

From: Katie Atkinson
Sent: 27 August 2022 17:40
To: Niamh Bonner
Subject: 22/00796/FUL

Good afternoon Niamh – I trust you are well and enjoying the bank holiday sunshine – I hope to enjoy it tomorrow and Monday!

I am writing in response to comments submitted regarding the above application at Keldholme.

It is acknowledged that the proposed holiday units are outside the development limit as set out in the supporting planning statement and so for planning purposes are within the countryside. However, that being said, the units are closely associated with the rear curtilage to Highfield House and existing built development (stables and adjacent agricultural sheds), therefore, are not *isolated* within the open countryside. One objection highlights 2 photographs from the nearest footpath to the proposed location, however, I consider this actually shows how unobtrusive the location would be against the existing built form. (See annotated images below). The crudely drawn red circle highlights the existing timber stable/pantile roof which the 2x shepherd's huts would sit immediately in front of (from this viewpoint) the long shed to the left, is within separate ownership and has a long planning history concerning residential usage which is not what is proposed here. The 2 shepherds huts would be of timber construction not as tall as the existing stable therefore would not protrude above the skyline or particularly seem 'out of place' at such a location where there is already human activity. The second image submitted by the objector below shows a closer view of the existing stables and mature neighbouring vegetation, which we believe will help assimilate the proposed units in the environment. The units would sit between the stable and existing fence shown below (it is proposed to replace the fence with more evergreen hedging) therefore not protrude into the open countryside.





Furthermore, electricity and water are already sourced close to the shepherd's huts (serving the stables) and close to the proposed location for the raised unit close to the main dwelling and garage, therefore no utilities would be required to be installed as a result of the proposals.

Concern that the existing leylandii hedge will create an 'unacceptable visual intrusion' (it is assumed on the countryside but may mean for the neighbouring property Rockwood ?) seems to be unjustified when viewing the image above. Highfield House and Rockwood are both visible in the photo and so is the top of the existing hedge. From this viewpoint, the raising of the hedge would serve to do nothing more than screen part of the upper floor windows of Highfield House. The image below shows the distance between Rockwood and the existing hedge (shown in yellow highlighter below) is considerable, therefore any growth would not cause intrusion, especially given the existing curtilage boundary at Rockwood.



The application does not propose the use of outdoor lighting for the units, instead the applicant relies on the fact that there is already outdoor lighting within the property curtilage which is sufficient for any visitors to be able to see clearly – from a health and safety point of view. This lighting was put in place by a previous owner and has been in existence for many years and is typical outdoor lighting as opposed to ‘floodlighting’ and as such there will be no impact on dark skies or light spill because of the proposed development. Within the units, the applicant proposes to utilise battery powered candles, fairy lights and where necessary low wattage, LED bulbs.

Regarding noise concerns, the proposals are for 3x single bed roomed units therefore are unlikely to be used by families but rather couples or individuals with a desire to be self-sufficient and in an environment to enjoy the rural aesthetics, as such it is entirely unlikely that there will be any noise from the property so as to give concern to noise nuisance. The location of existing mature vegetation and buildings will also buffer any conversational noise from any adjacent properties which are set well back the proposed locations.

With regard to the planning history set out by one of the objectors, none of this is in question. However, it should be noted that all these proposals relate to applications by previous owners or on adjacent properties for totally different uses therefore are not comparable. The applicant does not seek to extend the domestic curtilage beyond the development limits or neighbouring rear gardens, simply wishes to use space within the existing large curtilage to provide holiday accommodation.

With respect to traffic concerns – it is noted that NYCC Highways have no objections. Kraig Lane is effectively a long driveway within the ownership of the applicant (which neighbouring properties enjoy a right of access over), the road is sufficiently wide enough to allow two vehicles to safely pass and access/egress the site due to good visibility on to Grey Lane. It is correct that any visitors to the area would (if so wished) leave the site by foot and utilise a small section of the road if choosing not to access the verge immediate to the front of the properties before accessing footpaths further along Grey Lane. However, that is not unusual in a small settlement and the fact that the access to a

Public Right of Way (leading away from the site), is in close vicinity to the junction with Kraig Lane, then it is considered that any visitor to this area or vehicle using the local highway network would be aware of such fact. As such the visibility splays are such at this juncture that any road user would be able to clearly see a pedestrian.

The proposal is for 3 single bedroomed units therefore this is only an increase of 3 vehicles using the lane. It is understood that there would be no restrictions on movements, however, the road is wide enough and neighbouring properties set well enough back from Kraig Lane that residential amenity should not be detrimentally impacted by the low number of vehicular movements associated with the proposals.

Ryedale Local Plan Policy SP8 supports tourism accommodation of this type where there is not 'an unacceptable visual intrusion and impact on the character of the locality'. This is specifically related to tourist accommodation within the 'wider open countryside' therefore quite clearly means that the proposal does not have to be within the development limits of the settlement. BY carefully locating the 3x units within the existing curtilage of Highfield House and close to the existing built form (stables and adjacent sheds) it is considered that there will not be any visual intrusion into the landscape character beyond the settlement. Furthermore, the existing vegetation will soften the timber appearance of the 2 proposed shepherds huts and help retain the boundary between built form and open fields beyond the settlement boundary.

I hope this response helps in the determination of the proposal and goes some way to alleviate concerns of those who have objected.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you require any further information

Many thanks
Kind Regards,

Katie Atkinson (MRTPI)