

Application: Sproxton Hall Farm – change of use and alteration of farm buildings to form a mixed-use events and venue

Planning Application No: 20/00695/FUL

Second Re-consultation response from Sproxton Parish Meeting – Monday, 15th March 2021

I write as Parish Clerk on behalf of Sproxton Parish Meeting following the Ordinary Meeting held on Monday, 15th March by Zoom.

At the meeting, residents were again re-consulted on the above planning application, following discussions on the Acoustic Report and re-amended Transport Statement on the RDC planning website. Following guidance from RDC, only the Acoustic Report and changes to the amended Transport Assessment were discussed and the Parish voted upon **two** points:

- **“Having read the Acoustic Report, do Sproxton Parish Meeting feel that the contents of the report alleviates their concerns with regards to noise?”**
- **“Having read the amended Transport Assessment, do Sproxton Parish Meeting feel that the contents of the report alleviates their concerns with regards to highways matters?”**

ACOUSTIC REPORT:

The principle points which were raised at the meeting regarding the **Acoustic Report** were as follows:

Several parishioners mentioned numerous inconsistencies between the Acoustic Report and submissions on actual planning application/site visit such as:-

1. Noise from outside activities – noise assessment does not take into consideration impacts of outside noise activities. No reference in the acoustic report to any outside activities whatsoever, contradicting discussions with the applicants during site visits and village meeting discussions, as well as the planning application itself (eg. gatherings, fire pits, mingling, meadow walks, music).

The noise management plan states the only music outside will be “non-amplified, acoustic band/lone pianist/ violinist or otherwise non-amplified music” and is therefore inconsistent with the acoustic report’s assessment where the assumption is that guests will enter from the car park and the doors will then close on the gateway/tunnel and all noise will be contained. This is unrealistic.

2. Containment of noise within venue – assumptions made in the Acoustic report, such as the building having a flat roof and solid walls and the ‘tunnel’ being closed, do not match the plans of the building given in the planning application itself. The Acoustic Report predicates that the whole venue will be fastened up with no openings and the breakout noise calculations have been based upon this. Even a window being opened will affect the noise coming from the venue. A gateway with door closings is mentioned. The management of door and window closings will not be possible in the summer months with partying guests.

3. The proposal is not simply a wedding venue, it is a multi-events venue – most of the report is written on the assumption that all events are weddings, but there is concern about the kind of activities and associated noise that would come from outside and around the venue when used for a wider variety of events which villagers will have to put up with year-round.

4. Times when the outside breakout noise is above ambient sound levels – the report identifies times when outside break out noise is 'positive' (6/7db) above that of the ambient sound. This is actually fairly significant but the report seems to dismiss this. And this is only mentioned in situations making up 10% of the time, however this is based on an average. Crucially, at the times when this 'positive' breakout sound above ambient is at its peak, it will be significantly louder than the levels specified eg. bass drum beats. Therefore the actual sound levels heard outside will be considerably louder than the figures reported. Also, the report discusses breakout noise using the lowest equivalences, which is not what you would expect in such a sound report. All this sound estimation is predicated on a particular band playing at a particular loudness which seems to have been an over- optimistic assumption of the level of decibels.

5. Expected noise levels within the venue- page 36 of the Acoustic Report states that expected noise levels within should not exceed 95db and the next paragraph states there should be an 'electric noise limiter'. How will this alarm sound and be managed, if noise is exceeded? It then states that this limiter is not strictly necessary due to the favourable assessment of the noise breakout from that room being always less than 95db. Clearly, actual noise levels will be specific to each event. How will any person managing the venue (and the presence of such a person is not confirmed within the noise management plan) confirm that noise is not exceeding 95db? This will only be maintained with the doors closed... does this mean you must turn the music off before each person goes out from the venue? This is totally impractical and unmanageable for the whole event, each event, year round.

6. Technicality of the Acoustic Report- the noise assessment itself states that it is essential that construction recommendations are followed so that noise ceases to be an issue. However, it then states how difficult it is to get acoustic data for the materials to be used in construction so an estimate has been made for the purposes of this report. How can they assure us therefore, that using those recommended construction methods and materials will be effective in the way that they say they will be?

The noise report seems to be full of inaccuracies, is inadequate, difficult to understand and the content not particularly helpful to the villagers.

One parishioner stated that it might be worthwhile seeking a second opinion of an independent source with technical knowledge in this field to be sought regarding the findings of the Acoustic Report as it seems highly technical, difficult to understand and seems to raise questions about accuracy/understanding.

7. Loss of amenity and impacts from noise is a significant issue for the nearest neighbours to the proposed site, Sproxton Hall Holiday Cottages:-

Neighbouring property is not simply one private dwelling – the home and business comprises 4 self-contained cottages sleeping a total of 19 people. Amenity and the impact of a development must take into account the *users* of neighbouring land, not just the owners. Therefore 19 people not 2 (based on occupancy when open in 2020 of over 90%). Planning needs to be compatible with the existing ambience of the immediate locality, surrounding area and with neighbouring land uses and should not prejudice the continued operation of existing neighbouring land uses.

8. Site noise management is unclear (vehicle sounds also) - whilst sound insulation and a noise limiter has been mentioned, (assuming that these are actually going to be included and sufficient), this does not go far enough. There are particular concerns around noise associated with movement of vehicles. Currently, every item of traffic as well as voices of those on foot can be clearly heard at the cottages. Thus, experience tells us that the assessment is incorrect when it states that vehicular noise will be largely inaudible. The owners' bedroom is 4 metres away from where cars will be driving, partially on an unmade road (not tarmac roads) with potholes/puddles (not 10 metres as mentioned in the noise report).

9. Noise levels quoted on the road to the venue are only just within permissible limits- eg. Acoustic Report quotes that if cars are driving at 25mph. and do not have a sound system on in their car, it will just meet the levels permissible at night. This is unrealistic as it is unlikely that guests leaving the venue will do so quietly and the catering lorries leaving even later will be louder. Therefore this will be breaking the sound limits.

The noise from the traffic created by this venue (in excess of 100 cars potentially), is ludicrous for a village of this size. This will affect everybody in the village.

10. Detrimental impact on Holiday Cottages' business & USP- the Holiday Cottages have been extensively developed over the past three years, defining customer base and marketing accordingly. The importance of peace, quiet, tranquility and serenity in the area cannot be overstated and are highly valued, particularly as they are increasingly rare and special qualities. The cottages market themselves as being a hidden gem and differentiate from other providers on the basis of offering relaxing and quiet retreats away from busy life with great success. Guests return due to the overall ambience, character and beauty of the location, making the most of the stunning views by being outside well into the evening in the summer months. The holiday cottages rely a lot on repeat business (particularly out of the main summer season) and on positive guest reviews (e.g. all reviews have been 5* from Airbnb throughout 2019 & 2020). Negative reviews lead to reduced bookings and no repeat customer or recommendations.

11. Employment created from the establishment of a wedding/ events venue at Sproxton Hall would be potentially negated by the loss of business to Sproxton Hall Holiday Cottages – the

actual impact of this establishment might well cause the downfall of another, leading to a net 'zero employment gain'. Therefore there is no particular benefit to the local economy.

12. Issue of redress regarding control of guests' behaviour difficult as a 'dry-hire' facility- the opportunity for weddings creating repeat business is not great. Not only is the event a 'one-off', but as a 'dry-hire' venue, the usual control you would have over a customer's behaviour, ie. the sanction being that you are banned from returning if you do not follow the rules, would not apply to one-offs. The experience of parishioners who have run conferences and events in the past is that you cannot 'tell people who are celebrating not to have fun'. As a dry-hire, the element of controlling unwanted behaviour is reduced very significantly.

13. Noise from air conditioning units/ generators not taken into consideration- the plans also state the need for an air conditioning unit but there doesn't seem to be any consideration for the additional noise such a unit would produce.

14. Lack of Air Conditioning will lead to hot partygoers opening doors and windows – the noise assessment mentions on 'mechanical ventilation', not Air Conditioning. Therefore, when people get hot, they will inevitably open doors and windows and this is impossible to police. This will result in much higher noise levels than those taken into consideration by the noise assessment report. Air conditioning should be a stipulation at the very least.

15. Consideration of villagers using their own private outdoor spaces has not been taken into consideration - the Villagers as a whole will be affected by the noise from weddings and events at the weekend when they want to sit in their gardens outside, so the noise measurements and impact will be greater than those taken with the assumption that villagers will be inside their homes with their doors closed.

15. Concerns regarding the venue being 'dry-lease' and using external suppliers to provide resources at events:-

Vehicles used by suppliers – these will be larger, heavier vehicles transporting chairs & tables, hog roasts and associated equipment, catering equipment etc. These will not only produce more noise and create additional traffic but they will also be arriving on the days leading up to the event, departing around an hour after the end of the event in the early hours and also in the days after the event. Thus traffic noise will continue even longer. Such 'wedding' venues are often also used for school proms, 21sts and 18ths, where it can be even more difficult to keep clients within the venue inside and they are increasingly unlikely to adhere to the rules regarding noise pollution eg. no low bass music. The difference in transmission of sound between a 'disco' and a live band is completely different, especially when the venue is playing this music until midnight.

16. Carpark screening- the report states that 50% of the car park is screen by a dense growth of trees. There are trees there, but it is not very dense at all. Also, if 50% is screened, what happens to the noise from the other 50%? This has not been addressed.

17. Noise from ancilliary equipment/ machinery – mechanical ventilation at the venue and any generators brought onto site to support hired equipment will also create potential noise and may run continuously for great lengths of time. Villagers living in the houses well set back from the road in the village with double/ triple glazing can still hear large vehicles driving past when inside their homes so any extra noise is of great concern.

One resident queried the need for generators to supply the power required for such a venue and to light up the car park and the associated noise created. This has not been mentioned in any assessment. This is crucial as this would be consant noise.

The applicant's son pointed out that there was mains electrical supply to the farm at the end of the village and it wasn't purely run on generators.

18. Large numbers of people create significant noise- the numbers expected to attend at the top end of the scale will triple the number of people in the village so significant noise is bound to be generated.

19. The Acoustic Report suggests a large list of 'regulations' for guests to adhere to – How will guests be informed about this in advance of attendance? (Eg. going straight into the venue, not staying around outside, keeping car sound system volume low while driving down the street.) These messages need to be delivered before arrival so would these be stipulated on the website and would a list be sent to guests with invitations? This wouldn't be a great marketing ploy so how would this be ensured?

20. Currently the village is exceptionally quiet with virtually zero traffic uring the night – residents often walk dogs etc. very late at night and report no traffic movement by 11pm certainly and no movement of vehicles until the morning. The concern is that even one car at night represents an increase in traffic.

One resident who has lived in the village 21 years, stated that the village is very quiet. Her research of The Ryedale Plan etc. highlights that rural places are usually to be kept rural and quiet if possible. If there is a venue, even with only 50 cars and 100 guests, the passage of cars one after the other in procession, with the associated sounds of doors slamming and intoxicated happy voices saying their loud goodbyes as they all exit at virtually the same time will undoubtedly disturb the quiet of the night.

21. Movement of vehicles & associated road noise late at night in anti-social hours - The village street is the only way through the village and is in close proximity to people's bedrooms. This will cause unacceptable disruption to residents here when large numbers of vehicles leave at the same time at night. The hours of operation need to be restricted so that the status quo of the overnight period is kept. The number of vehicles is going to change from less than one to somewhere around 50-100 vehicles between the hours 2300 to 0300 and some of these will be heavy vehicles. The noise created is unacceptable.

22. Negative impacts upon health & well-being - this was mentioned on several occasions. Any increase in noise will have a detrimental effect on the character & useability of the village street amenity and in turn on our health and wellbeing.

Night-time noise especially, is unfair for the Holiday Cottages, those positioned close to the road, for those living in listed housing where we are not allowed double-glazing and have no foundations, and for those sleeping with their windows ajar in the hot summer months. This disturbed sleep will be detrimental to everybody's health. People come here to enjoy the peace and quiet and tranquility and when there is the opportunity in this world to grasp this, we should hold onto it and protect it and leave the village as it is.

23. COVID-19 safety of the venue- possibly a shorter term issue but the report states that the noise will be controlled by the closing of doors and windows and by using mechanical ventilation within. How is this compatible with a Covid-safe venue? In the short term, this could mean doors and windows will need to be open for good ventilation, leaking noise into the village. Would the mechanical ventilation also require air exchange for Covid safety?

24. Sproxtton is situated within the AONB with public bridleway alongside venue – we are in the AONB and in an area of tranquillity and this must be taken into account by the noise assessment. The noise assessment does not take into account the bridleway/footpath that runs right alongside the venue. This will clearly have an impact on people's enjoyment of that route. Some villagers regularly ride their horses on this route and this will not be possible if there are gatherings, traffic and noise alongside this route which has a big impact on the villagers' use and enjoyment of that bridleway.

25. Images of how the venue might appear when first introduced to the village- the lovely images initially shown to the village as to how the development might appear do not seem to match the alterations required for the building to match that described in the acoustic assessment. This is a big discrepancy. It is therefore also puzzling as to why the conservation officer has not been consulted again as a result of these changes which represent a major change to the appearance of the venue, particularly as there are new additions (eg. gates on the

entrance to the 'tunnel') which are part of the Grade 2 listed structure. Villagers would like to see more on this from the Conservation officer.

26. The National Planning Policy Framework talks about cumulative effects of noise – This is very important and is not just about cars, or guests mingling outside, or other outside entertainments (eg. bouncy castles/ clay pigeon shooting) or the music noise but the cumulative effect of all of these and especially as the planning application is for 7 days and 7 nights a week, 365 days of the year. It is not just one car/ one walk through a meadow, but the cumulative effect upon the village.

RE-Amended Transport Statement: ROAD WIDENING

The principle points raised at the meeting against and in favour of the re-amendments on the Traffic Statement (additional passing places close to Sproxton Hall Farm) are as below. These are in addition to the extensive discussions on this matter summarised in the previous consultee response in Appendix A - RDC document reference: 2137791

:

2137791	DC Consultation Parish	Tuesday, February 2, 2021
---------	------------------------	---------------------------

The applicant's son explained why three extra passing places had been incorporated in the re-amended plan at the far end of the village close to the venue- this came about after discussions at the last Parish Meeting in January. The visibility was deemed to be poor on this bridleway section of the lane so one passing place was moved from one side of the road to the opposite, pushing the hedge back to the tree line so you are able to see all the way down. The extra passing places include one at the front of Sproxton Hall which was suggested after speaking with another local farmer who felt this would be helpful in order to deal with his farm traffic.

1. New/enlarged passing place at section of road beyond the public highway going beyond the Village Hall up to Sproxton Hall Farm –involves removing a large section of hedge and moving it back into the field. Will this affect the chestnut trees that are there? Will they be cut down? Another villager commented that taking out 150 yards of hedgerow and replacing with (most probably) bare-root planting to replace it is not helpful. This hedge is home to very many species of wildlife and it would be a devastation to lose this.

Not only this, but where there is a new passing place, the ground increases quite steeply so it will not be simply a removal of a hedge but there will need to be considerable earthworks to create a flat surface. What would the appearance of this be – would it involve a steep bank?

2. Necessity for inter-visibility between passing places at section of road beyond the public highway going past from the Village Hall up to Sproxton Hall Farm – the re-amended plan creates three new passing places with inter-visibility between them deemed necessary on this small stretch of lane but in the Sanderson's Transport report, it states that this inter-visibility between the passing places in the main part of the village is not necessary. How then, will this

ease traffic volumes and improve flow? Therefore there seem to be lots of inaccuracies and contraindications in the original Sanderson's Transport Report.

3. Passing places on road beyond the public highway going past from the Village Hall up to Sproxton Hall Farm are actually on a public bridleway- Public bridleways must be useable by all users, ramblers, cyclists, dog-walkers & horse riders. There are villagers who regularly use this bridleway on horseback and these horses are certainly not going to stand in a traffic pull-in for lengths of time as traffic goes past on a narrow lane. These passing places do not do anything to make this stretch of road more useable.

4. The narrow lane in Sproxton village is unsuitable for use by the numbers of vehicles potentially arriving for events regardless of extra passing places – several parishioners stated that a lack of passing places has never been an issue as villagers are considerate of one another and cars are able to reverse. Asking the village to incorporate an extra 150 vehicles is not acceptable. Why should this peaceful, tranquil place alter its road structure to cater for a single wedding venue when there is no benefit to the community and further it will only serve to destroy the village amenity when walking and meeting with neighbours in the village as we regularly do.

The point was also made that wide tarmac passing places will not solve the high flow traffic problem and will spoil the village scene and make the village unattractive to the eye. Another parishioner seconded this and stated that once the need for so many deliveries wanes after Covid times, there would be no trouble with deliveries and passing once again. She felt the need to retain the character of this beautiful, unmodernised village.

One parishioner mentioned that the Village voted overwhelmingly that the transport arrangements were totally unsuitable at the last Parish Meeting (see Appendix 1) and other than the addition of passing places at the far end of the village, the transport statement remains unchanged and remains wholly unsuitable for the village.

5. More passing places in the modern age- One villager stated that Sproxton has grown organically and with today's larger vehicles (eg. tractors, oil delivery, courier companies) needed more passing places. The original proposal was good and the applicant has responded to views and adjusted the planning with an additional passing place. The applicant has tried to make a proposal which is acceptable and workable.

Another villager commented in response that the passing places would work well with a low flow of traffic, but the issue was that with a high flow of traffic in one direction (from/to an event), and whilst that might enable a single vehicle to move in the opposite direction, this vehicle may remain stranded there with a high number of vehicles on the other side of the road. How will the passing places solve that problem regarding venue traffic?

6. Lack of response from Highways regarding amended Transport Assessment – they do not seem to have commented on the changes and no communications have come from Highways for some time.

OTHER POINTS

- The point was repeatedly made by a number of villagers that an alternative route to the venue across the applicant's own land to the A170 at the rear of the venue would reduce many but not all of the noise & traffic issues associated with the application for the whole village and for Sproxtton Hall Holiday Cottages.
- The Chair asked if the owners of Sproxtton Hall Holiday Cottages, Helen & David Wells, had been consulted as business owners by the firm compiling the Acoustic Report. They replied they had not been consulted at all.

After the discussions, Sproxtton Parish Meeting voted TWICE to determine their status regarding the amended planning application. The vote was done publically on Zoom, with each current parish elector present at the meeting having one vote.

The Parish Clerk clarified the FIRST question to be voted upon by quoting directly from an email response from RDC:

"Having read the Acoustic Report, do Sproxtton Parish Meeting feel that the contents of the report alleviates their concerns with regards to noise?"

The results of this vote were as follows:

**50 electors voted in total:
42 Against (No): 84%
8 For (support/yes): 16%
0 Abstentions**

Then, Parish Clerk clarified the SECOND question to be voted upon by quoting directly from an email response from RDC: **"Having read the amended Transport Assessment, do Sproxtton Parish Meeting feel that the contents of the report alleviates their concerns with regards to highways matters?"**

The results of this vote were as follows:

**50 electors voted in total:
41 Against (No): 82%
9 For (support/yes): 18%
0 Abstentions**

Therefore, if an average is taken of the two votes, 83% of the Parish remain in objection to the Planning application, having considered the Acoustic report and re-amendments to the Transport Statement.

This is a fair and honest representation of the meeting. Full approved minutes can be found in

Appendix B.

Signed ...D. Hazorika-Stéphany.....26/03/21
Clerk of Sproxton Parish Meeting

**APPENDIX A: Minutes from Sproxton Parish Meeting Ordinary Meeting 25/01/21
(Discussion of initial amendments to Transport Statement)**



7pm – 7.10pm: Residents log into the Zoom Meeting. Residents informed the Zoom meeting would be recorded for the purpose of accurate minute-taking by the clerk.

PRESENT:

Clerk: Doobori Hazorika-Stéphany (minutes), Chris Parkin (guest)
Joanna & Rob Oliver, Chris Jenkins & Di Garside, George & Maureen Skinner, Joanne & Simon Welford, Katie Welford, Ann Spetch, Mary Welford & Matthew Clarke, Charlie Marwood, Kath and Dave Kershaw, Elaine & Steve Burgess, Margaret & Franklin Farrar, Helen & Dave Wells, Fiona Wainwright, Henry Wainwright, Ted Wainwright, Peta Poole, Emma & Jeremy Shaw, Juliane Schaub & Selwyn Jones, Ian & Katie Boddy, Colin Ward, Mike & Priscilla McAndrew, Pam & Ross Pattison, Sue & Mark Balmforth, John Rowley, Mathieu Hazorika-Stéphany, Fliss

Murtagh, Rosy Eaton, Anne & Philip Blackburn, Ann & Brian Mellor, Sarah & Jamie Vandebroecke, Nancy & Bob Roberts.

APOLOGIES: Mark Wainwright (Chair), Bob & Kate Shaw, Stuart & Linda Wilson, Joyce Walters, Vera & John Dransfield, John Ford.

Parish Clerk (Doobori Hazorika-Stéphaney) to explain how the Zoom meeting will proceed.

Welcome by Doobori Hazorika-Stéphaney, Parish Clerk: DHS read out apologies and then read a pre-prepared statement (See Appendix 1). DHS added an extra agenda item regarding the need to confirm that minutes would be checked and verified prior to Clerk writing the Sproxton Parish Meeting response to Ryedale District Council.

AGENDA ITEMS:

AGENDA ITEMS	DISCUSSION AND COMMENTS	ACTION REQUIRED BY WHOM/ DATE	OUTCOME
<p>1.1 Election of a temporary Chair for the purposes of this meeting only</p> <p>1.1 Chris Parkin to read out statement pre-prepared by Parish Clerk</p>	<p>DHS explained how voting would occur and that only 1st proposer required in legislation. Only one nominee: Chris Parkin (proposed by George Skinner), therefore motion carried and Chris Parkin elected Chair for the purpose of this meeting only.</p> <p>(See Appendix 2)</p>	<p>Signing of minutes after they are prepared.</p>	
<p>2. Discussion of Amendments to Sproxton Hall Farm Planning Application (see document reference and weblink below</p>	<p>2.1 ROAD WIDENING</p> <p>2.1a Intervisibility of passing places – whole street is narrow with some extremely narrow sections which cannot be widened, there are several bends, and also a gradient coming from the B1257. The key point is that there is no inter-visibility between the proposed passing</p>		

<p>minutes). <i>Not recorded in discussion order, but points collated for clarity.</i></p> <p>This includes:</p> <p>2.1 - road widening at three points within Sproxtton village</p> <p>2.2 - an extended parking area in an adjacent field</p> <p>2.3 - a designated drop-off point</p>	<p>places on the narrowest parts of the village street. This poses a grave risk to road safety.</p> <p>2.1b Increase in traffic - Many are concerned that this proposal would generate a significant increase in traffic flow, particularly tidal traffic and none of the proposals in the amended transport statement will solve this problem.</p> <p>The tidal flow of event traffic may well cause a problem at the narrowest point of the villages (at the top, western end close to the junction with the main road) where the width is just 3.7m. If there are cars bottle-necking in the passing places, this could easily result in an accident as cars turn onto/ off the B1257.</p> <p>The length of the passing places would only accommodate two cars and this won't be enough. They are all situated in the widest parts of the village, on one side of the road which is not helpful to ease the issue. Also, there is no intervisibility between two sets of passing places.</p> <p>2.1c Street is narrow in general with no kerbs or footpaths and limited lighting -</p> <p>The narrowness of the street has led to near misses on several occasions amongst residents and regular extensive verge damage which has been reported on numerous occasions over the years to the Highways department.</p> <p>Several residents mentioned damage to stone walls, even in places that are not particularly narrow in the village (eg. Honeystone House).</p> <p>Much of this traffic would be leaving the village in the dark – this isn't a village</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>with a lot of streetlights and most people would certainly not want these introducing. This would impact the Dark Skies nature of our village and the night traffic would cause further issues with bottlenecks and risks reversing/accessing/egress from homes. Also, several villagers walk their dogs in the dark at night and a large number of vehicles leaving at night increases the danger to these residents as well as during the day.</p> <p>In order to demonstrate the fact that passing places will not solve the issue of movement, let us consider the widest points of the village street. There is a wider section outside Whitestone Lodge. As it is wider, this is where cars often park on the road and as a result cars have regularly squeezed through, causing damage to the verge on multiple occasions and several times causing damage to the wall. How will a passing place slightly up the road in a narrower part address the problem when issues like this are already occurring on the widest sections of the road/?</p> <p>2.1d Part of the charm of the village lies in the quaintness of its grass verges, lack of kerb, footpath and street lighting giving it a rare street scene - the introduction of road widening measures such as passing places will reduce the character of the village lane and affect the street scene adversely.</p> <p>Although Sproxton is beautiful, road has difficulty accommodating larger vehicles of today and the increased deliveries of courier companies, oil deliveries and</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>supermarket shops, causing damage to walls, verges and annoyance to the villagers. The village needs some sort of solution to the problem of the road to move into the future and the creation of these passing places would do this.</p> <p>There are other villages with even narrower lanes and passing places and in such villages, drivers simply reverse up to the last passing place and allow other vehicle to go past. Passing places could prevent people from trying to squeeze past and hit walls etc. so could be a positive for day-to-day Sproxton driving.</p> <p>The presence of passing places does not necessarily mean that drivers will drive badly as a result of the road widening. These are part of everyday life in rural northern Scotland and a sensible driver's attitude changes when they see one, or it should do if driving safely. This would support the argument for passing places.</p> <p>Passing places used by resident villagers who consider each other and respect each other and make up a small number of cars moving around the village at different times of the day, is a completely different situation to possibly 220 guests (as stated in planning application) wanting to arrive at a venue at the same and all leave at a similar time. Music will stop at a certain time and they will all want to leave the venue. Similarly, they will all need to arrive together, too. There is a big difference between a village using a passing place and a wedding using a passing place and the volumes of cars involved. It is the volume of cars using the spaces at exactly the same time that</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>causes concern.</p> <p>This is a huge proposal and although there is empathy with the need to diversify a family business, the benefit will be to one family. Perhaps, as suggested elsewhere in the meeting, since the applicant owns the land to the main road, the alternative route should be considered as a viable alternative out of respect to the other occupants of the village. This wouldn't address the other concerns around noise pollution, light pollution and the fact that only a very small number of people stand to benefit at great inconvenience to many.</p> <p>The presence of passing places will encourage people to park in the village.</p> <p>2.1e Movement of vehicles & associated road noise late at night in anti-social hours - The village street is in close proximity to people's bedrooms and not only is this a nuisance for many people but passing place no. 2 is right next to the bedrooms at The Annexe, Stable Cottage & Keeper's Cottage. This will cause unacceptable disruption to residents here when large numbers of vehicles leave at the same time at night.</p> <p>There will be an undoubted increase in road noise as a consequence of this proposal going ahead. A different route from the A170 might be favourable for everyone in the village.</p> <p>2.1f Loss of village residential amenity – this is a close-knit village and there are many community events, notably the recent 'Pumpkin Promenade' where residents walked up the village viewing each other's pumpkin displays on</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>Hallowe'en and the hugely successful VE Day front garden/driveway celebrations to name just two amusements that we have. These events afford an incredible sense of community and the increase in traffic will compromise such events and personal usage of the road as it is the actual village lane which is the connection that allows these things to go ahead. The emphasis should be not on what the cars are doing but on what the people are doing – the village lane is our civic amenity which affects what we do, how we relate to the village and how we join together. Over the COVID crisis, if we had not had this village amenity in the way we have it now and the support of villagers, we would have been a lot weaker. The planning proposal will certainly compromise our residential amenity.</p> <p>Our village street does not have a footpath and this level of increase in road traffic would cause significant loss of residential amenity to the numerous regular dog walkers, many of whom frequent the village street past Sproxton Hall multiple times per day. At the moment, it is just about safe enough for a 92 year old daily dog walker to use, occasionally moving onto the verge/ driveways as vehicles pass, this would not be possible with increased vehicle numbers.</p> <p>Also, there are several resident horse riders who use the village street to exercise their horses regularly, as well others using the road and bridleways for equitation. NYCC Environmental Health</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>& Rights of Way department have stated that the bridleway may have to be diverted if this application goes ahead as it will not be useable in the narrow parts with the predicted increase in traffic. Thus the use of the village street will be changed and from Ryedale Portal (Local Plan) it appears that priority is supposed to be given to non-vehicular users of the street when it comes to considering planning applications. The residents' use of the street appears to have been overlooked when you consider the increased traffic due to events and all the ancillary traffic before and after created by a dry-use venue.</p> <p>2.1g Proximity of Holiday Cottages across the road - There hasn't been due consideration to the impact upon the holiday cottages and their business as a result of the proposed development. If as a business, your marketing is around quiet solitude and a rural, tranquil environment, there are a lot of issues around whether your clients will want to book for their week/ two week's holiday if there is nuisance caused by traffic/ noise in that area. This development would not be right in this community in this location.</p> <p>2.1h Document Approval from NYCC - One resident noted that the amended transport statement refers to the amended document being written with approval of North Yorkshire County Council. There is no document outlining this approval available on the portal. Where is this approval to be found?</p> <p>2.1i Passing place number 2 in</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>Sanderson's report – This is mentioned at the junction between Stable Cottage, The Annexe and Greystones. There is not currently a passing place there. Vehicles cannot pass at this point as there is a vertical wall 5 feet high at the South East end. There is not sufficient physical space before the wall for anything other than two cars to pass. This cannot be widened further. The foundations are within 2 meters of the wall (which already has scrape damage). As the place is only sufficient for two cars, when a larger vehicle tries to squeeze through, the likelihood of serious wall damage is very high.</p> <p>2.1j Telegraph poles - The second passing place has a telegraph pole in the way, which could be considered to be very dangerous. It is extremely vulnerable. This telegraph pole has all the telephone and broad band connection for a large number of village properties. This does not appear to have been noted in the documents.</p> <p>2.1k Drains - there is a drain in the way. The creation of a passing place would cause this drain to get blocked up and cause flooding, creating even more problems with floodwater at the bottom of the village.</p> <p>2.1l Previous large-scale planning application in Sproxton rejected– in 1990 there was a planning application to build a golf course in Sproxton. This was refused at the time. We cannot find the documentation to confirm this, but there is a suspicion that RDC refused this on the grounds of inaccessibility. The</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>creation of the 3 passing places will not solve the access issues, it may even cause further bottlenecks, rendering residents prisoners in their own homes as they may not be able to get out.</p> <p>2.1m Cars may actually increase in speed as a result of passing places – there have been numerous complaints about speeding in the village over the years. The passing places will simply exacerbate this, for example, during non-peak times, the road-widening measure of passing place will encourage people to drive faster as it is actually the narrowness of the road itself that encourages people to keep the speed low.</p> <p>2.1n Other road users – there seems to be no consideration at all to the fact that this road is not only used by vehicles; it is also a bridleway, used by horses and heavily used by dog-walkers and other pedestrians, children on bikes, in prams and visitors. The additional traffic will totally block our village up, even with the passing places and ruin a beautiful village.</p> <p>Another parishioner stated that he felt not enough consideration had been given to the significant numbers of pedestrians regularly using the village and crucially, the safety of pedestrians. This included the many dog walkers but also rambling clubs who would be accessing the public rights of way on Saturdays just as weddings were going ahead. How does the transport statement address the safety of the pedestrian?</p> <p>In the report (paragraph 3.29), Middle Farm Courtyard for example, is not</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>accurately described at a 'storage facility' and not a functioning farm with 7-10 traffic generating days per year. This is a huge understatement. The owner of the property states large farm vehicles enter the farm sometimes 2/3 time per day. There are sheep cows and storage for Hay, Silage etc. Thus, large HGVs pulling Trailers, Tractors, trailers, baling equipment etc. which are wide and long vehicles more or less daily. Much of these larger agricultural and other commercial vehicles servicing this farm (and others) do not appear to have been taken no account.</p> <p>2.1o Vehicles, other than cars – This is a rural village with a number of farms within the village. The passing places do not address the width of the road for large vehicles to pass each other or for agricultural vehicles to pass cars. Most modern cars are now around 2m in width so for the passing places to be wide enough to enable a car to pass a large vehicle (eg. a car to pass an oil delivery tanker) the passing places still do not allow sufficient space to pass large vehicles.</p> <p>At the moment we manage in this village by accommodating large vehicles. We can do this because of the current lack of cars in the village and the trip generation is low; for example, we can accommodate larger vehicles by reversing, moving over allow passage etc. If we increase that volume of traffic manifold, then this will immediately create blockages and the passing places will simply create pinch-points and bottlenecks, resulting in</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>blocking off/ shutting-in the village.</p> <p>2.1p Passing of Horses – The British Horse Society states that you need a car width in addition to your own car width and that of the horse to pass a horse. Even with the passing places, there is still insufficient space to pass in accordance with this standard.</p> <p>2.1q Alternative access - A solution might be to have a completely separate no through route access road. Then the village might be more on board with the planning application. This was mentioned by several parishioners who pointed out that the applicant owns all the land directly leading to the A170 where an existing right of way across his land already exists. These parishioners felt that this would help mitigate many concerns as long as it was not a through road and connected the A170 directly to the venue, circumventing the village street and the residential properties themselves. Residents living in closest proximity to the proposed venue mentioned this would help to address some of their concerns regarding noise and the location of the parking if the car park were located on the opposite side of the site, away from the Ebor way and linked to the alternative access route from the A170.</p> <p>2.2. CAR PARKING</p> <p>2.2a People will not solely park in the carpark provided - Not all guests attending an event will park in the provided car-parking. People will admit that at such events, they have parked along a street to enable a hasty exit/ if</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>they arrive late and parking is unavailable etc. Also, taxis and other vehicles waiting to pick people up will do so on the road, not in the venue itself. It is impossible to mitigate against people's behaviour.</p> <p>2.2b The overspill car park size is insufficient for the numbers of vehicles potentially arriving at events as per the planning application - query raised regarding where cars will park when the venue is catering for its maximum numbers. This relates to the point made earlier above.</p> <p>2.2c Landscaping is not mentioned in the report – where are the cars going to park – if in a field, where will they go when it's wet? Will they start parking in the village and block it up?</p> <p>2.2d The overspill carpark pushes the development further into open countryside and toward an area of ancient woodland – has this been carefully considered? Once damaged, these habitats are irretrievable.</p> <p>2.2e There are no lighting proposals regarding the parking area – This is a Dark Skies area and there have been several comments about how dark the village is. What impact will the lighting put in place have on the surrounding area and the local wildlife etc?</p> <p>DROP OFF/ PICK UP POINT This will not mitigate residents' concerns regarding the planning application.</p> <p>OTHER Frequency of weddings – a point was made that weddings would only be once per week, on a Saturday. Another point</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>was made that events during the week would be for 30, 40, 50 people and not 7 days per week. However, several parishioners stated that the planning application was for consent for events and conferences as well as weddings, 7 days per week, 365 days of the year.</p> <p>Traffic for events - As a 'dry lease' venue, not only will there be the event traffic, but also those of ancillary companies involved in each event, from crockery suppliers to disco staging, and the set-up of this would take movement of large vehicles in the day(s) before the event and removal after the event.</p> <p>Numbers attending weddings – there was some discussion over this (especially over the volume of cars generated) but the maximum number of guests is clearly stated in the application itself. One resident mentioned that numbers at each wedding would vary but that certainly any number would lead to an increase in traffic flow through the village. He felt that the evening's discussion clearly demonstrated that none of the amendments in the transport statement could mitigate against this and the ethos and issues from the initial planning submission remained.</p> <p>Air Pollution – this is of real concern, particularly if there are queues of traffic with idling engines, especially diesels, waiting in the village to enter the venue. The topography of the village means that air collects and hangs in the village, noticeable when people have bonfires, thus fumes may tend to 'sit' in the village,</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>which would be of particular concern to properties such as Stable Cottage where the actual occupied rooms are very close to the road.</p> <p>Agricultural activities – there was a suggestion previously to curtail farming traffic 2 hours before and after each event. This will not work as peak wedding times such as weather-dependent harvest traffic in the summer. It is simply not possible to control the harvest traffic at this time with the unpredictability of British weather. How could this be enforced?</p> <p>We live in an agricultural village and residents accept that there will be a level of farming associated activity. Farming is going through a challenging time and we have to have sympathy with what Sproxton Hall Farm is trying to do in this changing and uncertain time. However, although the project itself might be a good idea, especially in terms of renovating old buildings, it is the wrong situation for this project, mainly because of the access issues. It will compromise road safety and compromise the residential amenity for the village to unacceptable levels.</p>		
<p>3. Vote to decide the status of Sproxton Parish Meeting as a consultee on the above planning application. <i>This vote alone will determine the percentage of those</i></p>	<p>Some discussion was held to clarify exactly what the electorate were voting upon. The Parish Clerk clarified by quoting directly from the invitation letter to be a consultee from Ryedale District Council. Further clarification had been sought from RDC prior to this meeting, so the clerk was able to quote directly from an email response from RDC to confirm that the question to vote upon</p>	<p>Clerk (DHS) to write statement from Sproxton Parish Meeting in response to consultee request</p>	

<p><i>in attendance at the meeting in support/objection of/to the amended planning application.</i></p>	<p>was: Does the amended Transport Assessment alleviate your concerns regarding the planning application? 50 electors voted in total: 0 Abstentions 10 For (support/yes) 40 Against (No)</p>	<p>from RDC and submit by 30.01.21.</p>	
<p>4. Vote to decide if the written statements of those unable to attend may be read out in this meeting and therefore summarised separately in the response from Sproxtton Parish Meeting to RDC. <i>It will need to be clear that these comments are not necessarily the views of the Parish Meeting as a grouping of electors as proxy voting is not allowed by law. Only the votes of those present will count in calculating the percentage vote to determine the parish's status in this matter.</i></p>	<p>The point was raised that there should not be a need to have extra statements read as everybody has the opportunity to give their views directly to the council in writing. The Clerk responded by stating that as queries had been raised regarding electors feeling disenfranchised by a Zoom meeting, guidance had been sought from Yorkshire Local Councils' Association on how to handle the matter both in accordance with the 1972 Local Government Act, Schedule 12, Part 3 and also with regard to the 2020 Coronavirus Act. The Agenda and proceedings had been set in accordance with the YLCA guidance and with the knowledge of the (usual) Chair. A query was made regarding if we as a Parish Meeting should introduce standing orders for inclusion of written statements separately but in addition to the views of those present in the meeting to reduce the need for a repeat vote on future occasions. The Chair felt that it would not be appropriate to do so in under these circumstances in Covid times. Vote: Are you happy to have the written statements of those unable to attend the meeting read out? (Total voting numbers changed as some</p>	<p>Motion carried. Statements read.</p>	

	<p>electors had left the meeting).</p> <p>1 Abstention 84% Yes 16% No</p>		
<p>5. Reading of any written observations in support/objection to the amended planning application from parishioners unable to attend the Zoom Meeting. <i>Please note, these are not admissible as part of the official 'vote' to decide the Parish's status but form part of an additional statement for clarity only in order that those unable to attend are not entirely disenfranchised.</i></p>	<p>See Appendix 3 for the statements read.</p>	<p>To be summarised and added in addendum to the Parish consultee response statement.</p>	
<p>6. Confirmation regarding checking and signing of this evening's minutes.</p>	<p>The Chair checked everybody was happy to go along with the Clerk's proposal that the three previous minute checkers (Rob Oliver, Simon Welford & John Rowley) should once again verify the minute prior to signing off by the temporary Chair. Motion carried. 30 January 2021</p>	<p>Rob Oliver, Simon Welford & John Rowley to check minutes before signing off by tonight's Chair, Chris</p>	

		Parkin.	
AOB	None	N/A	

2127486 DC App Transport Assessment Wednesday, December 23, 2020 Revised

http://planningregisterdocs.ryedale.gov.uk/Planning/lg/GFPlanningDocuments.page?Param=lg.Planning&org.apache.shale.dialog.DIALOG_NAME=gfplanningsearch&SDescription=20/00695/FUL&viewdocs=true

APPENDIX 1 – Welcome from Clerk, Doobori Hazorika-Stèphany

Good evening, everyone and thank you for taking the time to attend this virtual Ordinary Meeting of Sproxton Parish Meeting. Some of you have had to develop new skills in order to attend and I very much appreciate your efforts! Thank you.

Thanks also to Joanna & Rob Oliver who have once again, kindly allowed us to use their business' Zoom account to facilitate this meeting. As Clerk, I have arranged this evening's meeting and have checked all proceedings are run in accordance with the expectations of Ryedale District Council and have been in close contact with Yorkshire Local Councils' Association to ensure that the correct legislation and associated guidance is followed.

You will be aware that we, Sproxton Parish Meeting, as one voice, have again been asked to be a single consultee on the Matter of the Sproxton Hall events venue planning application. This means that a brief summary of tonight's meeting will be sent in response to Ryedale District Council, determining the Parish's collective standpoint on the matter.

As we have convened to discuss the amendments to the transport statement for Sproxton Hall's planning application and to vote on our status regarding the amended application as a Parish Meeting, our Chair, Mark Wainwright, who clearly has a personal interest in the matter (as he is also the applicant), is unable to attend the meeting. This is because the law states that if present, the Chair **must** chair the meeting. As a result of Mark's absence, our first business is to elect a Chair for the purpose of this evening's meeting only. Once the Chair is elected, they will be in charge of proceedings, via the Agenda I have planned and circulated.

Tonight's meeting will be automatically recorded by Zoom's Record Meeting function which will enable me to prepare accurate minutes. Rather than a transcript, this time, they will be merely a summary of this evening's proceedings. One item I am adding to the agenda, is that the minutes are checked by our three checkers after the meeting and signed off by our temporary Chair, enabling me to write a summary response to Ryedale District Council as a Consultee.

The first Agenda item is: 1. Election of a temporary Chair for the purposes of this meeting only

As Sproxton Parish Meeting does not have standing orders requiring a seconder for any proposal, we require proposals only. There is no requirement to secure a seconder for any proposal as this is not a legislative provision. This means I will take proposals and we will simply vote for the one person we would like to chair the meeting and each person has one

vote. Anyone on the current electoral role for the parish and present in the meeting is eligible to vote. *Once nominations have been received, you will need to state the name of your preferred nominee when I call your name asking for your vote. At a normal village meeting, the vote would usually involve a show of hands, it is therefore considered a public vote. As this is not straightforward on a virtual meeting I will call the name of each elector present at the meeting and will ask the elector to state their vote aloud. The nominee with the most votes will be elected to be Chair for the evening.*

APPENDIX 2 – Statement by temporary Chair (Chris Parkin), prepared by Clerk

Good evening. My name is Chris Parkin and I live in Helmsley. I have previously been a Ryedale District Councillor and a Helmsley Town Councillor. I am here tonight to assist in facilitating this meeting and my task is to do so whilst not taking any part in the decisions reached by you but to try and ensure due process for all the residents of Sproxtton.

This statement has been prepared by the Parish Clerk in advance of the meeting for the temporary chairman to read to clarify several points regarding the voting process. It has been the subject of discussion with the Yorkshire Local Councils Association which endeavours to assist local councils through difficult processes like this one tonight.

For the avoidance of doubt, only Sproxtton Parish electors who are on the current electoral register, are present at the meeting and who are eligible to do so, may vote in Parish meetings. The latest electoral register, correct as of 1st January 2021, has been checked by the parish clerk. Each elector has one vote in each proposal. At a normal village meeting, the vote would usually involve a show of hands, it is therefore considered a public vote. As this is not straightforward on a virtual meeting, as this is, the clerk (on my behalf), will call the name of each elector present at the meeting and will ask the elector to state their vote aloud. The options are FOR, AGAINST, or ABSTAIN This will then be recorded by the clerk. The proposal with the most votes FOR is the motion which will be passed.

Part of the advice the Yorkshire Local Councils' Association supplied was to provide advice surrounding the eligibility of voters. They stated that *"electors are encouraged to consider their position and if they believe that they personally have a position of influence or involvement in the matter at hand, or a close relationship to anyone that is involved in the matter at hand, they may wish to consider whether they vote on the issues." This is a matter for the individual elector to decide for themselves and is not for other parishioners to comment upon in this meeting.*

Further, the 1972 Local Government Act (Schedule 12, Paragraph 3, section 18), determines the legislation surrounding Parish Meetings, and states that only those **present** and entitled at the meeting may be eligible to vote. **Thus, proxy votes are not allowed.**

In this difficult and extraordinary time owing to COVID-19, it was considered that some parishioners may be disenfranchised if unable to attend via Zoom or telephone. Therefore, although their views will NOT count toward deciding the majority for the parish's view as **one single consultee**, parishioners who are unable to attend and have prepared written statements in advance of this meeting may be able to share their view.

These items then conclude the 'rules' on due process.

We now move on to the agenda items.

Item 2

The main purpose of the meeting as listed on the agenda is to discuss the key points raised by the amended Transport Statement (23rd December 2020) relating to the Sproxton Hall Farm Planning Application and to determine if the revised planning application to include the Transport Statement is supported or not by this village meeting.

If you wish to speak on this matter it would be helpful if you are referring to the TS document you could advise me what page or item number you are addressing.

APPENDIX 3 – Written Statements in advance from those unable to attend via Zoom

3.1

Stewart & Linda walker
Keepers Cottage
Sproxton
YO62 5ef

Our cottage is half way down the village on the Main Street.

I believe we are the closest property to the road, that runs through the village.

The impact of the noise from the addition traffic will be more audible than other properties, which is unacceptable especially at unsociable hours, as our bedrooms are situated at the front of the property.

We object to the amended plans as we are against the original planning application as a whole.

Stewart & Linda Walker

3.2

Aspin Farm
Sproxton

York
YO62 5EF

Sproxton Hall Farm Planning Application

The revised planning application does nothing to alleviate the problems of traffic volume, noise and pollution. Therefore we continue to object to the planning application.

V.M. Dransfield
J.R. Dransfield

3.3

4 Woodland View, Sproxton, York, YO62 5EG
Friday, 22nd January 2021

I live on the Sproxton Village Street and the proposals in the updated Transport Statement directly affect me.

I object to the proposals to widen the Village Street in 3 places:

- There will be far too much traffic for this little road
- It won't solve the traffic jam problems that will happen with so many cars in up and down the street
- It would spoil the look of the village
- It won't help to make the road safe for the walkers, cyclists or horse riders. They have been ignored right the way through.
- People might park in the extra space made.

Who would pay for the proposed works and who would keep it up to standard?

Yours sincerely,

John Ford

3.4

Stonecroft, Main Street, Sproxton, York, YO62 5EF
23rd January 2021-01-28

As we cannot access or attend the Village Meeting on Monday, we the undersigned are submitting the following statement:

We have lived on Sproxton Village Street for over 25 years and will be directly and adversely affected by the proposals of the updated transport statement.

We object to the proposals to widen the street in three places and the suggested 'pick up' point for the following reasons:

- They will not solve, but intensify the disruption caused by the increased volume of traffic through the village
- It does not address the road safety issues regarding pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists
- Most significantly, no mention is made of who will bear the cost for the proposed road works and other maintenance over time. As tax payers, we object strongly to any proposal to fund this from the Highway's and District Council's budgets.

In general, these and others, such as a 'drop and pick up point' as well as the size and location of the parking provision, all of which appear to be oblivious to a range of environmental concerns, will, without doubt change the overall character of the village. They will make the main thoroughfare through the village look like a broken limb, badly set!

Yours sincerely,

Robert C. Shaw
Kathleen Shaw

3.5

Mrs Joyce M Walters
Rose Cottage
Sproxton
YO62 5EF

25 January 2021

Dear D,

I am feeling quite unwell since having my second COVID vaccination and have been in bed for the last 5 days and will unfortunately be unable to join tonight's meeting. As a resident of Sproxton village I will be directly and adversely affected by the proposals in the updated Transport Statement.

I object to the proposal to widen the Village Street in 3 places for the following reasons,

- The character of the village will be spoiled by the proposed alterations. We are a small, tranquil, rural community – not a town which would lend itself better to large events.
- The three locations of road widening will not solve traffic congestion or solve the problem of disruption caused by the increased volume of traffic. Especially as they are all on the same side of the road. I cannot understand how this can possibly help the traffic flow and will lead to me being delayed for some time trying to get out of my drive on to the village street.
- Road safety issues for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders have not been addressed at all. The villagers use the village street as a meeting place and for socialising. This would be impossible with the additional traffic created by the large events proposed.
- Ambulances, of which sadly I have had to call on several times in the last 18 months, could easily be delayed being caught up in the high volume of event traffic.
- Cars visiting the village who are not familiar with the narrow street may use these passing places for additional parking.

I object to the suggestion of provision of a pick-up point for the following reasons. Use of this cannot be enforced and it will potentially block traffic accessing the proposed parking spaces.

I object to the proposed parking provision for the following reasons.

- The site is adjacent to the Ebor Way long distance footpath and bridleways. It will have a negative impact on walkers and cyclists and make the public bridleway unusable for horses due to excessive noise, traffic and event movements, all of which will frighten the horses.
- The carpark would be noisy with over 100 cars trying to arrive and leave together.
- The car park will have to be well lit at night for safety reasons, creating light pollution to the newly created NYMM Dark Skies Area that it lies within.

I understand that I cannot vote at this meeting as I do not understand how the Zoom works on the telephone, despite my daughter's help and I do not own a computer. I do feel that I have been disenfranchised, but that you will register my objections and record them in the minutes.

Yours sincerely,



Joyce M Walters

**APPENDIX B: Minutes from Sproxton Parish Meeting Ordinary Meeting 15/03/21
(Discussion of Acoustic Report & re-amendments to Transport Statement)**



7pm – 7.10pm: Residents log into the Zoom Meeting.

PRESENT:

Clerk: Doobori Hazorika-Stéphany (minutes), Chris Parkin (guest)
Joanna & Rob Oliver, Joy Walters, Chris Jenkins & Di Garside, George & Maureen Skinner, Joanne & Simon Welford, Ann Spetch, Mary Welford & Matthew Clarke, Kath and Dave Kershaw, Elaine & Steve Burgess, Margaret & Franklin Farrar, Helen & Dave Wells, Fiona Wainwright, Henry Wainwright, Ted Wainwright, Peta Poole, Emma & Jeremy Shaw, Juliane Schaub & Selwyn Jones, Ian & Katie Boddy, Colin Ward, Mike & Priscilla McAndrew, Pam & Ross Pattison, Sue & Mark Balmforth, Mathieu Hazorika-Stéphany, Luke Seed, Katharine & Wilson Lamont, Floss Murtagh, Anne & Philip Blackburn, Ann & Brian Mellor, Sarah & Jamie Vandembroecke, Nancy & Bob Roberts.

APOLOGIES: Mark Wainwright (Chair), Charlie Marwood.

Parish Clerk (Doobori Hazorika-Stéphany) explained briefly that the Zoom meeting would follow the same format as the previous meeting as most attendees were the same.

Welcome by Doobori Hazorika-Stéphany, Parish Clerk: DHS checked attendance and took any apologies. As the Notice & Agenda were clear and the meeting was to follow the same format as the last meeting in January with virtually the same attendance, it was felt no further opening statements would be necessary.

AGENDA ITEMS:

AGENDA ITEMS	DISCUSSION AND COMMENTS	ACTION REQUIRED BY WHOM/ DATE	OUTCOME
1.0 Election of a temporary Chair for the purposes of this meeting only	Only one nominee: Chris Parkin (proposed by George Skinner), therefore motion carried and Chris Parkin elected Chair for the purpose of this meeting only.	CP: Signing of minutes after they are prepared.	
2.0 Discussion of Amendments to Sproxton Hall	ACOUSTIC REPORT DISCUSSION 2.1a Inconsistencies between Acoustic Report and submissions on actual	Minutes by DHS.	

<p>Farm Planning Application (see document reference and weblink below minutes). <i>Not recorded in discussion order, but points collated for clarity.</i></p> <p>This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acoustic Report 	<p>planning application/site visit such as:-</p> <p>Noise from outside activities – there is no reference in the acoustic report to any outside activities whatsoever, contradicting discussions with the applicants during site visits and village meeting discussions, as well as the planning application itself (eg. gatherings, fire pits, mingling, meadow walks, music). The acoustic report, page 30, 8.6 states “the venue does not intend to have any extensive outdoor entertainment, occasional lone, acoustic musician”. However the noise assessment does not appear to take into consideration any of the impacts of these outside noise activities.</p> <p>The noise management plan states the only music outside will be non-amplified, acoustic band/lone pianist/ violinist or otherwise non-amplified music” and is therefore inconsistent with the acoustic report’s assessment where the assumption is that guests will enter from the car park and the doors will then close on the gateway/tunnel and all noise will be contained. This is unrealistic.</p> <p>The Acoustic Report predicates that the whole venue will be fastened up ‘like a drum’ with no openings and the breakout noise calculations have been based upon this. Even a window being opened will affect the noise coming from the venue. A gateway with door closings is mentioned. How will this gateway/tunnel be managed in the summer months where guests will want to be outside and make the most of the beautiful countryside? It is unrealistic to expect that guests will be inside from arrival with all the doors closed during the</p>		
---	---	--	--

	<p>summer months, especially when the application acknowledges that a large part of the draw for weddings will be in the outdoor space and views, with guests wanting to continue partying outdoors.</p> <p>There are an awful lot of assumptions made in the Acoustic report – such as the building having a flat roof and solid walls and the ‘tunnel’ being closed. These assumptions do not match the plans of the building given in the planning application itself.</p> <p>2.1b The proposal is not simply a wedding venue, it is a multi-events venue – most of the report is written on the assumption that all events are weddings, but there is concern about the kind of activities and associated noise that would come from the outside and around the venue when used for a wider variety of events which villagers will have to put up with year-round.</p> <p>2.1c Times when the outside breakout noise is above ambient sound levels – the report identifies mentions a couple of times when this break out noise is ‘positive’ (6/7db) above that of the ambient sound. This is actually fairly significant but the report seems to dismiss this. And this is only mentioned in situations making up 10% of the time, however this is not the whole story as this is based on an average but crucially, at the times when this ‘positive’ breakout sound above ambient is at its peak, it will be significantly louder than the levels specified, at least another 10/11dbs which is another doubling of the loudness of the sound eg. bass drum beats.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Therefore the actual sound levels heard outside will be considerably louder than the figures reported. Also, the report discusses breakout noise using the lowest equivalences, which is not what you would expect in such a sound report. All this sound estimation is predicated on a particular band playing at a particular loudness which seems to have been an over- optimistic assumption of the level of decibels.</p> <p>If this planning application does go ahead and sounds from bands turn out to be considerably louder than those reported here, what is the remedial route at that point?</p> <p>2.1d Expected noise levels within the venue- on page 36 of the Acoustic Report it states that the expected noise levels within should not exceed 95db and the next paragraph states there should be an 'electric noise limiter'. How will this alarm sound, if noise is exceeded? It then states that this is not strictly necessary due to the favourable assessment of the noise breakout from that room being always less than 95db. Clearly, actual noise levels will be specific to each event. How will any person managing the venue (and the presence of such a person is not confirmed within the noise management plan) confirm that noise is not exceeding 95db? This will only be maintained with the doors closed... does this mean you must turn the music off before each person goes out from the venue? This is totally impractical an unmanageable for the whole event, each event, year round. (The Chair commented on this, stating that the sort of device that</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>may be used is known as an 'electric orange' which is wired into the circuitry of the establishment and has a noise meter within it. If the noise levels go over a certain level, it shuts down the electric circuit that the band/music system is playing on.)</p> <p>Several parishioners stated that it is simply unrealistic to 'lock 220 people' into a venue to attempt to control sound and that management of music suggested in the Acoustic Report (eg. not heavy rock music) would be fruitless when young guests are partying and a sound system is playing music of various eras. As it gets later music will get louder.</p> <p>The noise report seems to be full of inaccuracies, is inadequate, difficult to understand and the content not particularly helpful to the villagers.</p> <p>2.1e Technicality of the Acoustic Report-the noise assessment itself states that it is essential that the construction recommendations are followed so that noise ceases to be an issue. However, it then states how difficult it is to get acoustic data for the materials to be used in construction so an estimate has been made for the purposes of this report. How can they assure us therefore that using those recommended construction methods and materials will be effective in the way that they say they will be?</p> <p>Also, the report tends to focus on the music noise and potential crowd/traffic noise in a perfunctory way, and when mentioned in brief, it is without proper attention.</p> <p>One parishioner stated that it might be worthwhile seeking a second opinion of an independent source with technical</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>knowledge in this field to be sought regarding the findings of the Acoustic Report as it seems highly technical, difficult to understand and seems to raise questions about accuracy/understanding.</p> <p>2.1f Loss off amenity and impacts from noise is a significant issue for the nearest neighbours to the proposed site, Sproxton Hall Holiday Cottages:-</p> <p>Neighbouring property is not simply one private dwelling – Our home and business comprises 4 self-contained cottages sleeping a total of 19 people. Amenity and the impact of a development must take into account the users of neighbouring land, not just the owners. Therefore 19 people not 2 (based on occupancy when open in 2020 of over 90%). Planning needs to be compatible with the existing ambience of the immediate locality, surrounding area and with neighbouring land uses and should not prejudice the continued operation of existing neighbouring land uses.</p> <p>2.1g Site noise management is unclear (vehicle sounds also) - Whilst sound insulation and a noise limiter has been mentioned , (assuming that these are actually going to be included and sufficient) we do not feel this goes far enough. We have particluar concerns around noise associated with the movements of vehicles. At the moment, every item of traffic as well as the voices of those on foot can be clearly heard at the cottages. Thus, our experience tells us that the assessment is incorrect when it states that vehicular noise will be largely inaudible.</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>Our bedroom is 4 metres away from where cars will be driving, partially on an unmade up road (not tarmac roads) with potholes/puddles (not 10 metres as mentioned in the noise report).</p> <p>2.1h Noise levels quoted on the road to the venue are only just within permissible limits- eg. The Acoustic Report quotes that if cars are driving at 25mph. and do not have a sound system on in their car, it will just meet the levels permissible at night. This is unrealistic as it is unlikely for guests leaving the venue to behave this way and the catering lorries leaving even later will be louder. Therefore this will be breaking the sound limits.</p> <p>The noise from the traffic created by this venue (in excess of 100 cars potentially), is ludicrous for a village of this size. This will affect everybody in the village.</p> <p>2.1i Detrimental impact on Holiday Cottages' business & USP- the Holiday Cottages have been extensively developed over the past three years, defining customer base and marketing accordingly. The importance of peace, quiet, tranquility and serenity in the area cannot be overstated and are highly valued, particularly as they are increasingly rare and special qualities. The cottages market themselves as being a</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>hidden gem and differentiate from other providers on the basis of offering relaxing and quiet retreats away from busy life with great success.</p> <p>Guests return due to the overall ambience, character and beauty of the location, making the most of the stunning views by being outside well into the evening in the summer months.</p> <p>The holiday cottages rely a lot on repeat business (particularly out of the main summer season) and on positive guest reviews (e.g. all reviews have been 5* from Airbnb throughout 2019 & 2020). Negative reviews lead to reduced bookings and no repeat customer or recommendations.</p> <p>An alternative route to the venue across the applicant's own land to the rear of the venue would reduce many but not all of the noise issues associated with the application for the whole village and for Sproxton Hall Holiday Cottages.</p> <p>The Chair asked if the owners of Sproxton Hall Holiday Cottages, Helen & David Wells, had been consulted as business owners by the firm compiling the Acoustic Report. They replied they had not been consulted at all.</p> <p>2.1j Employment created from the establishment of a wedding/ events venue at Sproxton Hall would be potentially</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>negated by the loss of business to Sproxton Hall Holiday Cottages – the actual impact of this establishment might well cause the downfall of another, leading to a net ‘zero employment gain’. Therefore there is no particular benefit to the local economy.</p> <p>2.1k Issue of redress regarding control of guests’ behaviour difficult as a ‘dry-hire’ facility- the opportunity for weddings creating repeat business is not great. Not only is the event a ‘one-off’, but as a ‘dry-hire’ venue, the usual control you would have over a customer’s behaviour, ie. the sanction being that you are banned from returning if you do not follow the rules, would not apply to one-offs. The experience of parishioners who have run conferences an events in the past is that you cannot ‘tell people who are celebrating not to have fun’. As a dry-hire, the element of controlling unwanted behaviour is reduced very significantly.</p> <p>The Chair added that his understanding of current legislation was that regardless of body/company is brought in offering services, any redress would be against those operating the venue ie. the licence holder. It would be their responsibility to ensure that both the planning regulations and licencing registration were being enforced.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>2.1l Noise from air conditioning units/ generators not taken into consideration- the plans also state the need for an air conditioning unit but there doesn't seem to be any consideration for the additional noise such a unit would produce.</p> <p>2.1m Lack of Air Conditioning will lead to hot partygoers opening doors and windows – the noise assessment mentions on 'mechanical ventilation', not Air Conditioning. Therefore, when people get hot, they will inevitably open doors and windows and this is impossible to police. This will result in much higher noise levels than those taken into consideration by the noise assessment report. Air conditioning should be a stipulation.</p> <p>The Villagers as a whole will be affected by the noise from weddings and events and the weekend when they want to sit in their gardens outside, so the noise measurements and impact will be greater than those taken with the assumption that villagers will be inside their homes with their doors closed.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the venue being 'dry-lease' and using external suppliers to provide resources at events:-</p> <p>2.1n Vehicles used by suppliers – these will be larger, heavier vehicles transporting chairs & tables, hog roasts and associated equipment, catering equipment etc. and</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>these will not only produce more noise and create additional traffic but they will also be arriving on the days leading up to the event, departing around an hour after the end of the event in the early hours and in the days after the event. This means the traffic noise will continue even longer. Friends living near similar venues state that such 'wedding' venues are often also used for school proms, 21sts and 18ths, where it can be even more difficult to keep clients within the venue inside and they are increasingly unlikely to adhere to the rules regarding noise pollution eg. no low bass music. The difference in transmission of sound between a 'disco' and a live band is completely different, especially when the venue is playing this music until midnight.</p> <p>2.1o Carpark screening- the report states that 50% of the car park is screened by a dense growth of trees. There are trees there, but it is not very dense at all. Also, if 50% is screened, what happens to the noise from the other 50%? This has not been addressed.</p> <p>2.1p Noise from ancillary equipment/machinery – mechanical ventilation at the venue and any generators brought onto site to support hired equipment will also create potential noise and may run continuously for great lengths of time. Villagers living in the houses well set back from the road in the village with double/ triple glazing can</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>still hear large vehicles driving past when inside their homes so any extra noise is of great concern.</p> <p>One resident queried the need for generators to supply the power required for such a venue and to light up the car park and the associated noise created. This has not been mentioned in any assessment. This is crucial as this would be constant noise.</p> <p>The Chair responded by stating that it could be that modern generators (in his experience) produce a lot less noise.</p> <p>The applicant's son pointed out that there was mains electrical supply to the farm at the end of the village and it wasn't purely run on generators.</p> <p>Once again, many of these issues would be resolved with an alternative, direct and private route to the venue across the applicant's land and it is difficult to understand why this hasn't been considered given the sums of money that can be potentially generated from such a venue.</p> <p>2.1q Large numbers of people create significant noise-</p> <p>The numbers expected to attend at the top end of the scale will triple the number of people in the village so significant noise is bound to be generated.</p> <p>2.1r Acoustic Report suggests a large list of</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>'regulations' for guests to adhere to – How will guests be informed about this in advance of attendance? (Eg. going straight into the venue, not staying around outside, keeping car sound system volume low while driving down the street.) These messages need to be delivered before arrival so would these be stipulated on the website and would a list be sent to guests with invitations? This wouldn't be a great marketing ploy so how would this be ensured?</p> <p>2.1s Negative impacts upon health & well-being - this was mentioned on several occasions. Any increase in noise will have a detrimental effect on the character & useability of the village street amenity and in turn on our health and wellbeing.</p> <p>2.1t Currently the village is exceptionally quiet with virtually zero traffic uring the night – residents often walk dogs etc. very late at night and report no traffic movement by 11pm certainly and no movement of vehicles until the morning. The concern is that even one car at night represents an increase in traffic.</p> <p>One resident who has lived in the village 21 years, stated that the village is very quiet. Her research of The Ryedale Plan etc. highlights that rural places are usually to be kept rural and quiet if possible. If there is a venue, even with only 50 cars and 100</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>guests, the passage of cars one after the other in procession, with the associated sounds of doors slamming and intoxicated happy voices saying their loud goodbyes as they all exit at virtually the same time will undoubtedly disturb the quiet of the night. This is unfair for the Holiday Cottages, for those living (as we do) in a Grade 2 listed house where we are not allowed double-glazing and have no foundations and for those sleeping with their windows ajar in the hot summer months. This disturbed sleep will be detrimental to everybody's health. People come here to enjoy the peace and quiet and tranquility and when there is the opportunity in this world to grasp this, we should hold onto it and protect it and leave the village as it is.</p> <p>2.1u COVID-19 safety of the venue- Possibly a shorter term issue but the report states that the noise will be controlled by the closing of doors and windows and by using mechanical ventilation within. How is this compatible with a Covid-safe venue? In the short term, this could mean doors and windows will need to be open for good ventilation, leaking noise into the village. Would the mechanical ventilation also require air exchange?</p> <p>2.1v Sproxton is situated within the AONB – we are in the AONB and in an area of tranquillity and this must be taken into account by the noise assessment. The noise</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>assessment does not take into account the bridleway/footpath that runs right alongside the venue. This will clearly have an impact on people's enjoyment of that route. Some villagers regularly ride their horses on this route and this will not be possible if there are gatherings, traffic and noise alongside this route which has a big impact on the villagers' use and enjoyment of that bridleway.</p> <p>2.1w Movement of vehicles & associated road noise late at night in anti-social hours - The village street is the only way through the village and is in close proximity to people's bedrooms. This will cause unacceptable disruption to residents here when large numbers of vehicles leave at the same time at night. The hours of operation need to be restricted so that the status quo of the overnight period is kept. The number of vehicles is going to change from less than one to somewhere around 50-100 vehicles between the hours 2300 to 0300 and some of these will be heavy vehicles. The noise created is unacceptable.</p> <p>There will be an undoubted increase in road noise as a consequence of this proposal going ahead. A different route from the A170 would be favourable for everyone in the village.</p> <p>2.1x Images of how the venue might appear when first introduced to the village- the lovely images initially shown to the village as to how the development might appear seems not to match the alterations required for the building to match that described in the acoustic assessment. This is a big discrepancy. It is therefore also puzzling as to why the</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>conservation officer has not been consulted again as a result of these changes which represent a major change to the appearance of the venue, particularly as there are new additions (eg. gates on the entrance to the 'tunnel') which are part of the Grade 2 listed structure. Villagers would like to see more on this from the Conservation officer.</p> <p>2.1y The National Planning Policy Framework talks about cumulative effects of noise – This is very important and is not just about cars, or guests mingling outside, or other outside entertainments (eg. bouncy castles/ clay pigeon shooting) or the music noise but the cumulative effect of all of these and especially as the planning application is for 7 days and 7 nights a week, 365 days of the year. It is not just one car/ one walk through a meadow, but the cumulative effect upon the village.</p>		
<p>2.2 Discussion of Amendments to Sproxton Hall Farm Planning Application (see document reference and weblink below minutes). <i>Not recorded in discussion order, but points collated for clarity.</i></p> <p>This includes: - road widening at further points within Sproxton village (re-amended</p>	<p>2.2 ROAD WIDENING DISCUSSION (Further to those discussed in the previous Parish meeting on this issue – see Appendix 1)</p> <p>The applicant's son explained why three extra passing places had been incorporated in the re-amended plan at the far end of the village close to the venue- this came about after discussions at the last Parish Meeting in January. The visibility was deemed to be poor on this bridleway section of the lane so one passing place was moved from one side of the road to the opposite, pushing the hedge back to the tree line so you are able to see all the way down. The extra passing places include one at the front of Sproxton Hall which was suggested after speaking with another local farmer who felt this would be helpful in order to</p>		

<p>transport statement)</p>	<p>deal with his farm traffic.</p> <p>2.2a New/Enlarged passing place at section of road beyond the public highway going beyond the Village Hall up to Sproxton Hall Farm – this seems to involve removing a large section of hedge and moving it back into the field. Will this affect the chestnut trees that are there? Will they be cut down? Another villager commented that taking out 150 yards of hedgerow and replacing with (most probably) bare-root planting to replace it is not helpful. This hedge is home to very many species of wildlife and it would be a devastation to lose this.</p> <p>Not only this, but where there is a new passing place, the ground increases quite steeply so it will not be simply a removal of a hedge but there will need to be considerable earthworks to create a flat surface. What would the appearance of this be – would it involve a steep bank?</p> <p>2.2b Necessity for inter-visibility between passing places at section of road beyond the public highway going past from the Village Hall up to Sproxton Hall Farm – the re-amended plan creates 3 new passing places with inter-visibility between them deemed necessary on this small stretch of lane but in the Sanderson’s Transport report, it states that this inter-visibility between the passing places in village is not necessary. How then, will this ease traffic volumes and improve flow? Therefore there seem to be lots of inaccuracies and contraindications in the original Sanderson’s Transport Report.</p> <p>2.2c Passing places on road beyond the public highway going past from the Village Hall up to Sproxton Hall Farm are</p>		
-----------------------------	--	--	--

	<p>actually on a public bridleway- Public bridleways must be useable by all users, ramblers, cyclists, dog-walkers & horse riders. There are villagers who regularly use this bridleway on horseback and these horses are certainly not going to stand in a traffic pull-in for lengths of time as traffic goes past on a narrow lane. These passing places do not do anything to make this stretch of road more useable.</p> <p>2.2d The narrow lane in Sproxton village is unsuitable for use by the numbers of vehicles potentially arriving for events regardless of extra passing places - a couple of parishioners made the point that a lack of passing places has never been an issue as villagers are considerate of one another and cars have reverse gears. Asking the village to incorporate an extra 150 vehicles is not a sensible way forward. Why should this peaceful, tranquil place alter its road structure to cater for a single wedding venue when there is no benefit to the community and further it will only serve to destroy the village amenity when walking and meeting with neighbours in the village as we regularly do.</p> <p>The point was also made that wide Tarmac passing places will not solve the high flow traffic problem and will spoil the village scene and make the village unattractive to the eye. Another parishioner seconded this and stated that once the need for so many deliveries wanes after Covid times, there would be no trouble with deliveries and passing once again. She felt the need to retain the character of this beautiful, unmodernised village.</p> <p>One parishioner mentioned that the Village</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>voted overwhelmingly that the transport arrangements were totally unsuitable at the last Parish Meeting (see Appendix 1) and other than the addition of passing places at the far end of the village, the transport statement remains unchanged and remains wholly unsuitable for the village.</p> <p>2.2e Lack of response from Highways regarding amended Transport Assessment – they do not seem to have commented on the changes and no communications have come from Highways for some time. The Chair commented that this was not unusual, sadly.</p> <p>2.2f More passing places in the modern age- One villager pointed out that Sproxton has grown organically and with today's larger vehicles (eg. tractors, oil delivery, courier companies) desperately needs more passing places. The original proposal was good and the applicant has responded to views and adjusted the planning with an additional passing place. The applicant has tried to make a proposal which is acceptable and workable.</p> <p>Another villager commented in response that the passing places would work well with a low flow of traffic, but the issue was that with a high flow of traffic in one direction (from/to an event), and whilst that might enable a single vehicle to move in the opposite direction, this vehicle may remain stranded there with a high number of vehicles on the other side of the road. How will the passing places solve that problem regarding venue traffic?</p>		
<p>3. Vote to decide the status of Sproxton Parish</p>	<p>The Parish Clerk clarified the question to be voted upon by quoting directly from an email response from RDC:</p>	<p>Clerk (DHS) to write</p>	

<p>Meeting as a consultee on the above planning application regarding the Acoustic Report.</p>	<p>“Having read the Acoustic Report, do Sproxton Parish Meeting feel that the contents of the report alleviates their concerns with regards to noise?”</p> <p>50 electors voted in total: 0 Abstentions 8 For (support/yes): 16% 42 Against (No): 84%</p>	<p>statement from Sproxton Parish Meeting in response to consultee request from RDC and submit by 30.03.21.</p>	
<p>4. Vote to decide the status of Sproxton Parish Meeting as a consultee on the above planning application regarding the re-amended Transport Statement.</p>	<p>The Parish Clerk clarified the question to be voted upon by quoting directly from an email response from RDC: “Having read the amended Transport Assessment, do Sproxton Parish Meeting feel that the contents of the report alleviates their concerns with regards to highways matters?”</p> <p>50 electors voted in total: 0 Abstentions 9 For (support/yes): 18% 41 Against (No): 82%</p>	<p>Clerk (DHS) to write statement from Sproxton Parish Meeting in response to consultee request from RDC and submit by 30.03.21.</p>	
<p>5. Vote to decide if the written statements of those unable to attend may be read out in this meeting and therefore</p>	<p>The point was made by the Clerk that there was no need to have this vote for extra statements to be read as those who had submitted written statements were present at the meeting.</p>	<p>Vote cancelled.</p>	

<p>summarised separately in the response from Sproxton Parish Meeting to RDC. <i>It will need to be clear that these comments are not necessarily the views of the Parish Meeting as a grouping of electors as proxy voting is not allowed by law. Only the votes of those present will count in calculating the percentage vote to determine the parish's status in this matter.</i></p>			
<p>5. Reading of any written observations in support/objection to the amended planning application from parishioners unable to attend the Zoom Meeting. <i>Please note, these are not admissible as part of the official 'vote' to decide the Parish's status but</i></p>	<p>Not applicable - see above.</p>	<p>n/a</p>	

<i>form part of an additional statement for clarity only in order that those unable to attend are not entirely disenfranchised.</i>			
Confirmation regarding checking and signing of these minutes.	Unfortunately, the Clerk omitted to request minute checking at the meeting itself but has approached the previous minute checkers after the meeting to once again verify the minute prior to signing off by the temporary Chair (Rob Oliver & Simon Welford). 25.03.21	Rob Oliver & Simon Welford to check minutes before signing off by tonight's Chair, Chris Parkin.	
AOB	None	N/A	

http://planningregisterdocs.ryedale.gov.uk/Planning/lg/GFPlanningDocuments.page?Param=lg.Planning&org.apache.shale.dialog.DIALOG_NAME=gfplanningsearch&SDescription=20/00695/FUL&viewdocs=true