of the area;
- The proposed fracking development would be very close to the proposed development;
- Impact on waste recycling and rubbish collections- the costs will increase and be borne by residents;
- Concerns that the mains sewerage system is insufficient to cope;
- How will surface water be managed? SUDs do not appear to be suitable;
- The population increase with more properties are huge potential risks for crime and antisocial behaviour;
- Increasing lighting could be harmful to existing residents through light pollution;
- The application has only recently been refused by the District Council- and the reasons for its rejection are clear, and they are still relevant.
- Harm to the existing archaeology, and harm to the historic strip field patterns;
- Concerns about the properties to the east- the strip of housing with the road- reduce our privacy in our gardens and our homes due to this;
- The site is not in the local plan for building on;
- Suggest a noise survey is undertaken to confirm that the bund built for phase 1 is effective;
- Problems concerning the drainage of the existing site under construction;

5.5 In response to the additional consultation 3no. neighbour responses were received the

and following matters were raised:

- The applicant states that the "spine road" of Firthland road is sufficient to carry over 170 vehicles daily (average of more than one car per household on the NE) plus the current +55 vehicles from the almost completed estate. Firthland road is a virtual one way road currently with the number of vehicles parked on it - it may come to a complete standstill with the proposed extra traffic. Hence my very strong objection to the proposed plan.
- The existing sewage system is already causing capacity problems.
- No changes to the scheme
- Harms bat roosts
- Destruction of strip field systems
- Close to large factory- noise from extractor fans starts at 6am
- Roads can't support the amount of traffic
- Despite update our opinions and concerns remain as before
- The recently constructed dwellings are extremely close together- privacy is scant, and limited open space to enjoy- more linear building will make this worse
- Reduction of productive farm land and open spaces will be lost

6.0 APPRAISAL:

6.1 The main considerations to be taken into account are:

- i) Principle of the Development
- ii) The Housing Land Supply and Housing Requirements
- iii) Site- Specific Considerations:
 - Affordable Housing Provision and Housing Mix
 - Impact on Highways, Access implications for Pedestrians and Cyclists
 - Landscape Setting and Form and Character Impacts
 - Layout and Design
 - Heritage
 - Foul and Surface Water Management
 - Amenity Matters
 - Education
 - Open Space
 - Ecology
- iv) Wider Considerations
- v) Conclusions

i) Principle of the Development

6.2 The site is not allocated in the Development Plan for residential development, and the principle for the development of the site for housing is not established by the Development Plan. The principle of development would be established if Members are minded to grant permission, taking account of strategic policies of the Development Plan (Local Plan Strategy - LPS), the identified residential land allocations for Pickering in the Development Plan (Local Plan Sites Document LPSD), and other

material considerations. Key issues in the consideration of the application are considered in the following sections.

- 6.3 Policy SP1- General Location of Development and Settlement Hierarchy- identifies Pickering is a Local Service Centre, and a secondary focus for growth. The policy provides a strategic steer to guide the allocation of land for development and the release of other land if this is required. Pickering now has housing land allocations at the town, which would cumulatively deliver at least 750 dwellings over the plan period (2027). Since the commencement of the Plan Period (2012) and adoption of the Plan in 2013 a number of permissions have been granted and some of these are completed. The allocations required to meet the residual requirement have been identified and adopted through Local Plan Sites Document in the summer of 2019. The site is on the edge of Pickering. Planning application 14/01259/MFUL is under construction, and is identified as a Commitment in the LPSD and is within the Pickering Development Limits. As such, the general location of the site does not conflict with spatial approach of Policy SP1, in isolation.
- 6.4 However, Policy SP2- Delivery and Distribution of Housing- builds on the principles of SP1, and sets out policy parameters for residential development. For Pickering, within the context of new build development outside of the Development Limits this includes: “Allocations in and adjacent to the built up area”. The Local Plan Strategy (LPSD) (adopted in 2013) was written to operate as a strategic steer for housing sites to come forward in advance of the Local Plan Sites Document (LPSD). However, the LPSD is now adopted, and this sets out the allocations in accordance with Policies SP2 on that basis.
- 6.5 Members will be aware that the LPSD was very recently adopted, in the summer of 2019, and is now part of the Development Plan. It has full weight in relation to the consideration of planning applications. The site of this application has not been identified as an allocation in Policy SD2 of the LPSD. This application does cover land which was submitted for consideration (as site 378/205) as part of the production of the LPSD. This site was not proposed as a land allocation in the Publication and Submission Stages, and this position continued as the Examination progressed.
- 6.6 It was consulted upon as a site option choice. Earlier site consultation work had identified the need to retain choices regarding the location of new housing development, as this site provided land for a school. However, during discussions with the Local Education Authority became clear that in respect of the building out of residual requirement to meet at Pickering, land for a school was not needed within the context of the current plan housing requirement up to 2027. Furthermore, the adopted allocations have direct access to the main road network and would not adversely impact on the identified strip field system.
- 6.7 As such the site does not accord with the adopted Development Plan. The Applicants have not disputed this position. It is for Members to consider whether there are material considerations which would, on balance, justify the release of the site which is not in accordance with the Development Plan, and therefore represent a departure from the Development Plan.

iii) The Housing Land Supply and Housing Requirements

- 6.8 National Policy remains clear that the planning system has a critical role in increasing the supply of housing. Paragraph 59 of the revised NPPF states that:

"To support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay."

- 6.9 Housing delivery is a significant material consideration. Members of the District Council have recognised this through the granting of planning applications for housing prior to the adoption of the Local Plan Sites Document (with steer from the Local Plan Strategy). However, the benefit of additional housing is balanced against any impacts of the development, in consideration with the housing land supply position.
- 6.10 Policy SP2 states that the Plan will seek to deliver at least 3000 (net) new homes between 2012 and 2027. This is a plan requirement of 200 homes per year, but there is flexibility: within SP2 is the operation of the 'Local Buffer', which allows for a 25% (50 dwellings) uplift in any year's completions- without penalty on the following five year's supply. This has resulted in, with the operation of the Local Buffer, between 177 and 200 homes per year being required.
- 6.11 At 31 March 2019, 185 dwellings were completed (net), which is slightly below the Plan's requirement of 200 homes. On that basis, there is no further reduction on the land supply calculation operating the buffer, and it remains 177 dwellings (based on previous year's completions in excess of 250 dwellings) or 200 dwellings. It should be noted that under the National Housing Delivery Test the District is expected to deliver 185 dwellings. In the previous six years, housing completions were in excess of 200 homes, and in the four most recent, in excess of 250 dwellings.
- 6.12 The trajectoryised five year land supply position at 31 March 2019 is not yet calculated, as discussions with Developers have not yet taken place. However, the District has a raw supply of planning permissions of 1514 plots (gross). With a 62 unit scheme (at the former ATS site) identified as not currently deliverable (1452 units) and a generous 15% non-implementation rate, the number reduces to 1234 dwellings.
- 6.13 Accordingly the adjusted land supply is respectively 6.97 years or 6.17 years-worth of supply. This is, however, not trajectoryised, which is a process by which the Local Planning Authority consults with developers on the roll-out of sites. It gives a more realistic picture of delivery, as it is not possible to assume that all these plots will be delivered in the following 5 years.
- 6.14 A part of the Examination of the Local Plan Sites Document the Council was asked to update the land supply position and to also factor in the delivery of the allocations, based on the roll out of permissions and the proposed allocations obtaining planning permission based on Developer's information. This supply information was accepted by the Local Plan Inspector at the LPSD examination as being deliverable and sufficient to meet needs over the Plan Period.

- 6.15 The Local Plan Sites Document allocated land for 1104 dwellings, giving a total land supply of 4097 for the Plan Period (2012-2027).
- 6.16 IT is considered that the Authority can demonstrate a robust level of supply in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 73 of the NPPF ‘*Local planning authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years’ worth of housing against their housing requirement set out in adopted strategic policies, or against their local housing need where the strategic policies are more than five years old.*’ It should be noted that whilst the Local Plan Strategy Policies are more than five year’s old, a Strategic Housing Market Assessment undertaken in 2016 to assess the Plan housing requirement, confirmed that in conjunction with the operation of the local buffer, it was still appropriate, and did not need updating. This was subsequently part of the evidence base for the Examination of the Local Plan Sites Document.
- 6.17 It is considered that on the basis of the above information the Ryedale Plan (LPS and LPSD) remain appropriate in meeting objectively assessed needs, and remains up to date. On the basis of the supply position, there is no overriding need to release a site on the basis of housing requirements or housing raw supply. As this application represents a departure from the Development Plan, Members therefore are in the position to decide whether the benefits of the proposal outweigh departing from the Development Plan's provisions.

v) Site Specific Considerations:

Affordable Housing Provision and housing mix

- 6.18 Affordable housing need is a significant material consideration. Affordable Housing need is being met, in part through the allocation of housing sites and exception sites. The previous application was revised, during its consideration, to address deficiencies in the scheme in respect of expected occupancy of the affordable homes versus their living room sizes, and transfer values based on room sizes. The Council’s Housing Services have made the following conclusions regarding the scheme, in which they are happy with the quantum of housing, but not the nature of the housing, raising concerns around the size of the 1 and 3 bed units in particular:
- The 1bed (Alnmouth) has a second room- described as an Office- which means that it cannot be described as a 1 bedroom dwelling for Council Tax purposes, and the bedrooms will be, in combination, too small.
 - The 2bed (Henley) is below the nationally described space standards (NDSS) but has an acceptable layout;
 - The 3bed (Windermere) is a 2 bedroom house with an office- falling 14sqm short of the NDSS, creating issues around occupancy and Council Tax. Being over three floors the resulting ground floor living accommodation is insufficient for the expected occupancy of the units.

This has led them to strongly object to the current scheme:

“Despite reiterating our concerns over the initial proposals for the affordable housing on this site, especially considering the issues relating to delivery of the affordable homes on Phase 1 and previous Persimmon schemes and following many discussions, acceptable compromises were made (17/01536/ MFUL), but have reverted back to

unacceptable house types on this revisited application. Building to (MHCLG) Nationally Described Space Standards is a good starting point to make sure we do not have issues with overcrowding, low demand, neighbour issues, high turnover and the effects on the housing element of Universal Credit. In order for housing to support his application, we need to be assured that the units are deliverable. Housing Services therefore strongly objects to the application on the basis of the noted concerns with the 1 and 3 bedroom affordable homes”.

- 6.19 This is disappointing. During the course of the previous application progress was made to amend some of the house types to allow clear bedroom occupancy, the room sizes in terms of bedrooms and living space to be clearly, and adequately, reflected the expected occupancy.
- 6.20 The previous application did have, eventually, interest from a Registered Provider, and despite the need to demonstrate that the affordable housing is deliverable, no interest is indicated in this current application.
- 6.21 Returning to the need for the affordable housing, at the 3 July 2018 Planning Committee Members were minded to approve a scheme in Pickering (at Whitby Road) which will provide a significant contribution of affordable housing within the Plan period at Pickering. Since that time the application has been approved, and construction on the site has commenced. This is a site which is identified as an allocation in the adopted LPSD. This does temper to a degree the weight to be attributed to the benefit of providing affordable housing through this current application in the planning balance. However, in making this argument, it is done in the knowledge that there will be a lag time for the delivery of that affordable housing, as a proportion of the market housing will be delivered first. Members may also note that the permission granted at Firthland Road (described as Phase1) is well under construction and this is expected to deliver some affordable dwellings in advance of the site at Whitby Road.
- 6.22 The scheme proposes 8no.bungalows, in the Folkstone design, which has 2 bedrooms. In a scheme of 161 dwellings, Policy SP4 requires that at least 5% of schemes of over 50 dwellings are provided as bungalows, providing it is viable in conjunction with other requirements or where there are overriding reasons why this cannot be achieved in urban design. This would be just over 8 units, and therefore the proposal is broadly compliant in regard to SP4. Six units are positioned on two blocks the eastern edge of the scheme- facing Goodlands Road, and two units are on the south of the scheme.
- 6.23 It is considered that this proposal does not deliver affordable housing in a manner consistent with Policies SP3 and SP4 of the Ryedale Plan- Local Plan Strategy. Policy SP3 is concerned with ensuring that the "size, type and tenure of affordable units will reflect the affordable housing needs in the locality". Policy SP4 seeks to ensure that the resulting development "contributes to provision of a balanced housing stock, in terms of sizes, and number of bedrooms, and ensure a well-designed inclusive scheme". There is a need to ensure that affordable housing is genuinely deliverable, and will result in good quality homes, that are attractive to Registered Providers. It is considered that the concerns relating to the proposed affordable housing contribution are sufficient to limit the weight to be applied to the affordable housing contribution in the decision making process.

Impact on Highways, Access implications for Pedestrians and Cyclists

- 6.24 A number of the representations received have raised issues regarding the capacity of local road network to accommodate the increased levels of traffic resulting from the proposed development. Whilst the Local Highway Authority have not raised concerns around general traffic movements and junction capacity they have raised the following concerns:
- 6.25 The proposed layout of the scheme results in a large cul-de-sac, and not a loop system, which would have, in the event of an emergency, permitted access in either direction onto the site for the existing 52 units and the proposed scheme. Providing a loop is incorporated- and leaving no more than 50 dwellings on a cul-de-sac, this would be acceptable- with additional traffic calming measures on the road running laterally along the southern boundary.
- 6.26 A number of the proposed house types do not have sufficient parking spaces (6mx3m) and for a 3 and 4 bedrooms a minimum of two spaces is required. The presence of multiple pairs of driveways, being 4.8m wide, results in very little manoeuvrability round the vehicles, particularly where there are multiple parings.
- 6.27 All planting would be expected to be set back a minimum of 2.5 metres from the carriageway and 1.5 metres from the footpath. The position of trees should also take into consideration street lighting, with appropriate set back.
- 6.28 Matters raised in the neighbours' responses are noted, but they principally revolve around driving behaviour, such as parking too close to junctions and not driving at a speed appropriate to the road conditions. As such these are not capable of being considered material in assessing the impact of a development proposal. The Local Highway Authority did not object to the previous application on the grounds of highway capacity, nor have they with this application- their concerns rest with the layout.
- 6.29 In the previous consideration of the scheme, the Highway Authority raised the matter of the formation of a crossing of the A170, to facilitate safe crossing. This has not been raised in relation to this application, as an issue of compliance. This is because of the issues of compliance with the layout of the scheme as existing- and the absence of the loop system is a key issue with the layout. Therefore, it is not clear that the scheme can comply with the provisions of Policy SP10. This is in respect of provision of a network of safe cycling and walking route aligning residential areas with employment sites, town centres and schools and recreational facilities; and the requirement to improve connectivity with existing footpaths, cycle routes, public rights of way and public transport facilities.
- 6.30 Matters regarding the lack of a loop system for dual direction access, the plating and parking considerations have not been addressed in revised plans. Concerns regarding the estate road layout, and parking provision, are not resolved. Therefore it is considered that the scheme as laid out, does not to comply with SP20- Generic Development Management Issues, which is concerned with appropriate and safe access, parking and servicing.

Landscape Setting and Form and Character impacts

- 6.31 The application site is situated within the National Landscape Character Area of the Vale of Pickering, which is primarily defined in extent by the Vale's low-lying topography. However, the 2012 Vale of Pickering Statement of Significance which was produced by Historic England in partnership, makes clear that the cultural landscape of the Vale includes the land which rises into the Moors and Wolds. It states that the Vale landscape is of significance due to the continuous record of habitation from the Mesolithic period through to present day, which about 10,000 years.
- 6.32 The 2011 Landscape Characterisation Project of North Yorkshire and York identifies the area in which this site is situated as 'Open Vale Carr Farmland' but does not go into the same level of detail that the District-level Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) (Landscapes of Northern Ryedale,1999). The landscape features of this site are typical of the LCA which identifies the land as being part of the Vale of Pickering and within Linear Enclosed Farmland. The key characteristic features are:
- Historic linear field pattern
 - Gently sloping land which rises to the north
 - Distinctive linear field systems
 - Locally enclosed landscape.
- 6.33 The changes in levels are generally very gradual, within this area to the south of Pickering, and this has resulted in the site being an area of land which is not readily viewable at distance from principal vantage points. Nevertheless on site, and on adjacent footpaths, the open fields afford the ability to view the rising land of the Fringe of the Moors and key landscape and cultural features such as Beacon Hill and the Church of St. Paul and Peter. It is also an area of land which is framed by the town, with the development along Firthland Road and Greenlands Road. To that extent, it is a site which is read within the context of the built form of Pickering. This relationship has not changed, significantly, with the development of the 52 dwellings to the south of Firthland Road, as the site was previously read within the context of the built edge of Pickering.
- 6.34 This site is identified as being part of the relic mediaeval strip field system through work done on the Historic Landscape Characterisation by NYCC and Historic England. The strip field system remains relatively intact around Pickering. As a non-designated heritage asset, this is principally considered within the heritage section of the report. However, it is clear that the field patterns are also an integral feature of the landscape. Whilst Historic England have not been consulted on this application, they have had long-standing engagement in the work on the Ryedale Plan. On the 2015 sites consultation they advised:
- "The network of historic field boundaries are a distinctive feature of the landscape setting of Pickering and make a significant contribution to the character of the town. With increasing pressure for development around Pickering, this landscape is becoming increasingly threatened. Consequently we fully endorse the Plan's approach to this historic landscape and the intention to direct development away from the areas where the strip fields system is relatively intact and legible."*
- 6.35 The LCA (Landscapes of Northern Ryedale) refers to the presence of the strip fields as

being not unusual within the Fringe of the Moors, which is the rising land to the north. It goes on to state that they are the only examples left in the Vale of Pickering, where the majority of the field boundaries date back to the periods of enclosure in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. On that basis, the presence of the strip fields is particularly important for the understanding of the time-depth of the landscape of the Vale of Pickering. They also represent a particularly important landscape feature for the setting of Pickering.

- 6.36 It is considered that the site's situation is well-related to the built form. However, the strip fields, are a locally distinctive, important feature of the landscape setting of Pickering, and are considered important to be retained where possible.
- 6.37 Given this historic landscape context, Officers have sought to retain as much as possible of these hedgerows in order to balance visibility with retention of as much hedgerow as possible. The applicant has responded to this by reducing the number of incursions to the hedgerows. However, even with the field boundaries retained there are nevertheless impacts on the legibility of the field boundaries as the mass of the development would remove the ability to read the boundaries in their totality. This has occurred in the Mickle Hill Scheme at Pickering. This impact is discussed in greater detail within the heritage section of the report.
- 6.38 Policy SP13 is concerned with protecting the distinctive elements of the landscape character of the Vale of Pickering as a valued local landscape. It is acknowledged that the proposed layout of the site has sought to strike the balance between retaining the hedgerows and meeting highway visibility requirements. The proposed layout has reduced the level of fragmentation of the hedgerows, to an acceptable level in ecological connectivity terms, and it meets highway requirements. However, the presence of the development would be result in unavoidable harm to maintaining the ability to read the strip fields, which have already experienced a loss of integrity, within the landscape setting of Pickering. This is considered to be contrary to the aims of Policy SP13.

Layout and Design

- 6.39 LPS Policy SP20- Generic Development Management Issues- considers the impact of development on the character of the area, and the design implications of development. New development is expected to respect the character and context of the immediate locality and the wider landscape/townscape character in terms of physical features and the type and variety of existing uses. Expanding on this, Policy SP16 - Design- requires that development proposals create high quality durable places that are accessible, well integrated with their surroundings and which, amongst other aspects, reinforce local distinctiveness through the location, siting form, layout and scale of new development respecting the context provided by its surroundings including: topography and landform that shape the form and structure of settlements in the landscape, and that views, vistas and skylines that are provided and framed by the above.
- 6.40 The applicant has proposed a layout which has retained where possible the existing hedgerows to a greater extent than the originally submitted plan. It is considered that whilst the site with the existing built form of Pickering based on the current proposed layout there will be a loss of context because of the impact on the strip fields. As a result the development within the site it will be at odds with the objectives of Policy SP16.

- 6.41 The general layout of some of the houses is considered to raise some concerns. The frontage is very linear on the eastern side of the site and this is despite the changes in property designs and types from the previously submitted scheme. The properties have also been set around 18m from the rear elevations of existing residential properties. However this is not considered to be a satisfactory distance to ensure no direct overlooking, which would be expected to be a minimum of 20 metres. This could be addressed with repositioning and property size and it was not an area of concern in the previous planning application. However, this layout is considered not to be in accordance with Policy SP20 which seeks to ensure that development does not result in a loss of privacy.
- 6.42 In terms of designing out crime, the Police Designing out Crime Officer, has raised no comments on the proposal.

Heritage

- 6.43 The site contains field boundaries which have been identified within the Historic Landscape Characterisation work by NYCC and Historic England as being part of a relic mediaeval strip field system. Whilst Historic England have not been asked to comment on this planning application they have, through the development plan process, highlighted the significance of the level of intactness and preservation of the strip field systems which surround large areas of Pickering. They have identified that these are relatively rare features within the context of the Vale of Pickering, which was mentioned in the Landscape Character Assessment.
- 6.44 'The Vale of Pickering an Extraordinary Place Statement of Significance' is a document produced by now Historic England, with partners. It refers to the 'cultural landscape' definition which is used by UNESCO to refer to "a distinct geographical area ...represent(ing) the combined work of nature and man." The Vale of Pickering is such a landscape. The strip fields are clearly part of that cultural landscape and are considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. When viewed on a map, this area of the strip fields is not quite as intact or legible as other parts of the parish, such as the strip fields to the East of the settlement. Since Members are considering the impact of the development on these features, this level of intactness is important as it makes the field patterns more vulnerable to the effects of development.
- 6.45 The setting of the strip fields is provided by the fields themselves, with the hedgerows being the historic asset by which the field patterns are identified. They have an intrinsic and reciprocal relationship. Historic England have identified that value of a heritage asset may be aesthetic, communal, historic and evidential. It is considered that these particular strip field systems have strongest values of evidential value: the potential of a place to yield evidence about past human activity and historical value: the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected through a place to the present. To a lesser extent are aesthetic value, due to the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place, and communal value: the meanings of a place for the people who relate to it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory.
- 6.46 The applicants have made reference to the previous reason for refusal, and have sought to refine the layout to reduce the amount of incursions into the strip fields. However,

additional gaps in the hedgerow are only part of the significance of the strip fields. They have historic significance; as a record of past land management practices, and have become relatively rare on a wider geographical scale and are concentrated to the south of Pickering with the lower vale land. As discussed when considering the landscape impact, once development occurs in and around the field patterns their ability to be read within the landscape becomes impossible, even if they are retained, because visual relationships and intervisibility between the fields and hedges is lost. This has occurred at some extent at Mickle Hill, Pickering. As such, even with the further reduction in incursions into the hedgerows there would be substantial harm experienced to the strip field system if development was to occur, and that harm to a non-designated heritage asset must be weighed against what public benefit can be derived from the development. Policy SP12 states that the Council will "*seek to ensure that the sensitive expansion, growth and land use change around Market Town and villages... safeguarding surrounding historic landscape character and setting of individual settlements*". It further states that for features of local historic value and interest throughout Ryedale, regard will be made to the scale of any harm of any harm and the significance of the heritage asset. The strip fields are significant within the Vale of Pickering. The identified substantial harm to their integrity, setting and significance, together with the adverse impact on the setting of Pickering, does not accord with the policy expectations of SP12.

- 6.47 The site has been subjected to both geophysical survey and consequential trial trenching. The site includes part of a prehistoric (Neolithic) or Romano-British settlement and its associated field system, and thus is of archaeological significance. The Heritage Unit of NYCC have advised that they are supportive of the approach being proposed, and the heritage assessment is a suitable base line from which to establish the programme of investigation. The density and preservation of the remains varies across the site. The mitigation will take the form of strip, map and record for the most sensitive areas and an archaeological watching brief for those areas of less significance. They have also advised that some areas can be ruled out due to previous work. On that basis, it is considered that in so far as the archaeological implications, the proposal is plan-compliant in terms of Policy SP12, as the proposed works would lead to enhanced understanding commensurate with the significance of the non-designated heritage asset. As part of commenting on the application they have identified conditions, including the submission of a Written Scheme of Archaeological Investigation, which would be imposed if Members were minded to grant the application.

Foul and Surface Water Management

- 6.48 The site is within Flood Zone 1, which is in terms of management of flood risk, is the most suitable flood risk classification, and the site therefore passes the sequential test of ensuring that development occurs in the areas at least risk of flooding. There is still a need to ensure that both foul and surface water management are addressed satisfactorily. In summary, surface water drainage is to be provided through the connection and use of pre-existing land drains. Sustainable drainage systems, where the water percolates into the ground are indicated to be partly feasible based on the ground conditions identified in the FRA/geotechnical survey, but have been the subject of discussion in the previous application. Soakaway/infiltration trenches are identified in the FRA as not suitable due to the "shallow depth at which ground water was encountered" this is particularly at the southern component of the site (as identified in

the geotechnical report). It is proposed to use pumps and tanks to hold back the water to a flow rate which is limited to 5 litres per second.

- 6.49 The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) have sought further clarification with the proposed means of surface water management. These requirements are based on the assumed peak flow of 5l/s (Yorkshire Water's maximum discharge rate):
- :
- Full micro-drainage calculations for the SuDS functionality
 - Drainage Impact Assessment- drainage design drawings with discharge point, flow restriction, attenuation size and capacity and condition/serviceability of the drainage ditch;
 - IDB consent and Yorkshire Water agreement
 - Site levels/impermeable area plan to prove that the proposed gardens/greenspaces do not contribute positively to the drainage system;
 - Designing for exceedance- and exceedance plan showing overland flow routes during an extreme flood event;
 - Confirmation of maintenance agreements along with a maintenance plan/schedule for the proposed SuDS (unless adopted)
- 6.50 The Vale of Pickering Internal Drainage Board, have reiterated their comments made in 2018. They originally objected to the previously submitted application but since further information has been provided they are satisfied subject to the application of conditions as required by the LLFA. They have also recommended that a Scheme for the Management of Surface Water is prepared at detailed design stage and this will provide for the applicant's drainage consent application, which is required prior to commencement of work.
- 6.51 Foul water is proposed to be removed by means of the public sewer. Yorkshire Water have previously confirmed, as part of the previous application that they are satisfied provided only the site's foul water utilises the public sewer, subject to the necessary permissions from Yorkshire Water. However, their response to this application is awaited, and officers have chased for a response. No response has been provided to date and this will be provided in the Late Pages or at the meeting.

Amenity Matters

- 6.52 Adverse impacts on residential amenity have been raised by the residents of Firthland Road and Greenlands Road, who would be in close proximity to the application site. A number of responses have been concerned with construction impacts. However, this is a temporary feature, which is capable of being regulated through conditions to reduce the potential for noise and dust during construction. A number of residents who have enjoyed the open fields would, if permission was granted, have a much changed outlook- but Members will be aware that there is no legal right to a view. Private enjoyment of views is not a material planning consideration. Similarly, impacts on property values are also not a material planning consideration.
- 6.53 The site is proximal to Westgate Carr Industrial Estate, and representations have been made which identify that there would be noise issues experienced by new residents due to activities at the Rosti Automotive enterprise which is to the west of the site. The noise assessment, which considered the full enterprise of Rosti Automotive has been

considered by the Environmental Health Officers. The study is from 2017, and, based on the sensitive receptor points, has not been updated to reflect the extent of the currently proposed scheme, which extends further westwards, closer to the Industrial Estate. When examining the plans, the proposed extension of the bund does not extend as far as the closest dwellings. Therefore, Environmental Health Officers are not satisfied with the report's observations, conclusions and recommended mitigation for the installation of a 2.5m high bund – based on it considering a different layout, set more eastwards. Rosti Automotive were consulted on the previous and current planning application, and they have not made any response regarding whether they consider that the development of the site would conflict with their current, or future operations at the site. The deficiencies in the study have led to Environmental Health Officers to being unable to support the application. Therefore based on the evidence provided noise levels are not satisfactorily addressed relating to policy compliance in respect of noise and Policy SP20.

- 6.54 Yorkshire Water have a sewerage treatment works on the Westgate Carr Industrial Estate. They have confirmed on the previous application that they are satisfied with the application of a minimum 200m cordon sanitaire to ensure no adverse amenity impacts, which could prejudice their operations. Environmental Health Officers have not identified any air quality concerns either in terms of adjacent uses, or as a consequence of the development.
- 6.55 Adjacent residents have raised concerns about the loss of light and overlooking as a result of the scheme. Officers, when considering the previous scheme, sought to ensure that there would be an acceptable level of distance from new and existing units on Greenlands Road, thereby ensuring that there would not be a loss of light nor an overbearing effects, and no levels of overlooking would be achieved which would unacceptably compromise the reasonable living conditions of the residents. The distances involved are decreased from before, being less than c.18m the closest distance between dwellings. This not considered to be within the margins of acceptability in terms of distance concerning overlooking. Whilst some of the dwellings are single storey (there are two terraces of bungalows), the rest are two storey, and it is considered that the proximity of these dwellings on the eastern side of the scheme may result in a detrimental overbearing effect. As such it is considered that as currently designed there is insufficient space between some of the proposed dwellings and the existing properties of Greenlands Road, particularly to the northern component on the eastern side, harming residential amenity through overlooking and a for some properties an overbearing effect. This would be contrary to the provisions of SP16 and SP20.

Education

- 6.56 Persimmon have identified in the Design and Access Statement that they would be prepared to secure land for a new primary school/community use. This is not indicated on the Plan, nor in a draft s.106 setting out heads of terms. Members will be aware that this is a development which would be liable for the Community Infrastructure Levy.
- 6.57 North Yorkshire County Council, as Local Education Authority (LEA), have provided responses to the application setting out the likely impact and potential implications for school places. The LEA have provided their calculations for 161 dwellings. For Pickering Community Infant School, Pickering Junior School and the Secondary School the development generates no need for extra placed, there is no contribution due

to sufficient outstanding capacity.

- 6.58 The response from the LEA demonstrates that based on the application's identified impact, there is no resulting need for a new school to be provided, and indeed there is no short fall in school places. As such the Local Planning Authority is unable to require that land be retained for educational uses through a legal agreement as is not required to mitigate an infrastructure deficit as a result of the development proposed.

The LEA have reiterated in their most recent response that "*please also note that in some circumstances there may be a requirement for additional land as a result of this application*". This is understandable given the lack of available land, but it is not clear what circumstances these would be where the land could be required, given their formal response. The Local Planning Authority can only consider the impacts of the development scheme itself, either directly, or if there is a cumulative consideration, and this is not substantiated.

- 6.59 The LEA have previously advised as part of the consideration of the previous application that if permission is granted for this application, there is a possibility that a new school could be required as a result of cumulative impact based on the delivery of the proposed allocations, and current commitments. This is, however, by no means certain, as pupil numbers have been falling at Pickering, and this current application has not generated any contribution to school places.
- 6.60 As part of work to establish the infrastructure delivery requirements of the Ryedale Plan- Local Plan Strategy, it has been confirmed that the combination of CIL receipts, and any other funding streams which may be accessed, can only meet the delivery of one new primary school. This is to be at Norton Lodge, Norton, where the majority of the residual housing requirement is proposed to be met. This is also to respond to the fact that 50% of the overall housing requirement in the Plan is to be delivered at the Principal Town (Malton and Norton). The LEA have confirmed a new school is needed in Norton on that basis.
- 6.61 The direct impact of the application has therefore been evaluated, and there is existing capacity. The LEA is also clear that with existing permissions and proposed allocations there is no need for a new school at Pickering. On that basis, the Local Planning Authority cannot secure the land to be available for a future educational/community use. Despite the brief reference to providing land for a new school, it is considered that this has no weight in the decision-taking process, as a new school is not required to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

Open space provision

- 6.62 In respect of Policy SP11- Community Facilities and Services- on-site formal children's place is required on a scheme of this size. Based on applying the policies of the Local Plan Strategy for open space provision and children's play space c. 0.8ha of open space is sought. The overall open space provision (covering children's place space, ecological mitigation) is just over 0.5ha- which is around 60% of what the Local Plan Strategy would require. Whilst play space could be distributed through the site, it is better to provide a range of play facilities in a single, larger area. Other forms of open space,

such as informal recreational activity- can be provided across the site, and is considered that this is where the scheme is deficient.

- 6.63 The play area specification is to be confirmed. It is identified on the plan as oval shaped area, and c.700m m² in area with fencing around within a wider area which totals 0.2ha (with the play area). As such the scheme is between a Locally Equipped Area for Play and a Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play. The play area, and the habitat/ecological mitigation area (c.0.3ha) remain as originally proposed.
- 6.64 There are other areas of open space to the north which are between dwellings on the site subject to the approval in 2017 and the dwellings on this site (c.0.07ha within the application site). It is noted that whilst a public footpath system was previously shown to extend round the south and western extent of the site, and within that area are areas of informal open space, in this application these areas have been deleted from the scheme. There is an area of land to the south of the property known as Long Acres, but this is not identified with a specific intended use, and therefore cannot be inferred as public open space. Therefore, there is insufficient public open space provided. This is contrary to Policy SP11 which seeks to ensure that a proportional approach is taken to open space provision, in terms of both the quantum of space to reflect the scale of the development proposed and to provide a range of typologies.

Ecology

- 6.65 The site is predominantly arable farmland and improved grassland. However, the ecological surveys conducted in 2018 (for the previous application) found that the site was of value for a range of biodiversity locally, and that there will be loss of biodiversity if no mitigation, enhancement, creation or restoration of ecological features is undertaken. Members are aware of the statutory responsibility placed on Local Authorities by the NERC Act 2006 (s.40) which states that:
- "The public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity."

- 6.66 The following species were found
- 2 Pipistrelle bat roosts and moderate foraging activity along established hedges
 - Evidence of badger activity but no Sett
 - Long term Barn Owl roosting in existing farm buildings
- And there is the habitat of a network of existing field hedgerows and associated hedgerow trees. The scheme has also reduced the number of incursions into these features, retaining a reasonable degree of connectivity.
- 6.67 The County Council's Ecologist is satisfied with the ecological survey work, and "*the measures proposed to avoid, mitigate and compensate for impacts upon protected species are considered appropriate for the level of impact*". She has suggested a series of conditions, if Members are minded to grant the application. These relate to the provision of a management plan for the sustained management of the hedgerows and ecological habit area.
- Pre-commencement surveys of mobile species to ensure that works undertaken are

- based on the most up to date information and where necessary update the mitigation plans;
- Submission of a detailed Ecological Mitigation, compensation and Enhancement Plan which includes all the measures set out in the Ecological Appraisal and subsequent measures put forward within the Design and Access Statement and Landscape Plan; and
- Submission of an Ecological Monitoring and Management Plan to deal with long-term monitoring and management of the mitigation and compensation features across the site. In line with current DEFRA recommendations, it is suggested that the period of term for management is 30 years.

Both the demolition of barns and any removal of hedge would need a license from Natural England, and would be undertaken at a non-sensitive time for the protected species (in accordance with the above). Policy SP15- Green Infrastructure (GI)- seeks to ensure that new developments enhance GI opportunities by protecting, enhancing, creating and connecting wider elements of GI including, amongst other elements hedgerows. So protecting and enhancing biodiversity and wildlife corridors, to minimise fragmentation of habitats, and to help build greater resilience for species. This is also sought by Policy SP14- Biodiversity - which also expects a net gain in biodiversity to be provided as part of new development schemes. It is considered that the proposal is therefore compliant with Policies SP14 and SP15.

vi) Wider considerations

- 6.68 References have been made in the representations to the land's status as Green Belt; this is not correct. The land is within the Open Countryside as it is outside the Development Limits. The land is agricultural land and identified within the Agricultural Land Classification as being in Grade 3, which could mean that part of the site is what is described as Best and Most Versatile Land. However, the use of such land is to be balanced with wider sustainability considerations, principally whether the need for development outweighs the loss of the land, in accordance with Policy SP17. This report seeks to evaluate and report that consideration process.
- 6.69 The applicants are aware of the CIL charge, and have completed the relevant information. 15% of the money generated through CIL would be given direct to the Town Council, and the remainder spent on key infrastructure provision both in Pickering, and the wider District.
- 6.70 Hydraulic Fracturing is not taking place in the locality of the site. Furthermore it is a minerals planning matter, which is not within the consideration of the District Council as Local Planning Authority.

viii) Conclusions

- 6.71 The site is not allocated for development in Policy SD2 of the Local Plan Sites Document. Aligned to this it is contrary to Policy SP2 of the Local Plan Strategy.
- 6.72 It is for Members to consider whether there are material considerations which would, on balance, justify the release of the site which is not in accordance with the Development Plan, and therefore represent a departure from the Development Plan.

- 6.73 Against the context of a robust housing land supply, as a key material consideration, there is no need to release the site for the proposed use.
- 6.74 The loss of significance of the non-designated heritage asset of the strip fields is a sustained concern in relation to development of this site. The harm to the significance of the strip fields cannot be mitigated, as it is loss of the fields which undermines their significance. This is contrary to a number of Policies within the Development Plan concerning protection of heritage assets, and the impacts of landscape setting on the form and character of the setting of settlements.
- 6.74 There are also a number of issues/deficiencies with the proposed scheme which it is considered weigh against the scheme. These are:
- Concerns over the acceptability and deliverability of the affordable housing;
 - Highways concerns through the non-use of a loop system for dual access;
 - Amenity issues raised by the position of dwellings relative to the Rostie McKeekie scheme and Greenlands Road;
 - Non-plan compliant levels of public open space

Some of these issues could (and indeed were) addressed in the previously considered scheme.

- 6.75 The scheme does not accord with the Policies of the adopted Development Plan. There are considered to be no material considerations which outweigh the provisions of the Development Plan. The proposal is therefore recommended for refusal for the reasons set out below.

RECOMMENDATION: **Refusal**

- 1 The site is not allocated for residential use in the Development Plan. To approve the application would be a departure from the Development Plan. There are no benefits of the scheme, as material considerations, which would outweigh the identified harm and the scheme raises issues of non-compliance with policies of the Ryedale Plan - Local Plan Strategy when read as a whole. It is also not in accordance with the Ryedale Plan-Local Plan Sites Document, in particular Policy SD2, which identifies the proposed allocations.
- 2 The proposal would result in substantial harm to the hedgerows and their setting which make up the historic strip fields which are on this site. This would result in substantial harm to the significance of a non-designated heritage asset and the setting of Pickering, contrary to the provisions of Policies SP12, SP13 and SP16 of the adopted Ryedale Plan-Local Plan Strategy.
- 3 The absence of a 'loop' road system prevents the ability of emergency vehicles to fully access the site. The proposed layout effectively operates as a cul-de-sac, and therefore does not meet the standards required by the Local Highway Authority in respect of providing access for emergency vehicles on larger residential schemes. This is contrary to Policy SP20 of the adopted Ryedale Plan- Local Plan Strategy, which is concerned with the provision of appropriate and safe access and servicing of development.

- 4 The proposed affordable housing provision, with regard to the 1 and 3 bedroom units, is considered to be unacceptable for the purposes of establishing occupancy. Some of the bedrooms are of insufficient size for their expected occupancy, and there is also not a commensurate level of living accommodation relative to the number of proposed bedrooms when three-story accommodation is used. As a result, the affordable dwellings are considered to be undeliverable. Therefore this aspect of the application is contrary to the provisions of Policies SP3 and SP4 of the adopted Ryedale Plan-Local Plan Strategy, concerned with affordable housing provision and housing mix and type.
- 5 The proposed layout and extent of the proposed housing of the proposed housing on the south western extent of the site projects beyond the range of previous noise assessments and is not fully covered by the acoustic bund. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the noise generated from the adjacent industrial estate can be satisfactorily integrated in order to protect the residential amenity of the occupiers of the proposed dwellings. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy SP20 of the Ryedale Plan - Local Plan Strategy.
- 6 The proposed layout and extent of the purposed dwellings on the eastern side of the site directly look onto existing dwellings on Greenlands Road. There is less than 20m distance between the existing and proposed dwellings and this is insufficient to ensure that there will be no loss of privacy for the occupants of properties in Greenlands Road and the occupants of the proposed dwellings the proposal is therefore contrary to Policy SP20 of the Ryedale Plan- Local Plan Policy.
- 7 Whilst some elements of open space are plan compliant (ecological area and children's play space area), the overall scheme provides just over half the expected publically accessible open space required by the Policy SP11 of the adopted Ryedale Plan - Local Plan Strategy. This is a policy which seeks to ensure that a commensurate amount of on-site open space is provided, to provide meaningful and usable space to meet the range of needs for the residents. This is therefore contrary to Policy SP11 of the adopted development plan.