

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

**Planning Application No: 22/00791/FUL**

**Sproxton Parish Meeting’s re-consultation response on revised elements of the above second application and its amendments - Tuesday, 3<sup>rd</sup> January 2023**

I write as Parish Clerk on behalf of Sproxton Parish Meeting following the Ordinary Meeting held on Tuesday, 3<sup>rd</sup> January, 2023 at Sproxton Village Hall. At the meeting, residents were re-consulted on the amendments to the above planning application, following changes to the original. As this application is a revision of the original application (20/00695/FUL), attendees were reminded that we are to discuss the amendments in the second application, not the whole application.

As the whole application is a new submission however, it is most important to take into consideration all the previous points of discussion surrounding the application as a whole, as these were not discussed at this latest meeting. For this reason, we have submitted the previous consultation responses as an appendix to this latest consultation response from Sproxton Parish Meeting.

The applicant, Mark Wainwright and son, were invited to speak at the outset, but were unable to attend this evening. The main amendments outlined for discussion were: an amended location plan with all of the land owned by the applicant highlighted within a blue area (which we assume is the venue site as there is no key). There is a revised site layout plan with a newly sized car park which comes up to the bridleway. There is also a Technical Note from Sandersons

The principle points raised were as follows:

**1. Confusion between the original access, a revision and this amended plan which shows the car park coming right down to the bridleway with a lockable gate** - although the applicant’s wife stated that as far as she was aware, the original plan should be the same as the current and the bridleway gate should not have vehicular access. There was general disagreement to this and several parishioners pointed out that the current plans we are discussing do show the car park coming down to the bridleway and a ‘lockable gate’ of unspecified size. Alan Goforth has been asked to clarify which plan is correct, but there has been no response to this as yet.

**2. Farm access to the venue without vehicular access** – queries were made how it would be possible for farm access to be permitted through the lockable gate but other vehicular access to the venue to be prohibited. The applicant’s wife stated that the intention is that guests will not use the gate access. Several parishioners stated that this was unsatisfactory and asked for confirmation that gates to the car park will be locked when events are in progress. The applicant’s wife stated that she didn’t know when the gates will be locked.

One parishioner made the point that most of the current farm traffic will be redirected along the new farm track rather than coming through the village eg. pig wagons at 6am, crop sprayers, corn trailers and pig manure loads. This would be a golden opportunity to solve one of Sproxton’s long term sources of irritation such as damaged grass verges. However, another parishioner counteracted this stating that he felt that when you live a village such as this, you accept that there will be noise e.g. pigs in the morning at 6am, etc. and brought into this in a rural community. The noise coming from an entertainment venue is a different sort of noise and not what we brought into.

A query was raised regarding the possibility of a guarantee that there would be absolutely no access to the bridleway and village i.e.. no gates and walled off. This would make it more acceptable. In response, another parishioner noted that there was also discussion about moving the track NE at the last meeting, but the applicant has not come back to us on this and there is no amendment on the planning application.

**3. Specification for the access track from the A170** – Parishioners queried if there will be traffic lights to contend with 100+ vehicles at one given time coming up the bridge and hill from Helmsley and downhill from Thirsk and Malton directions, as they feel this will cause huge traffic concerns.

One parishioner stated that the access road is described in the plan as a 150mm sub-base and the top surface is not discussed with the applicant required to fill in the holes twice a year. He felt that private vehicles are unlikely to use such a track and that the applicant had left access from the village in place for this reason. This has also been raised by the AONB. The parishioner also noted that lighting of the access track has also been missed off which is a serious concern.

The applicant's wife stated that they would keep the hard stone track in good condition as they would want guests to use this route. She also stated that the planning officer would detail the lights required. The Chairman reminded parishioners that lighting was discussed with regard to the initial application and we should be mindful to discuss amendments mainly.

**4. Conditions tying access route to the venue** – A parishioner queried if there should be a condition tying the new access route to this wedding & events property? i.e. All the land with the access route and venue on is currently under the ownership on one person; if any of the fields with the access road are sold separately, is there anything tying the use of the wedding venue to the access road? Otherwise, if the land with the access route is sold, that means that any access traffic would be back to using the village road for access.

**5. Signage to the venue** – There were several issues raised regarding signage if the new access road is authorised. One parishioner noted that there are three main access points and the documentation says that the signage will be on the A170 only. For the majority of traffic (coming from Thirsk), the A170 right turn from this direction into Sproxton is already very dangerous particularly at night and anyone will be directed by Satellite Navigation through the village and so will anybody looking for Sproxton on a map. Thus, there will be extra signage required from all directions in order to contend with this. Unless this signage is in place any traffic coming from either of the other two routes will use the village street. The Chairman noted that Mr Boyne from Highways has still not replied on this.

One parishioner reminded the Parish Meeting that one of the reasons the Golf course was refused back in the 1990s was because the then North Riding council wouldn't allow signage from the A170. Another parishioner had the impression that the AONB would consider the possibility of a brown sign on the 'Sproxton Only' pole at the village entrance.

Another couple of parishioners remarked that there is an awful lot of passing traffic that still continues to turn into the top of the village despite the fact that the sign now says 'Sproxton only' although this has helped reduce incidences.

Another parishioner noted that the report says that all the signage for the new access road will be on the applicant's land. However, what the report is missing is any signage on the highway saying that access cannot be via the village.

The applicant's wife responded by stating there will be a new postcode, a map given to attendees, and we could put a sign on land we have coming-along the A170 from Thirsk. We don't have any land to do this from the Malton side.

Parishioners generally felt that traffic management would be required to deal with traffic crossing the A170 as there would be so many vehicles coming at one time.

The applicant's wife stated that they are still waiting for Highways reports as they have given lots of recommendations and they have done surveys, but they haven't published anything yet.

**6. Enforcing traffic to use the new route to the venue** – several parishioners queried if was possible to enforce the requirement for the venue traffic to use the new route to stop traffic entering the village. One made the point that if not stopped at the entrance to the village, the traffic would come all the way down, find no entrance and then turn around and come all the way back.

The applicant's wife stated that the intention is to ask each car on arrival at the first 10-15 events if there were any problems on the journey and find out if there are any issues. Parishioners responded with general dissatisfaction with this response and stated that there would be nobody stopping anyone coming through the village. One parishioner stated that he felt the idea of monitoring the first 10/15 events had been thrown into the submission to make it seem as though this has been taken into consideration and once the venue is built there may be no way to change it back.

**7. Queries around the size and siting of the car park and impact upon bridleway users**– there were several comments regarding the increased car-parking capacity by comparison with the original plan and concerns raised that this was the beginning of an increase in numbers attending events. The applicant's wife was unable to give a reason for the increase in numbers of car parking spaces.

Clarification was requested on where the car park starts and ends, because as the car park stands on the amended plan (coming down to the bridleway), Bransdale Cottage and the holiday cottages (opposite) will be able to see the cars parked in at least the lower portion of the field from outside and within their property. This is an issue.

Despite the plan to put hedging in place along the car park boundary with the bridleway, several parishioners raised concerns about the use of the bridleway as the current positioning of the plan would make the bridleway potentially more dangerous. The point was made that this is a public bridleway, therefore there should be no limit on members of the public using it as such. One parishioner pointed out that any negative effects on bridleway users should not legally happen according to the Highways Act and the Countryside Act. Another parishioner pointed out that following late night events, some users of the car park will be returning to remove their cars in the morning so this could well have an impact on people using the bridleway during daytime hours.

**8. Noise outside the venue** – Many felt that the issue of outside noise has been ignored. Parishioners felt that significant noise from the outside area, close to the bridleway, holiday cottages and owner's residence was highly likely. One parishioner highlighted a contradiction in the planning; in the Noise Management Plan it states that the area to the south of venue building won't be used. However, this is where the smoking area to be used 12noon-10pm is sited. What about the noise from this? What about noise coming from the now enlarged car park, the vehicular noise of vehicles using the venue and providing facilities at the event. There was a resulting general lack of confidence that the mitigations on the Noise Management Plan would be adhered to.

On sound insulation, one parishioner pointed out that it seems strange that lots of information about the use of materials in the build to provide sound insulation and use of air conditioning on the first application has been left out of this latest application as it is not mentioned at all. Another parishioner noted that fireworks usage is not mentioned in the amended plan either.

**9. Noise from external suppliers using generators** - several parishioners made the point that there is no discussion of supply vehicles such as outside catering vans, ice cream vans, bouncy castles, gin bars etc. making noise from running generators all day.

**10. Forced air ventilation system & associated noise-** One parishioner stated that forced air ventilation produces considerable noise and had not been factored into the calculations of noise levels during assessments or taken into consideration on the noise management plan.

Another parishioner noted that forced air ventilation is tricky to manage as it does not actually cool the air e.g. on a hot day it will blow hot air over hot people. As a result, people need to open doors and windows. This will happen at the venue unless there is air conditioning (which there is no mention of in the latest plans) and opening doors/windows would contravene the noise management plan which stipulates that all doors and windows must remain closed to mitigate sound. The loss of the air conditioning system is a backwards step from the latter stages of the original application where it appeared to be included. It has not been included in the revised/updated plans so we take this to mean that they will not be used.

**11. Noise from music which cannot be played via the sound array system** - One parishioner queried the noise from music that doesn't go through the sound array system e.g. Scottish pipers, acoustic bands, swing bands, brass bands The noise management plan mentions that everything has to go through the sound array system.

The applicant's wife stated that their thoughts are that most music will go through the amplification system and she couldn't see that 'one violin' would be a problem.

**12. Night noise** – One parishioner raised the point that she was very concerned about the night noise caused by people leaving the venue at night, the noise of vehicles on such a road surface right at the back of our homes, coming so close to where we are sleeping and the prospect of car lights shining at the rear of homes at night.

**13. Other possible activities at this mixed-use venue** – one parishioner noted that in August, the applicant stated he was willing to remove all of the other events other than weddings. This hasn't happened and there are concerns about the "etc." in the application pertaining to events and what this could mean.

The applicant's wife gave examples of possible events such as yoga/Pilates classes, art classes or community events such as a Sproxton Village Christmas Fair.

Another Parishioner pointed out that the wording of the planning application leaves open the possibility of any event whatsoever such as clay pigeon shooting for example. A further parishioner stated that any venues may hold up to 28 days clay pigeon shooting per annum without planning permission.

**14. Sewerage** – One parishioner noticed the most recent plan doesn't have the sewage treatment works on the plan at all. Yorkshire Water has indicated that Sproxton's current waste treatment works is insufficient to cope with the new venue. In the previous version of the plans, the sewerage plant was to be sited well away from the holiday cottages and Bransdale Cottage but in the latter stages of the original application it was within a couple of metres of two of their bedrooms. There are concerns that it has moved about a lot and is hugely significant - it should be sited well away from these properties and this should be a simple change to the plans to allay fears.

The applicant's wife stated that the plan is that it will be in the triangle field opposite Sproxton Hall and will be only a manhole cover that is seen in the corner.

The clerk thanked the applicant's wife, clarifying however that parishioners must only vote on what is seen on the current plan.

**15. Direct contradiction between Environmental Health reports** – One parishioner noted that Environmental Health back in 2020 objected because the stringent conditions needed for the venue to go ahead could not be enforced. This happened in two previous EH reports. This time there is a huge discrepancy and direct contradiction to the two previous EH reports as the EH report this time says that the conditions CAN be enforced. Please could someone clarify the change? The Chairman replied that this has been queried with no response from RDC or Environmental Health.

**16. General inadequacy of the Noise Management Plan** – the owners of Bransdale cottage and Sproxton Holiday cottages raised concerns regarding the inadequacy of the Noise Management Plan: Having tranquility is key to living at our property and for the key selling point of our business so we would like to see a much more strengthened management plan. There are many opportunities where the plan could have been strengthened but hasn't in the latest submission (e.g. blocking gates to bridleway, restricting and defining types of events, limiting types of suppliers that are brought in (i.e. those that don't need generators). Our primary concerns relate to noise (from various sources) and impact this will have on our business, which is based on peace and tranquility, as well as our home if noise is not managed effectively and mitigated wherever possible. We would like to see a strengthened Noise Management Plan where details of how the events noise will be tightened and particularly behaviour of people is to be managed.

**17. Quality of information from applicant** – One parishioner queried why we are at the 11<sup>th</sup> hour and still have so many questions. Would it not have been better if, as in a normal case of planning applications, our questions could have been answered? He felt that it is very unfair to treat villagers in this way. There was general agreement from the Parish Meeting.

**18. Environmental Health and planning conditions** – A parishioner pointed out that in the latest EH report says that they would not agree to this venue until all the conditions are met. No work can start on the buildings until the road is put into place, then they have to build the place. And then test the noise system will be adequate.

**19. Further amendments to the application** – One parishioner stated that we never had the opportunity to comment on items that went to the planning committee as small amendments last time this planning went forward. He asked for clarity that if this happens again, we would have the opportunity to comment on any further amendments.

The Chairman responded by saying that he would bring this to the attention of the planning officer. He also reminded parishioners that they have the opportunity to write individual letters until the 12<sup>th</sup> of January and could lobby Steve Arnold as our local councillor.

Val Arnold (member of Helmsley Town Council who attended the meeting) finished by saying: This application seems very piecemeal. It should be an application that you receive finally with all the amendments so you have a clear picture of exactly what will be the end product as a whole and this should be mentioned to Alan Goforth.

After discussions, Sproxton Parish Meeting voted to determine their status regarding the amendments to the new planning application. The vote was done publically by raising a hand, with each current parish elector physically present at the meeting having one vote. Please note that Yorkshire Local Councils' Association have confirmed that this is the correct and lawful procedure required to ascertain the view of the Parish Meeting as a singular body.

The Voluntary Parish Clerk clarified the question to be voted upon:

*Having listened to the discussions on the most recent amendments to the planning application for "Change of use and alteration of farm buildings to form a mixed use events and venue barn (wedding ceremonies and reception and small conferences etc.) with associated facilities, landscaping and parking including new access from A170 (revised scheme to refusal 20/00695/FUL dated 07.07.2021)<sup>[1]</sup><sub>SEP</sub>" at Sproxton Hall Farm, Sproxton, are you in support of this application?*

***Voted upon and objected to by a significant majority (91%).***

Support: 3

Objection: 32

Abstain: 0

**OUTCOME: Sproxton Parish Meeting objects to the planning application at Sproxton Hall Farm, Sproxton.**

This is a fair and honest representation of discussions at the meeting. For a complete understanding of the views of Sproxton Parish Meeting to the application in its entirety please also consider other points covered in the previous consultation responses as only amendments to the new application were discussed in this latest meeting.

The previous four consultation responses may be found in Appendices A, B, C & D with full minutes of the latest meeting (not yet approved) in Appendix E.

Signed ...D. Hazorika-Stéphany.....09/01/23

Voluntary Clerk of Sproxton Parish Meeting

**APPENDIX A – 1st Consultation response to RDC regarding original application 20/00695/FUL (January '21)**  
**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, 25<sup>th</sup> January 2021**

I write as Parish Clerk on behalf of Sproxton Parish Meeting following the Ordinary Meeting held on Monday, 25<sup>th</sup> 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 Sproxtton 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 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 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

*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 – 2nd Re-consultation response to RDC regarding original application 20/00695/FUL (Mar '21)**

**Application: Sproxtton 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 Sproxtton Parish Meeting – Monday, 15<sup>th</sup> March 2021**

I write as Parish Clerk on behalf of Sproxtton Parish Meeting following the Ordinary Meeting held on Monday, 15<sup>th</sup> 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 Sproxtton Parish Meeting feel that the contents of the report alleviates their concerns with regards to noise?”**
- **“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?”**

**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, cathering 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. Sproxton 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 Sproxton Hall Holiday Cottages.
- 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.

After the discussions, Sproxton 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 Sproxton 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 Sproxton 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 C – 3rd Re-consultation response regarding original application 20/00695/FUL (June '21)**

**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**

**Third Re-consultation response from Sproxton Parish Meeting – Wednesday, 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2021**

I write as Parish Clerk on behalf of Sproxton Parish Meeting following the Ordinary Meeting held on Wednesday, 23<sup>rd</sup> June by Zoom.

At the meeting, residents were once again re-consulted on the above planning application, following discussions on the “revised Noise Impact Statement and associated data” and the “applicant’s highways consultant’s response to the latest highway officer’s comments on the inter-visibility of passing places and carriageway widths”. These documents can be found on the RDC planning website and were the only issues discussed following guidance from RDC. Afterwards, the Parish voted upon the following question:

- Having listened to the discussions on the most recent amendments to the planning application for “*Change of use and alteration of farm buildings to form a mixed use events and venue barn (wedding ceremonies and reception and small conferences etc.) with associated facilities, landscaping and parking*” at Sproxton Hall Farm, Sproxton, are you in support of this application?

### **DISCUSSION AROUND REVISED NOISE IMPACT STATEMENT:**

The principle points which were raised at the meeting regarding the **revised noise impact statement** were as follows:

**1. The applicant’s son stated that the amendments to the noise report are more specific data collected over a longer time period to capture traffic noise and noise from the village etc., as opposed to last time.**

**2. No external activities at venue** – Ryedale Testing’s response to Apex Acoustics stated: there would be no external activities, sound would be limited to guests arriving and leaving, the smoking area would be well screened from Sproxton Holiday Cottages by a wall and building so there would be no noise.

However, parishioners noted:-

- No external activities is a change from the original application
- Noise to and from the car park and people socialising cannot be stopped
- The Noise Management Plan cannot be enforced as there is no contract between visiting guests and applicant.

**3. Data Accuracy** – Parishioners queried the accuracy of data produced by Ryedale Testing in light of the response from Apex Acoustics.

**4. Suppression of noise & Enforcement of Noise Management Plan** – There are queries about the noise emanating from Sproxton Hall Farm; physical alterations suggested to suppress the noise may impact upon the other part of the planning application to do with listed building status. These may be incompatible.

It was noted that Ryedale Testing say that noise management measures outlined in their report are “essential to noise reduction” e.g. windows, doors, tunnel gate and movement and behaviours of people. It is not made clear how this Noise Management Plan will be enforced.

The applicant's son stated that as the family would continue to live at Sproxton Hall they would do their utmost to ensure it was as quiet as possible.

**5. Traffic noise along village Street** - Parishioners were unconvinced that Ryedale Testing’s assessment of traffic noise at houses such as Keeper's Cottage was a fair reflection of the noise likely to be generated.

The applicant’s wife referred to a speed survey carried out in the village in 2018. Average speeds were well below 30 mph, so there would not be an issue.

In response Parishioners made the following points:-

- The 2018 survey was done in response to a speeding complaint and is nothing to do with the application.
- The survey was of locals used to the road conditions, not people on a single visit and unfamiliar with the road.
- Lack of safe walking routes for pedestrians are a grave concern.

**6. Noise from agricultural activity** - the applicant's wife stated that there have been no complaints about agricultural noise even though this can be significant. She felt that concerns about noise from the venue are getting out of hand and venue noise will not affect people.

Several Parishioners pointed out that they tolerate normal agricultural noise because they live in an agricultural community. The different character/quality of noise at different times and on a different scale at the venue would be very different to normal agricultural noise and is therefore unacceptable.

One Parishioner noted that intermittent noise is more difficult to tolerate than continuous noise such as the grain drier, and is particularly a problem at night.

Several Parishioners noted that there is almost nil night time traffic. This would be very different with streams of traffic leaving the venue and is unacceptable to villagers.

**7. Noise level impact on Sproxton Hall Holiday Cottages and Bransdale Cottage** - claims in the Ryedale Testing report do not match the experience of the owners. Traffic and people talking on the road can be heard in their bedroom.

DISCUSSION AROUND RESPONSE BY SANDERSONS (applicant's consultant) TO NYCC HIGHWAYS LATEST DOCUMENT:

The principle points raised at the meeting regarding the comments pertaining to inter-visibility of passing places and carriageway widths were:

**1. The applicant's consultant's response doesn't address concerns** – Parishioners felt that the consultant's response did not address the issues raised by NYCC Highways, particularly with reference to inter-visibility between passing places along the village street and carriageway width.

**2. Traffic levels will remain throughout the village** - it was pointed out that all large vehicles servicing houses at the far end of the village have to travel the whole length of the village street to turn at the Village Hall/Sproxton Cottage, so the amount of heavy traffic is same throughout the village.

**3. Loss of important village amenity** - as well as use by vehicles; pedestrians, dog walkers and riders use the village street daily and stand and chat to neighbours etc. The amended application does nothing to address this aspect of highway safety.

**4. Regarding creation of passing places** - A query was raised pertaining to passing places – how will we stop these being used as laybys?

After the discussions, Sproxton Parish Meeting voted to determine their status regarding the amended planning application. The vote was done publically by raising a hand, with each current parish elector physically present at the meeting having one vote. Please note that Yorkshire Local Councils' Association have confirmed that this is the correct and lawful procedure required to ascertain the view of the Parish Meeting as a singular body.

The Voluntary Parish Clerk clarified the question to be voted upon:

- **Having listened to the discussions on the most recent amendments to the planning application for “Change of use and alteration of farm buildings to form a mixed use events and venue barn (wedding ceremonies and reception and small conferences etc.) with associated facilities, landscaping and parking” at Sproxton Hall Farm, Sproxton, are you in support of this application?**

The results of this vote were as follows:

***Voted upon and objected to by a significant majority (89%).***

Support: 4

Objection: 32

Abstain: 0

**OUTCOME: Sproxton Parish Meeting objects to the planning application at Sproxton Hall Farm, Sproxton.**

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

Signed ...D. Hazorika-Stéphany.....27/06/21

Voluntary Clerk of Sproxton Parish Meeting

**APPENDIX D – 4th consultation but 1<sup>st</sup> response to RDC regarding new application 22/00791/FUL (Aug '22)**  
**Application: Sproxton Hall Farm – change of use and alteration of farm buildings to form a mixed-use events and venue barn**

**Planning Application No: 22/00791/FUL<sup>L</sup><sub>SEP</sub>**

**Sproxton Parish Meeting's consultation response on revised elements of the above new application -  
Tuesday, 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2022**

I write as Parish Clerk on behalf of Sproxton Parish Meeting following the Ordinary Meeting held on Tuesday, 2<sup>nd</sup> August at Sproxton Village Hall.

At the meeting, residents were re-consulted on the above new planning application, following significant changes to the original. As this application is predominantly based upon the original application (20/00695/FUL), the applicant, Mark Wainwright, was invited to present an outline of the major changes to the Parish Meeting.

As such, the Parish Meeting discussion centred around the proposed new speaker system and proposed new highway. As the whole application is a new submission however, it is most important to take into consideration all the previous points of discussion surrounding the application as a whole, as these were not discussed at this latest meeting. For this reason, we have submitted the previous consultation responses as an appendix to this latest consultation response from Sproxtton Parish Meeting.

After the discussions, the Parish voted upon the following question:

The [second] question to be voted upon is: *Having listened to the discussions on the application for "Change of use and alteration of farm buildings to form a mixed use events and venue barn" at Sproxtton Hall Farm, Sproxtton", are you in support of this application?*

### **DISCUSSION AROUND PROPOSED NEW SPEAKER SYSTEM & SOUND IN GENERAL:**

The principle points which were raised at the meeting regarding the **proposed new speaker system & sound** were as follows:

**The applicant introduced the concept of the new speaker system for all amplified music which would act as 'noise cancelling sound' and described a highly effective demonstration of the system at the proposed venue recently.**

**1. Effective demonstration of sound reduction using speaker system** – several villagers were invited to the sound demonstration and were impressed at the significant sound reduction outside the proposed venue and stated that the amplified music being played through the sound system could not be heard at the Village Hall and some way up the village, however, on the day of the sound test, music could be heard at Sproxtton Hall Holiday Cottages, resulting in a sound complaint.

One Parishioner pointed out that the sound impact report stated that the noise during the test was 25db and that the assessment stated that all doors and windows would have to be shut with 450mm stone walls in order for noise levels to be within acceptable parameters. Another point mentioned was that the sound management plan states that someone will have to go around and check all the windows and doors are shut in order for the sound mitigation to be effective. How can you assure us that people running the events will do this effectively and to the letter? Plus, what about sound deadening planting around the venue? This would be good.

**2. Noise emanating from non-amplified sources** – there were multiple queries as to the possibility of suppressing sound from non-amplified "live" music sources such as chamber quartets, brass bands, swing bands, saxophonists etc. The applicant stated that as these were non-amplified sources of sound, there was no way of using the speaker system to reduce noise from such sources.

One parishioner queried if any noise assessments had been done on acoustic sounds at all, to which the applicant replied 'no'.

Further parishioners asked if it might be possible to have acoustic assessments done from different points in the village owing to the discrepancies in the land/ way sound is carried and another parishioner asked if it might be possible to have further more professional assessments done on the sound mitigation with the sound system and our own acoustic specialists.

**3. Proposed sound insulation methods** – one parishioner asked for detail about the methods to be used within the building to attenuate sound. The applicant's response was that they would act in accordance with the requirements given by Environmental Health and Buildings Regulations' officers.

Another Parishioner asked how the sound system would cope with the sound of large numbers of guests singing along to songs 'at the tops of their voices'. The Applicant's response was that sound deadening would be effected by the materials used for sound insulation in the build although no detail was offered. Again, another parishioner made the point that it would be nearly impossible to contain 220 people in a building on a hot day – surely they would open doors and windows and sound would be emitted. The applicant stated that force ventilation would be in place to combat this. However, another parishioner queried if sound tests had been done on the force ventilation system itself.

**4. Queries around the accuracy of the sound test referenced in the Noise Impact Assessment and associated baseline dBA levels** – there was considerable discussion around the baseline noise levels in this tranquil, rural village and the validity of the noise test. One parishioner mentioned that in rural areas, baseline dBA levels are often inaccurate as they are usually set for urban areas. The applicant's response was that their sound testers had conducted a baseline noise survey in the village. Another parishioner pointed out that the tests were conducted in the early evening when there was still a considerable amount of ambient sound, which can change the outcome of such tests. She asked if further tests would be done in the dead of night as noise carries much further at night. The applicant's initial response was that the tests required had already been completed (for the current application as it stands) but later commented that he would see what might be done about repeat tests in the early hours of the morning.

**5. Current listed building consent and approved plans for the change of use** – One parishioner queried what would happen if the required sound mitigation is different to that on the approved plans and the listed building consent. The technician who demonstrated the sound system recently made a point of saying that it's very important that the sound insulation is absolutely intact and butts up from one join to another to be effective. Any gaps and the sound proofing will fail. The applicant's response was that they would work with the Building Conservation officer with regard to the listed building.

**6. Outside noise at this mixed-use venue** - several queries were raised as to the noise impacts of potential outside noise from the venue. The applicant's response was that there would be no outside amplified music but there would be a car park and a smoking area (which the sound assessment has taken into account).

One parishioner made the point that on a hot day there might be approximately 220 people gathering outside, with nothing to mitigate against the noise this large group would create, during the day, when villagers are enjoying the peace and tranquility of their gardens.

Another parishioner then pointed out that the garden area outside has hours of use on the planning application from 12 noon until 10pm at night, seven days a week. She queried how you could mitigate against the noise people outdoors all this time would create.

The applicant's response was that they do not plan for all the guests to be outside at the venue all this time, as we are not an outside venue.

Later, one parishioner made the point that we are not a silent village by any means. We hear traffic, motorbikes, parties, horseboxes regularly. The applicant also noted that their normal agricultural activities are quite noisy – eg. tractors, grain dryer running.

A couple of parishioners agreed but made the statement that the difference is that the existing noise would be expected in a village such as Sproxton. Villagers do not expect the noise created by a wedding venue that runs seven days a week, especially unknown mixed events etc. Several parishioners agreed that a stronger caveat on the 'other events' should be made. Having listened to further similar comments, the applicant stated that he could potentially consider 'weddings only' as the diverse range of other events had not occurred to him.



**7. Other activities at this mixed-use venue** – one parishioner pointed out that there is a mention in the plan for approximately 30 events a year and surely weddings would only be a part of that. This raised several points of discussion from parishioners concerned about all the varied types of event such a mixed-use venue might entail from music festivals to clay pigeon shoots & conferences. The general consensus was that the request for the change of use to 'mixed events etc.' as far too wide and ambiguous. The applicant's explanation for such a planning request was that "there are many events that we cannot foresee in the future and therefore we need the planning permission to encompass events that may come up so we do not keep changing these permissions".

#### **DISCUSSION AROUND PROPOSED NEW ROAD ACCESS FROM A170**

**The applicant described the proposed new road as being one vehicle width, crushed stone farm track with passing places. It will go behind the mature hedge, not on the same side as the public footpath. There will be temporary signs saying no access to the wedding venue at the top of the village in place before the wedding happens and removed afterwards. He also stated there would be no illumination of the route.**

**1. Would the new proposed access route be used?** – This was queried by a parishioner. The applicant's response was that there would be a bespoke postcode, google pin drops, what three words etc. to get as many people as possible to use the new road access. He stated there would be no access from the car park onto the existing village road/Ebor way.

**2. Discrepancy of routes/access on submitted planning documents** – One parishioner raised the point that on one plan on the Ryedale planning portal there is a visible access onto the Ebor way and on another there is no access, so they are contradictory. Another asked if confusing plans would be removed from the portal. The applicant stated that confusing plans would be removed and that there should be no access from the car park onto the bridleway.

Further to this, one parishioner suggested that the plan does not make it clear that there will be no access from the village, just alternative access. She asked if any wedding or events traffic would use the existing alternative route through the farmyard. Another parishioner followed, asking if caterers or other facility vehicles would use the existing access from the village either. The applicant stated that he would not expect this and that all commercial traffic would be expected to use the new proposed route.

**3. Suitability of road surface** – one parishioner queried how over 200 cars a week would cope with this sort of track and whether people with nice cars would use it with potentially expensive vehicles. The applicant stated that he have lots of farm tracks like this and would have to maintain it so that people can use it otherwise, complaints about the track might mean people don't come to the venue. However, another parishioner stated that by the time farm vehicles have used this stone track through the winter it will not be serviceable for weddings in the Spring with a churned out, damaged road surface. Wouldn't a concrete base or better road be better from the outset?

Another parishioner felt that the new farm track would improve the general level of village traffic as it would remove a considerable part of Sproxton Hall Farm traffic – something which has long been the cause of irritation due to potential for damaged verges etc.

**5. Noise on departure from venue & traffic noise along village street** – One parishioner raised a query about the general noise created by 220 partygoers themselves departing a venue at the hours of closing stated by the applicant (Sunday- Friday it is 12 midnight and Saturday it is 1am). Another asked if a noise assessment had been completed on the fact that 100 cars would be leaving the village at midnight all together. The applicant stated that yes, a noise assessment had been completed within acceptable levels.

**6. Farm traffic access route** – One parishioner raised the point that if farm traffic could still access the farmyard via the village, organisers would have difficulty physically preventing contractors, wedding venue traffic etc. from using the existing village road. Similarly, another parishioner queried if there would be any way that farm guests could come out of the farmyard, through the farm, out through the farmyard and onto the village street. The applicant suggested that in order to prevent this, they would have to use their existing lockable double gates.

**7. Pedestrian access to venue** – One parishioner asked if there would be access for pedestrians etc. into the venue from the bridleway into the venue as he was concerned that people would drive down, park in the village street and walk into the venue. Another also mentioned that there was nothing to stop a 52-seater bus driving down the village to drop guests off either. The applicant replied that he could not see why a hand gate would be needed so this could be closed off so there is no access from the bridleway. Another parishioner suggested that this could be enforced by saying in the planning application, “We ensure no permitted access to vehicles or pedestrians from the bridleway” - This would stop people being dropped off by minibus etc.

**8. Increase in rural theft** – One parishioner had concerns in terms of increased access and opportunity for rural theft. The applicant responded that this was a concern and stated that there would be a lockable gate on the new road.

**9. Signage** – The applicant responded to two queries to confirm that temporary signage would go up at the top of the village road for all events and that there would be a sign for “Sproxton Hall Wedding Venue” at the top of the new road accessed from the A170.

**10. Turning point toward the end of the proposed road (just up from the village hall)** – One Parishioner raised a concern about the turning point in the new road with accessibility, theft etc. and noise as they live very close to this. The additional quantity of cars coming quite close to where they live on several days of the week and the timing of the noise in the early hours is unacceptable and they don't feel their objections to the original plans have been met in terms of venue noise, traffic noise, traffic pollution and feel that they would be very disturbed by these events as will the nearby Sproxton Hall Holiday Cottages.

**11. Attenuation of road sound by hedges** – The applicant stated that the sound analysis had forecasted the noise of cars and that hedges would provide a reasonable attenuation of sound. A couple of parishioners responded that this did not alleviate their concerns and one stated that since the removal of hedges at the entrance point on the A170, there was a noticeable increase in traffic noise. The applicant responded that they wish to build a visibility splay in order to attenuate the sound and the hedges will go back into place.

**12. Possibility of the new road moving back further east** – there was lots of general agreement from the Parish Meeting when a parishioner queried the possibility of making the road dogleg further east and keep the traffic further away from the village. The applicant responded that it may be possible and was a good point and that he would give it consideration although he didn't think the AONB would like it.

**13. Vehicular access at A170** – A couple of parishioners asked if the visual splay and new road had been approved by highways. The applicant responded that it was not approved but that Highways are aware and said it meets their criteria. The applicant had a conversation with Highways who explained what needed to be done to make the road work and that they approve that plans will fit with all Highways Agency parameters. Another parishioner raised the point that the Sanderson report says the vehicular access will be approved only if all vehicular access turns left. However, the applicant contested this. One parishioner also noted that Stephen

Boyne who is the head of Highways is away on leave until August 17<sup>th</sup> and the consultation observations close on August 16<sup>th</sup>.

**14. Construction traffic if plans are approved** – One parishioner asked for a guarantee that the new road would be built first in order to facilitate access to the building site (which will go on for 40 weeks according to the application documents), otherwise construction traffic will use the village street for those 40 weeks causing great disruption. Another parishioner mentioned that this should be a condition of any approval of this application.

After discussions, Sproxton Parish Meeting voted to determine their status regarding the new planning application. The vote was done publically by raising a hand, with each current parish elector physically present at the meeting having one vote. Please note that Yorkshire Local Councils' Association have confirmed that this is the correct and lawful procedure required to ascertain the view of the Parish Meeting as a singular body.

The Voluntary Parish Clerk clarified the question to be voted upon:

*Having listened to the discussions on the application for "Change of use and alteration of farm buildings to form a mixed use events and venue barn" at Sproxton Hall Farm, Sproxton", are you in support of this application?*

The results of this vote were as follows:

Support: 4

Objection: 25

Abstentions: 3

**OUTCOME: Sproxton Parish Meeting objects to the planning application at Sproxton Hall Farm, Sproxton.**

This is a fair and honest representation of discussions at the meeting. For a complete understanding of the views of Sproxton parish Meeting to the application in its entirety please also consider other points covered in the previous consultation responses as only the main changes (the speaker system and proposed new road) were discussed in this latest meeting. The previous consultation responses may be found in Appendices A, B & C. Full minutes of the latest meeting (not yet approved) can be found in Appendix C.

Signed ...D. Hazorika-Stéphany.....16/08/22

Voluntary Clerk of Sproxton Parish Meeting

**APPENDIX E – Minutes (unapproved) of latest meeting on Sproxton Parish Meeting discussing amendments to the latest planning application: 22/00791/FUL (03.01.23)**



**MINUTES**  
**Sproxton Parish Meeting – Ordinary Parish Meeting**  
**Tuesday, 3rd January 2023 – 6pm**  
**Sproxton Village Hall**

**PRESENT:**

Chair: George Skinner

Voluntary Clerk: Doobori Hazorika-Stéphany (minutes)

Joanna & Rob Oliver, Joy Walters, Chris Jenkins & Di Garside, Maureen Skinner, Joanne & Simon Welford, Charlie Marwood, Elaine & Steve Burgess, Helen & Dave Wells, Juliane Schaub, Colin Ward, Mike & Priscilla McAndrew, Pam &

Ross Pattison, Franklin Farrar, Bob & Nancy Roberts, Brian Mellor, Peta Poole, David & Cath Kershaw, Ian & Katie Boddy, Fiona Wainwright, Joe Marwood, Ellie Turnbull, Emma & Jeremy Shaw, Val Arnold, George Jabbour.

**APOLOGIES:** Mathieu Hazorika-Stéphany, Kate Shaw, Selwyn Jones, Sue & Mark Balmforth, Mark & Henry Wainwright, Margaret Farrar, Philip & Ann Blackburn, Steve Arnold, Fliss Murtagh, Ros & Robert Field.

**Welcome** by Chairman, George Skinner. Formal welcome to George Jabbour and Val Arnold our local councilors. Thank you all for attending.

**AGENDA ITEMS:**

AGENDA ITEMS	DISCUSSION AND COMMENTS	ACTION REQUIRED BY WHOM/ DATE	OUTCOME
1. Signing off minutes from last OPM (30.11.22) by Chair, George Skinner.	DHS: prepared minutes for review. GS: Welcome – brief reference to last meeting minutes. GS: Reviewed (referring to matters arising), read & signed minutes after they were agreed by parishioners.	GS to sign 30.11.22 OPM minutes.	Completed Minutes filed in SPM Red Minutes Book.
1b. Matters Arising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DHS- contacted St John Ambulance, British Red Cross and BHF for quotes for CPR/Debrillator training. Unfortunately all courses are either out of area or prohibitively expensive eg. SJA - £1060 for 10 delegates. DHS also contacted Chris Davies at YOR Training (Malton based) who will come out for £300. (precept would need to go up by £60 every 5 years minimum). He also suggested we might ask local GPs/medics who might do it for free.</li> <li>DHS also contacted Yorkshire Ambulance Service whom SPM have been in communication with in the past to see if they are able to offer any CPR/defib community support or advice on qualifications required/insurance indemnity.</li> </ul>	Phillipa Armstrong – contact her as she is a helpful local Medic contact known to some parishioners.	
2. An update on North Yorkshire Council.	<p>GS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While it will be the largest council geographically in England, North Yorkshire Council aims to be the most local. There is a clear commitment to work with town and Parish Councils, the community and voluntary sector, health and emergency services and other partners to maximise the value of every North Yorkshire pound and to support and empower communities to drive local action and local priorities</li> <li>There will be a single website, a single telephone number and a single set of social media feeds. This approach will make it easier for people to get in touch. There will also be a main office in every former district area, supported by around 30 additional customer access points across the county.</li> </ul>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 90 members elected by the public in May 2022 will continue to represent their divisions for a further four years from 1 April 2023. The Executive, working as a ‘shadow executive’ for the new council has already taken a number of key decisions, e.g. devolution, council tax issues</li> <li>• The structure of the new council is taking shape, including the appointment to some of the most senior roles.</li> <li>• Involved in e.g. Cost of living campaign and delivering household support grant</li> </ul>		
<p>3. To receive details of, discuss and vote upon recent amendments to the planning application for “Change of use and alteration of farm buildings to form a mixed use events and venue barn (wedding ceremonies and reception and small conferences etc.) with associated facilities, landscaping and parking and new access from A170 (revised scheme to refusal 20/00695/FUL dated 07.07.2021)at Sproxton Hall Farm, Sproxton</p>	<p><a href="https://planningregister.ryedale.gov.uk/caonline-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=makeComment&amp;keyVal=RELPK7NOG0X00">https://planningregister.ryedale.gov.uk/caonline-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=makeComment&amp;keyVal=RELPK7NOG0X00</a></p> <p>GS: Chair reminded electors that detailed information on the plans may be found on the RDC planning portal online (above). Please note that any discussion around planning applications should be objective and based upon material planning considerations. This applies to all planning applications. Alan Goforth at RDC has previously advised that we should discuss the amended portions of the planning applications. GS: Please remember you are discussing the planning application, not personalities involved. Please also remember that we are to discuss the amendments in the application, not the whole application. MW has been invited to speak at the outset, but was unable to attend this evening.</p> <p>The main amendments are: an amended location plan and all of the land owned by the applicant with a blue area (which we assume is the venue site) as there is no key. There is a revised site layout plan with a newly sized car park which comes up to the bridleway.</p> <p>FW: As far as I know the original plan should be the same as the current and the bridleway gate should not be vehicular access (Some general disagreement with this).</p> <p>MS &amp; JO: agreed the details of the current plan and said that the current plan we are discussing this evening definitely shows a lockable gate from the bridleway directly to the car park.</p> <p>PP: suggested that a letter should be sent to clarify this.</p> <p>GS: I personally asked Alan Goforth which of the three plans should be the correct version and he hasn’t supplied a response.</p> <p>MS: explained that there seems to be some confusion between the original access, a revision and this amended plan which shows the car park coming right down to the bridleway with a lockable gate.</p> <p>Chair: Thank you for your contributions. I will try again to get a response from Alan Goforth.</p> <p>CW: How can you have farm access and it not be vehicular access?</p> <p>FW: the intention is that guests will not use the farm access.</p>		

	<p>CW: therefore can you confirm that the gates to the farm access will be locked when events are in progress?  FW: I don't know when the gates will be locked.</p> <p>GS: there is a technical note from Sandersons, the applicant's consultant which explains the specification for the access track from the A170.</p> <p>ES: will there be traffic lights to contend with 100+ vehicles coming up the bridge and hill from Helmsley at one given time? This will cause huge traffic concerns.</p> <p>GS: this will be a matter for Highways to contend with.</p> <p>MMcA: it is described in the plan as a 150mm sub-base and the top surface is not discussed and that the applicant will be required to fill in the holes twice a year. Therefore it stands to reason that vehicles will not be using such a track and this is why the access from the village has been left in place. This has also been raised by the AONB. Lighting has also been missed off and this is a serious concern.</p> <p>FW: we will keep the high quality hard stone track in good condition as we want our guests to use this route. The planning officer will detail the lights required and all lighting we install will be down lighting and subdued in contrast with many of the current spotlights and up lights in Sproxton when everybody is discussing how important dark skies are at the moment.</p> <p>GS: lighting was discussed with regard to the initial application and we should be mindful to discuss amendments mainly.</p> <p>DW: Why are there an increase in cars in the car park?  FW: I've no idea.</p> <p>DW: It seems to be the beginning of an increase in numbers... where does it end?</p> <p>HW: Please could we ask Alan Goforth to clarify where the car park starts and ends, because as the car park stands on the plan (coming down to the bridleway), we (opposite) will be able to see the cars parked in at least the lower portion of the field from outside and within our property. This is an issue.</p> <p>RO: Although there is a plan to put hedging in place, I am concerned about the use of the Bridleway as an actual Bridleway, as the current positioning of the plan would make the bridleway potentially more dangerous.</p> <p>FW: we currently only have two horses in the villages exercising first thing in the morning.</p> <p>KB: we actually have 4 horses permanently housed in the village and it is a public bridleway, therefore there should be no limit on members of the public using it as a bridleway. We also have friends who ride their horses from Helmsley also using it regularly.</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>JO: I'd like to point out that any negative effects on Bridleway users should not legally happen according to the Highways Act and the Countryside Act.</p> <p>ES: Early morning users of the car park will be removing their cars in the morning so this could well have an impact.</p> <p>CJ: I'd like to discuss noise. The issue of outside noise has been ignored. There is likely to be significant noise from the outside area, close to the bridleway, holiday cottages and owner's residence. The area to the south of the building which is on the noise management plan states this is as an area that won't be used – This is a contradiction: what about the noise coming from the now enlarged car park, the vehicular noise of vehicles using the venue and providing facilities at the event, and what about the noise from event attenders – for example, this last revision includes another contradiction of an outside smoking area to be used 12noon-10pm, what about the noise from this? How can we have confidence when the compiler of the report can't be bothered to check the consistency of the application? How can we have confidence that they will apply the measures in the NMP?</p> <p>MMcA: the latest noise assessment did not take into consideration noise from the air management plan – as this will make significant noise. Now that you have the listed building plan and approval, the forced air ventilation installation would require changes to the way the building is built and it produces considerable noise. This has not been factored into the calculations of noise levels during assessments.</p> <p>DW: Forced air ventilation is very tricky to manage as it does not actually cool the air e.g. on a hot day it will blow hot air over hot people – we can see this is tricky even in January, tonight! We have had to open windows and doors to ventilate the space during this meeting. This will happen at the venue unless there is air conditioning (which there is no mention of in the latest plans) and opening doors/windows would contravene the noise management plan which stipulates that all doors and windows must remain closed to mitigate sound. The loss of the air conditioning system is a backwards step from the latter stages of the original application where it appeared that this would be included. They have not been included in the revised/updated plans so I take this to mean that they will not be used.</p> <p>JO: in August, Mark did say he was willing to remove all of the other events other than weddings. This hasn't happened. I am concerned at the etc. and what this could mean.</p> <p>FW: Example of possible events might be yoga/Pilates classes, art classes or community events such as a Sproxton Village Christmas</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>Fair. We believe that you have to have specific planning permission to hold other large scale activities, eg clay pigeon shooting’.</p> <p>JO: what is says in the planning application is open to anything. You may have the best intentions and tell us otherwise. However the planning application leaves us open to any event whatsoever.</p> <p>CJ: any venues can hold up to 28 days clay pigeon shooting without planning permission.</p> <p>DG: There is no discussion of supply vehicles such as outside catering vans making noise from running generators all day.</p> <p>JW: outside catering doesn’t refer to vehicles outside, just companies from outside.</p> <p>KB &amp; JO: what about fish &amp; chip vans, ice cream vans, bouncy castles, gin bars outside etc. all with their own noisy generators.</p> <p>RO: There are lots of sensitivities about noise because of local and national reports we read in the press about the conduct of people who attend these events in terms of the number of events and types of events and this new application leaves all this detail very open-ended which makes it very difficult to support this application.</p> <p>DG: the noise management plan mentions that everything has to go through the sound array system. What about music that doesn’t go through the sound array system? e.g. Scottish pipers, acoustic bands, swing bands, brass bands?</p> <p>FW: Our thoughts are that all/most music will go through the amplification system. I can’t see that one violin will be a problem.</p> <p>SW: I would like to make a point that most of the current farm traffic will be redirected along the new farm track rather than coming through the village For instance, pig wagons at 6am, crop sprayers, corn trailers and pig manure loads. This is a golden opportunity to solve one of Sproxton’s long term sources of irritation.</p> <p>RP: the report says only the majority of farm traffic will use this route.</p> <p>HW: We have concerns regarding the inadequacy of the noise management plan. Having tranquillity is key to our peace of living at our property and for the key selling point of our business so we would like to see a much more strengthened management plan. There are many opportunities where the plan could have been strengthened but hasn’t in the latest submission (e.g. blocking gates to bridleway, restricting and defining types of events, limiting types of suppliers that are brought in (i.e. those that don’t need generators). Our primary concerns relate to noise (from various sources) and impact this will have on our business, which is based on peace and tranquillity, as well as our home - if this is not</p>		
--	--	--	--



	<p>managed effectively and mitigated wherever possible. We would like to see a strengthened noise management plan where details of how the events noise will be tightened and particularly behaviour of people is to be managed.</p> <p>JS: I am very concerned about the night noise caused by people leaving the venue at night, the noise of vehicles on such a road surface right at the back of our homes, coming so close to where we are sleeping and the prospect of car lights shining in is terrible.</p> <p>MMcA: Could we have a guarantee that there was absolutely no access to the bridleway and village? e.g. No gates and walled off? That would make it more acceptable.</p> <p>GS: There also discussion about moving the track NE at the last meeting but MW has not come back to us on this and no amendment on planning app.</p> <p>GS: One thing I personally feel is that when you live a village such as this, I accept that there will be noise e.g. pigs in the morning at 6am, etc. I bought into this in a rural community. I think the noise coming from an entertainment is a different sort of noise and not what I bought into.</p> <p>JM: Have speed bumps for the village ever been considered?</p> <p>GS: we are moving off topic here. Also we are signed up to the 20s plenty campaign – there will be an update at a further parish meeting.</p> <p>ES: actually there is medical evidence that the stop/start nature of speed bumps on a narrow road channelled with houses and hedgerows either side would have a hugely negative effect on respiratory health.</p> <p>CW: Regarding signage; if this new access road is authorised. There are three main access points and the highways doc says that the signage will be on the A170 only. I think most traffic will be coming from Thirsk. The A170 right turn from this direction into Sproxton is already very dangerous particularly at night and anyone will be directed by sat nav through the village and so will anybody looking for Sproxton on a map. And thus, there will be extra signage required from all directions in order to contend with this. Unless this signage is in place any traffic coming from either of the other two routes will use the village street.</p> <p>RP: Mr Boyne has still not replied on this from Highways and seems to be very elusive in the matter.</p> <p>MMcA: One of the reasons the Golf course got refused back in the 1990s was because the then North Riding council wouldn't allow signage from the A170.</p> <p>GS: I got the impression that AONB would consider the possibility of a brown sign on the 'Sproxton Only' pole.</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>CK &amp; KB: Is it enforceable to stop traffic entering the village? At what point would they be stopped or would they come all the way down and then turn around and come back?</p> <p>FW: The intention is to ask each car on arrival of the first 10-15 events if there were any problems on the journey and find out if there are any issues. We would staff this.</p> <p>KB: so there would be nobody stopping anyone coming through the village.</p> <p>RO: I feel this business of monitoring the first 10/15 events has been thrown into the submission to make it seem as though this has been taken into consideration but it is rather like testing the ship once it has been launched. And once the venue is built there may be no way to change it back.</p> <p>MS: the report says that all the signage for the new access road will be on your land. However, what the report is missing is any signage on the highway saying that access cannot be via the village.</p> <p>FW: there will be a new postcode, a map given to attendees, and we could put a sign on land we have coming from the A170 Thirsk, also we could put signage on our own land and the same from the Helmsley side. We don't have anything from the Malton side.</p> <p>DG: There is an awful lot of traffic that still continues to turn into the top of the village despite the fact that the sign now says 'Sproxton only'.</p> <p>JW: this has helped reduce incidences though.</p> <p>GS: Yes.</p> <p>ES: Traffic management is also going to be required to deal with traffic crossing the A170 as there is so many vehicles coming at one time and this is a huge change on the new plan.</p> <p>FW: we are still waiting for Highways reports as they have given lots of recommendation and they have done surveys but they haven't published anything yet.</p> <p>GS: I think it met current regulations.</p> <p>KB: Is there a condition tying the road to this wedding events property? i.e. All the land with the access route and venue on is currently under the ownership on one person; if any of the fields with the access road are sold separately, is there anything tying the use of the wedding venue to the access roads? Otherwise, if the land with the access route is sold, that means that any access traffic would be back to using the village road for access!</p> <p>RO: Environmental Health back in 2020 objected because the stringent conditions needed for the venue to go ahead could not be enforced. This happened in two previous EH reports. This time there is a huge discrepancy and direct contradiction to the two previous EH reports as the EH report this time says that the</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>conditions CAN be enforced. Please could someone clarify the change?</p> <p>GS: This has been queried with no response.</p> <p>MMcA: Why are we at the 11<sup>th</sup> hour and still have so many questions? Would it not have been better if, as in a normal case of planning applications, our questions could have been answered. It is very unfair to treat us in this way.</p> <p>RP: The latest EH report says that they would not agree to this venue until all the conditions are met. No work can start on the buildings until the road is put into place, then they have to build the place. And then test the noise system will be adequate.</p> <p>HW: I've noticed in the most recent plan doesn't have the sewage treatment work on the plan at all. Yorkshire Water has indicated that Sproxton's current waste treatment works is insufficient to cope with the new venue. In the previous version of the plans, the sewerage plant was to be sited well away from our house but in the latter stages of the original application it was within a couple of metres of two of our bedrooms. We are concerned that it has moved about a lot and is hugely significant for us- it should be sited well away from our property and this should be a simple change to the plans to allay fears.</p> <p>FW: The plan is that it will be in the triangle field opposite us and will be only a manhole cover that is seen in the corner.</p> <p>DHS: Thanks for clarifying that, however, we must only vote on what is seen on the current plan.</p> <p>CW: We never had the ability to comment on items that went to the planning committee on small amendments last time this planning went forward – could we have clarity that if this happens again, that we have the opportunity to comment on any further amendments?</p> <p>GS: We will bring this to the attention of the planning officer. Don't forget you have the opportunity to write individual letters until the 12<sup>th</sup> of January as an individual and of course you could lobby Steve Arnold also as our local councillor.</p> <p>DW: Sound insulation – seems strange that lots of information about the use of materials in the build to provide sound insulation and use of air conditioning on the first application has been left out of this latest application as it is not mentioned at all.</p> <p>GS: Fireworks usage is not mentioned in the amended plan either.</p> <p>Val Arnold: This application seems very piecemeal. It should be an application that you receive finally with all the amendments so you have a clear picture of exactly what will be the end product as a whole and this should be mentioned to Alan Goforth.</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>RP: This application seems to be very higgledy-piggledy by comparison to others we have voted upon recently.</p> <p>DHS: Gave clarification on the exact wording of the agenda item, the amended planning application and application number being discussed and clarified that only those on the current electoral role for Sproxton Parish would be eligible to vote.</p>		
<p>3b. Vote to decide the status of Sproxton Parish Meeting as a consultee on the above planning application</p>	<p><b>The question to be voted upon will be:</b> Having listened to the discussions on the most recent amendments to the planning application for <i>“Change of use and alteration of farm buildings to form a mixed use events and venue barn (wedding ceremonies and reception and small conferences etc.) with associated facilities, landscaping and parking”</i> at Sproxton Hall Farm, Sproxton, are you in support of this application?</p> <p>Yes/ hands up - would indicate an elector is in support. We will then take objections and abstentions for completeness. Vote count checked by DHS and ES.</p> <p><b><i>Voted upon and objected to by a significant majority (91%).</i></b></p> <p>Support: 3  Objection: 32  Abstain: 0</p> <p><b>OUTCOME: Sproxton Parish Meeting objects to the planning application at Sproxton Hall Farm, Sproxton.</b></p>	<p>DHS to summarise discussion and vote outcome to send to RDC.</p>	
<p>Confirmation regarding checking of minutes.</p>	<p>DHS (Clerk) requested minute checking volunteers after the meeting ended.</p> <p>Minute checkers for today’s meeting: SW &amp; DG.</p>	<p>DHS to respond to RDC by 12.01.23.</p>	

AOB	<p>a) If there are any members of the Parish electorate who would like to be added to the <b>Parishioner email contact list</b>, please send an email to <a href="mailto:sproxtonclerk@btinternet.com">sproxtonclerk@btinternet.com</a> giving permission for your details to be held by Sproxton Parish Meeting and used for Parish Meeting business.</p> <p>b) Investigation into ownership/responsibility for maintenance of building/ grounds of the Parish Church.  GS: had an email back in the summer that there were discussions to be had as to the future of the church and land and would GS be willing to meet. I gave them availability but no one has come back to me. I presume the chap (James) was from the PCC.  MMcA: Ann Rutter (Warden at Helmsley church) emailed me today (as I had emailed the PCC about who is the owner). Apparently there is a PCC meeting to discuss the future of the church.  GS: perhaps we could ask the PCC to come along?  VOTE: Are we happy that GS/DHS should make enquiries into ownership/responsibility for maintenance of building/ grounds of the Parish Church?  RESULT: Unanimous agreement.</p> <p>c) <b>RIPONIAN STAGES RALLY – SUNDAY 12 FEBRARY 2023</b> - Ripon Motor Sports Club will be organising the Riponian Stages Rally on Sunday 12<sup>th</sup> February 2023. This is a Special Stage Motor Rally authorised under the Motor Vehicles Competitions and Trials regulations. Competitors in the rally are scheduled to pass by or near your property on two occasions as detailed below (all times approximate).  <b>Nawton/Helmsley/Sproxton/Wass Moor Forest 10:20 – 12:45 &amp; again at 13:50 – 16:15</b></p> <p>The event will be running in accordance with the Government and Motorsport UK COVID 19 requirements prevailing at the time of the event. The event consists of special stages held on private land, linked by sections on the Public Highway. All sections on the public highway are non-competitive. Drivers and crews are given ample time to complete those sections quietly and courteously. The event does not condone or encourage speeding on any public highway sections of the route. <b>During the event sections of public highway will be closed in accordance with Road Traffic Act 1988 – Section 12c (as amended), the roads affected are: - Keys Beck Road between Keys Beck House and Wheeldale Bridge from 08:00 until 16:30 Wass Bank Road and High Street past Studford Farm from 09:00 until 18:30.</b></p>	DHS  GS/DHS to investigate	Updated 05/01/23
-----	--	----------------------------------	------------------

Time meeting ended: 19.41