



RYEDALE
DISTRICT
COUNCIL



Oswaldkirk Conservation Area Assessment & Management Plan

Consultation Statement
September 2011

1.0 Introduction

This statement is prepared under regulation 18 (4) (b) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004. This requires that a Local Planning Authority shall not adopt a Supplementary Planning Document until they have prepared a statement setting out a summary of the main issues raised in the representations and how these main issues have been addressed in the Supplementary Planning Document which they intend to adopt.

The National Park Authority's Statement of Community Involvement states that in relation to Supplementary Planning Documents consultation will be undertaken as follows (this is consistent with Ryedale District Council's Statement of Community Involvement):

Stage	Type of Involvement
Pre-Production • Survey and evidence gathering	• Informal engagement and discussions with specific and general consultation bodies, and other consultees
Production • Preparation, and publication, of draft Supplementary Planning Document (and Sustainability Report)	• Formal public participation for a 6-week period • Exhibitions where appropriate
Revision of draft Supplementary Planning Document	• Ongoing discussions, as required
Adoption • Adoption of document	• Notification of adoption of document to all interested parties

Informal consultation was undertaken with residents of Oswaldkirk prior to the production of the draft document via an open day held in the Village Hall on 3 November 2007.

Formal consultation under regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 was undertaken between 26 July and 6 September 2010. The consultation documents comprised of:

- Draft Oswaldkirk Conservation Area Assessment and Management Plan Supplementary Planning Document;
- Notice of SPD Matters;
- Habitats Regulations Assessment.
- Sustainability Appraisal Report
- Pre-Production Consultation Statement

Specific consultation bodies were sent copies of the above documents and other general consultation bodies as considered relevant were informed of the consultation by letter. A list of consultees is set out below.

Advertisements were placed in the local newspaper – Malton Gazette - informing that the Draft Supplementary Planning Document was available for consultation and where it could be viewed.

All of the documents listed above, along with details of the consultation, were placed upon the Authority's website, www.moors.uk.net. The documents were also available to view in the Authority's office in Helmsley. A total of 7 separate responses have been received, with the response from the Parish Meeting representing the views of many residents as expressed at the meeting.

Overleaf is a summary of each individual response and details of how these have been addressed in finalising the Supplementary Planning Document.

List of Consultees

- § Oswaldkirk Parish Meeting
- § English Heritage
- § NYCC Highways Area 2 Department
- § NYCC Planning and Countryside Unit
- § Environment Agency, York
- § Government Office, Yorkshire and Humber
- § Natural England, York
- § Yorkshire Forward

2.0 Issues Raised and Addressed

The following table is derived from the comments received during the formal consultation period and sets out how the comments have been addressed in the final document.

Name	Date of Comment	Comment	Endorse CAAMP	Alteration
Jonathan Kendall, Environment Agency	28/07/10	Satisfied with Habitats Regulation Assessment.		
Heather Rennie, Natural England	19/08/10	Welcomes CAAMP and endorses proposals for monitoring undertaken as part of Annual Monitoring Reports. Notes incorrect reference at 6.1 of Sustainability Appraisal Report.	Y	Correct reference at 6.1.
Alison Munday, Government Office for Yorkshire & The Humber	3/09/10	No comments.		
John Pilgrim, Yorkshire Forward	6/08/10	No comments		
Mr and Mrs D. Thompson & Mrs E. Blower	6/09/10	CAAMP is good but concerned about location of arrows on Map C and tree management in relation to Oswaldkirk Bank.		Representation of views on Map C from Oswaldkirk Bank amended.
Mr D. Goodman	6/09/10	CAAMP contains useful ideas. Population of village sustained by post-war developments. Trees and hedges require active management to maintain views. Various points of historical information provided		Comments and information noted and minor textual changes made (8; 9.1; 10.5; 10.6; 11.7, 12; 14.4; 18; 19.13). Residual ridge and furrow noted on Open Spaces map, and reference added at 8. Not possible to protect R & F via statutory designation, relies on land

ANNEX 2

		<p>and textual changes and clarifications suggested and requested.</p> <p>Evidence of ridge and furrow in fields has virtually disappeared in recent years - could be protected?</p>		management.
Mr M. Clook, for Oswaldkirk Parish Meeting	6/09/10	<p>Welcomes CAAMP, especially re. views and vistas, important green spaces and maintenance of boundaries and trees. Query re quinquennial review.</p> <p>Concern expressed over clarity of guidance on need for Planning Permission and what development would be permitted; use of dated photographs and need to take account of recent tidying up of street signs; road safety versus conservation; all electricity cables should be undergrounded. The CA boundary should be extended to include Manor View, St Oswald's Close and properties along the B1257 in order to protect views and vistas and ensure a consistent approach to planning. Further minor points (incorrect boundaries, post and rail fencing, reference to consultation statement).</p>		<p>Quinquennial reviews are recommended by English Heritage [2006] but in practice will only occur if required and if resources permit. The requirement for Planning Permission for works is complicated and changes whenever the General Permitted Development Order is amended (frequently). The guidance in the CAAMP is intended to identify the special character of the area and provide guidance on sympathetic development. Sometimes this will require PP, sometimes not, but this can only be determined in each case by enquiry to the Local Planning Authority. Clarification regarding maintenance added at 20.0.</p> <p>Guidance on acceptable future development must be site specific and would be offered on a case by case basis, taking into account the guidance within the CAAMP. Paragraph 19.11, Signage, has been updated, as well as photographs. Photos have not generally been updated as they are intended to illustrate points in the text and not constitute a precise record of the CA today. The LPA does not make decisions on works by Highways but it is</p>

ANNEX 2

				<p>consulted and has a duty to make the case for conservation. Paragraph 19.12, Overhead Wires & Poles, has been amended. The enlargement of the CA to include Manor View, St Oswald's Close and the B1257 cannot be justified in terms of designation criteria. They do not share the key characteristics of the CA identified in 17.1, essentially not being a cohesive part of the historic built area and form of the village. Works which require PP outside the CA but where they would affect the character or setting of the CA will nevertheless be subject to the analysis and guidance contained in the CAAMP. Minor points: boundaries are provided by the Ordnance Survey and cannot be amended locally; information added at 11.7; the pre-production consultation statement includes a table of comments with how these have been addressed.</p>
--	--	--	--	---