

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

Re-consultation response from Sproxton Parish Meeting – Monday, 25th January 2021

I write as Parish Clerk on behalf of Sproxton Parish Meeting following the Ordinary Meeting held on Monday, 25th January by Zoom.

At the meeting, residents were re-consulted on the above planning application, following discussions on the amended Transport Statement with a date scanned of 23 December on the RDC planning website. Following guidance from RDC, only the three key areas pertaining to the amended Transport Assessment were discussed and the Parish voted upon **“whether the information within that alleviates their concerns on the matters raised originally.”**

The principle points which were raised at the meeting against and in favour of the three key amendments on the Traffic Statement are as follows:

ROAD WIDENING – points against

1. Inter-visibility 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 places on the narrowest parts of the village street. This poses a grave risk to road safety.

2. Increase in traffic – tidal flow of event traffic may well cause a problem at the narrowest point of the village (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. The event traffic would cause further issues with bottlenecks and risks reversing/accessing/egress from homes. 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 and will therefore fail to ease the issue.

3. Street is narrow in general with no kerbs or footpaths and limited lighting – narrowness of the street has led to near misses on several occasions, stone wall damage at several points and regular extensive verge damage which have been reported on numerous occasions to the Highways department.

Much event traffic would be leaving the village in the dark –streetlights are limited (4) and most people would certainly not want these introducing. This would impact the Dark Skies nature of our village. Also, 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 throughout the day.

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, regularly causing damage to the verge 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?

4. 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.

Passing places used by considerate and respectful resident villagers make up a small number of cars moving around the village at different times throughout the day. This is a completely different situation to up to 220 guests 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.

The presence of passing places will encourage people to park in the village.

5. Movement of vehicles & associated road noise late at night in anti-social hours – 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.

6. Loss of village residential amenity – this is a close-knit village and there are many community events within the village, notably the recent 'Pumpkin Promenade' and hugely successful VE Day front garden/driveway celebrations to name just two. As it is the actual *village street itself* providing the connection between properties, the increase in traffic will compromise such events and compromise personal usage of the road. 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. This planning proposal will certainly compromise our residential amenity.

No footpath so 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. Also, several resident horse riders use the village street to exercise horses regularly, as well others using the road and bridleways for equitation. NYCC Environmental Health & 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 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 created by a dry-use venue.

7. 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 a holiday if there is nuisance caused by traffic/noise in that area. This development would not be right in this community in this location.

8. 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?

9. Passing place number 2 in Sanderson's report – mentioned at the junction between Stable Cottage, The Annexe and Greystones. 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.

10. Telegraph poles – 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 broadband connections for a large number of village properties. This does not appear to have been noted in the documents.

11. Drains – there is a drain in the way of one passing place. 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.

12. 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.

13. 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.

14. Other road users – 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. How does the transport statement address the safety of the pedestrian/other road users?

In the report (paragraph 3.29), Middle Farm Courtyard for example, is not accurately described as 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 HGVs pulling trailers, tractors, baling equipment etc. enter the farm sometimes 2/3 times per day. Much of these larger agricultural and other commercial vehicles servicing this farm (and others) do not appear to have been taken no account.

15. 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.

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 blocking off/ shutting-in the village.

16. 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.

17. Alternative road access - A solution would be a completely separate 'no through route' access road direct to the venue. 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. This solution wouldn't address the other concerns around noise pollution, light pollution, environmental impact etc. and the fact that only a very small number of people stand to benefit at great inconvenience to many.

ROAD WIDENING – points in favour

1. Passing places will help to alleviate traffic issues in Sproxton generally – Although Sproxton is beautiful, the road has difficulty accommodating larger vehicles of today and the increased deliveries of courier companies, oil deliveries and supermarket shops, causing damage to walls, verges and annoyance to villagers. The creation of these passing places would provide a solution. Also, 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.

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.

CAR PARKING – points against

1. People will not solely park in the car park 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 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.

2. 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.

3. 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?

4. The overspill car park 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.

5. 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?

PICK UP/ DROP OFF POINT – points against

1. This will not mitigate residents' concerns regarding the planning application.

OTHER POINTS

1. **Frequency of weddings** – a point was made that weddings would only be once per week, on a Saturday. Another point 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.

2. **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.

3. **Numbers attending events** – 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.

4. **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, which would be of particular concern to properties such as Stable Cottage where the actual occupied rooms are very close to the road.

5. **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?

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.

After the discussions, Sproxton Parish Meeting voted to determine their status regarding the amended planning application. **The question posed was: Does the information within the amended Transport Statement (considered this evening) alleviate your concerns on the matters raised originally (in the original planning application)?**

The vote was done publically on Zoom, with each current parish elector present at the meeting having one vote. Two electors were present via the phone link and were unable to speak, but their votes (shared via text message on the screen to the Parish Meeting) were submitted. The results of this vote were as follows:

0 Abstentions

10 For (support/yes)

40 Against (opposition/No)

50 electors voted in total

Therefore, Sproxton Parish Meeting is 80% in objection to the amended Transport Statement alleviating their concerns regarding the Sproxton Hall events venue planning application.

The meeting then voted on whether to allow separate and additional statements (written & sent to the clerk in advance of the meeting) in order to represent those parishioners who felt disenfranchised by a Zoom meeting and were unable to attend. The motion was passed with 84% in favour.

Please note that the parish meeting is merely acting as a conduit for those observations. These additional comments are not necessarily the views of the 'parish meeting' as a grouping of electors, as these electors were unable to attend in person. These views are summarised in Appendix A.

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

Signed ...D. Hazorika-Stéphany.....
Clerk of Sproxton Parish Meeting

APPENDIX A: separate and additional statements (written & sent to the clerk in advance of the meeting) representing those parishioners disenfranchised by a Zoom meeting and therefore unable to attend.

Please note that the parish meeting is merely acting as a conduit for those observations. These additional comments are not necessarily the views of the 'parish meeting' as a grouping of electors, as these electors were unable to attend in person.

Eight electors wrote with their observations. All eight electors felt that the amended transport statement did not alleviate their concerns regarding the original planning application and were in objection to the amended planning application at Sproxton Hall Farm.

Several electors mentioned points in objection in line with those points summarised in the main body of the consultee response to RDC. Additional points raised included:

- No mention is made of who will bear the cost for the proposed road works and other maintenance over time. As taxpayers, we object strongly to any proposal to fund this from the Highway's and District Council's budgets.
- In general, these amendments 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.
- 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.
- 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 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.

APPENDIX B: Minutes from Sproxton Parish Meeting Ordinary Meeting 25/01/21



MINUTES

Sproxton Parish Meeting - Ordinary General Meeting Monday, 25th January at 7pm - Virtual Meeting via Zoom

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 Vandenbroecke, Nancy & Bob Roberts.

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

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

Welcome by Doobori Hazorika-Stéphany, 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
1.1 Election of a temporary Chair for the purposes of this meeting only	DHS explained how voting would occur and that only 1 st 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.	Signing of minutes after they are prepared.	

<p>1.1 Chris Parkin to read out statement prepared by Parish Clerk</p>	<p>(See Appendix 2)</p>		
<p>2. Discussion of Amendments to Sproxtton 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:</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>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 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 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 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</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>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 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</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>recent 'Pumpkin Promenade' where residents walked up the village viewing each other's pumpkin displays on 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 & 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.</p> <p>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</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>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 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</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>inaccessibility. The 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 accurately described as 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</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>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 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 they arrive</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>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</p> <p>This will not mitigate residents' concerns regarding the planning application.</p> <p>OTHER</p> <p>Frequency of weddings – a point was made that weddings would only be once per week, on a Saturday. Another point 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</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>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, 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>		
3. Vote to decide the status of Sproxton Parish	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	Clerk (DHS) to write statement	

<p>Meeting as a consultee on the above planning application. <i>This vote alone will determine the percentage of those in attendance at the meeting in support/objection of to the amended planning application.</i></p>	<p>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 was: Does the amended Transport Assessment alleviate your concerns regarding the planning application?</p> <p>50 electors voted in total:</p> <p>0 Abstentions</p> <p>10 For (support/yes)</p> <p>40 Against (No)</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: fit-content; margin: 10px auto;"> <p>Therefore, Sproxton Parish Meeting is 80% in objection to the amended Transport Statement alleviating their concerns regarding the Sproxton Hall events venue planning application.</p> </div>	<p>from Sproxton Parish Meeting in response to consultee request 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 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</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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Vote: Are you happy to have the written statements of those unable to attend the meeting read out?</p> <p>(Total voting numbers changed as some electors had left the meeting).</p> <p>1 Abstention</p> <p>84% Yes</p> <p>16% No</p>	<p>Motion carried. Statements read.</p>	

<i>this matter.</i>			
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>	See Appendix 3 for the statements read.	To be summarised and added in addendum to the Parish consultee response statement.	
6. Confirmation regarding checking and signing of this evening's minutes.	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	Rob Oliver, Simon Welford & John Rowley to check minutes before signing off by tonight's Chair, Chris 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:

- 1) They will not solve, but intensify the disruption caused by the increased volume of traffic through the village
- 2) It does not address the road safety issues regarding pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists
- 3) 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,

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.

1. 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.
2. The carpark would be noisy with over 100 cars trying to arrive and leave together.
3. 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