



# Visually Important Spaces

## Topic Paper

This paper describes a potential approach to how we could identify areas of open space within settlements in the North York Moors Local Plan. The spaces have been identified because their preservation is important to the character of the settlement.

**July 2018**

# Contents

Summary .....	3
1. Introduction .....	3
2. Policy Context .....	3
3. North York Moors National Park Context .....	5
4. The Current Approach to Identifying Spaces .....	5
5. Proposed Approach.....	5
6. Types of Spaces Identified .....	8
7. Policy Options .....	8

## Summary

This Topic Paper provides background information on the work carried out in identifying Visually Important Spaces to support the Preferred Options consultation.

The context for considering adopting this approach is set by the National Park statutory purposes and duty, outlined below, and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) <sup>1</sup> which requires great weight to be given to National Park purposes and to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks.

Given this landscape driven context, protecting and enhancing the historic environment is an important component of the National Planning Policy Framework's drive to achieve sustainable development. The protection of our built and historic environment forms one of the 'Core Planning Principles' that underpins the planning system.

This is the first time the National Park Authority is thinking about identifying areas of important spaces for historic built environment reasons.

## 1. Introduction

1.1 The purpose of this Topic Paper is to:

1. Set out the national and local policy context for considering the identification of Visually Important Spaces.
2. Provide information on why we need to identify these spaces.
3. Provide information on the process undertaken to identify these spaces.
4. Outline the policy which would apply to these spaces.
5. Provide a working table of the spaces for inclusion and deletion as a result of public consultation.

1.2 The paper is presented to assist discussion on the inclusion of these spaces as part of the Preferred Options consultation. Comments raised as part of this consultation will help feed into further stages of the emerging Local Plan and therefore nothing in this paper should be taken to represent a definite future direction of policy.

## 2. Policy Context

### National Park statutory purposes and duty

2.1 The Environment Act 1995 sets out two statutory purposes for National Park Authorities:

1. To conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of National Parks, and;
2. To promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the Parks by the public.

---

<sup>1</sup> National Planning Policy Framework, CLG 2012

- 2.2 Section 62 of The Environment Act goes on to place a duty on National Park Authorities in pursuing these purposes “to seek to foster the economic and social well-being of local communities within the National Park”.
- 2.3 In developing policies relating to the identification of visually important spaces within the emerging Local Plan, we are aiming to protect the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the National Park by ensuring new development is sustainable and fosters the social well-being of local communities within the National Park.

### **National Planning Policy (NPPF, 2012)**

- 2.4 The new Local Plan must be in accordance with policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2018). Of particular relevance are;
- Paragraph 172 - “Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks...which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in these areas and should be given great weight”.
  - Paragraph 184 & 185 – “(Heritage) assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance... Plans should set out in their local plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment”

### **Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990**

- 2.5 Under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 the Authority has a duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of an Area which means that within Conservation Areas development needs to be carefully controlled to ensure that the character of settlements are preserved or enhanced.

### **National Park Management Plan**

- 2.6 The National Park Management Plan 2012 (amended in 2017) is the strategic framework for the future of the National Park setting out how the Authority will fulfil its statutory purposes and meet the socio-economic duty of its communities. One of the aims in the Communities section is that new development will protect and enhance the National Park’s landscape and built heritage.

### **The Helmsley Plan**

- 2.7 The Helmsley Plan was produced jointly with Ryedale District Council and adopted by the National Park Authority in July 2015. It sets out the future development of the town up to 2027 and is in accordance with the current Core Strategy<sup>2</sup>. The Helmsley Plan sits within the area covered by the emerging Local Plan and will remain in force, so it is important that the emerging policies do not conflict with those in the Helmsley Plan.
- 2.8 Its policy on windfall development requires particular regard to be given to ensuring that proposals conserve those elements which contribute to the historic character of Helmsley, especially the burgage plots and other important open spaces within the town.

---

<sup>2</sup> Core Strategy and Development Plan Policies, November 2008

### 3. North York Moors National Park Context

- 3.1 The geology and landform of the North York Moors is such that the wider landscape frequently makes a significant contribution to the character of its villages. The moorland, hills and dales form a magnificent backdrop to all of the North York Moors villages and the topography generates many long-distance views both into and out of its settlements. The distinctive form of the National Parks villages is such that the landscape frequently extends into the village through small and large open spaces within the main part of the village. It is the combination of these features that gives each village its own distinctive character and quality, and the relationship between buildings and spaces, views along streets and between buildings are important components which contribute to their rural character. As a protected landscape, it is important that those spaces which contribute to the wider character of the village and its relationship with the surrounding landscape are maintained and preserved.

### 4. The Current Approach to Identifying Spaces

- 4.1 The existing Core Strategy does not specifically identify visually important spaces but instead adopts a principle of focussing small scale housing development to infill plots within villages (Core Policy J). Para.9.16 outlines infill as:

*“...a small gap within a continuously built up frontage within the main built up area of the settlement, which can accommodate no more than one dwelling.”*

- 4.2 The Core Strategy and Development Policies document also states in Development Policy 4 that ‘proposals for development within or immediately adjacent to a Conservation Area will only be permitted where they preserve or enhance the character and appearance or setting of the area and where buildings and features, including open spaces, are retained and respected...’ In addition Development Policy 3 seeks to maintain and enhance the distinctive character of the National Park and development will be permitted where “the siting, orientation, layout and density preserves or enhances views into and out of the site, spaces about and between buildings and other features that contribute to the character and quality of the environment and will not result in the loss of an open space which contributes to the amenity, character and setting of a settlement.”
- 4.3 Whilst the policies in the Core Strategy and Development Policies document have been generally successful in protecting visually important spaces both inside and outside Conservation Areas, and Core Policy J has made it clear that ‘not every gap will be considered as an appropriate infill site’ there is recognition by officers that there is a finite supply of developable infill sites in villages and that the supply of infill sites is reducing. This puts greater pressure on those spaces that still remain and their development could significantly harm the character of North York Moors villages.

### 5. Proposed Approach

- 5.1 The importance of small gap sites within villages was raised by respondents to the First Steps consultation carried out at the end of 2016. Some of the key themes and comments on what residents in particular felt was important about their local village environment were:
- Open spaces, open views, village greens, grass verges, cobbles, and common land – which need protection from infill development.
  - Protection of natural spaces.

- It is paramount that the traditional character and features of the villages and the wider landscape are preserved.
- There is a real danger of the character and attraction of moorland villages and the surrounding countryside becoming spoilt if new sites are opened up
- There was however recognition that small scale development is needed in order to maintain the vitality of local communities.
- The National Park is not a museum and therefore new developments within existing village boundaries would be acceptable and beneficial to keep village life vibrant.
- Small developments are needed but need to move away from 'infill' – small open spaces are important to the character of the village.

5.2 While large scale housing will almost certainly conflict with the National Park's statutory purposes to 'conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the Park', the Authority recognises the need to support small-scale housing development within villages in order to support the growth and vitality of these communities.

5.3 On this basis, the Authority is proposing to continue its approach of locating new housing on small infill plots, but widen its policies to enable the development of small infill sites for up to two dwellings, rather than one, as is the current planning policy. Whilst this should enable better use of land, this approach will undoubtedly increase development pressure on existing undeveloped parcels of land.

5.4 It is therefore proposed to identify 'Visually Important Spaces' (VIS) within the named settlements in the Local Plan where it is considered that the development of those spaces could harm the rural character of the village. The purpose of this policy approach is not to resist all future development of these spaces but rather to identify what it is that is important about the space so that we can ensure any new development does not harm that special character.

5.5 The purpose of this approach is to:

1. Support the development (in particular housing) policies contained within the emerging Local Plan for the villages outlined in the Settlement Hierarchy in order to help steer any infill development to the most appropriate locations. The identification of these important spaces will aid the Authority's Development Management and Planning Policy teams and provide valuable information for landowners, applicants and developers.
2. Form part of the 'evidence base' for the emerging Local Plan by providing an understanding of how the significance of the built environment may be affected by proposed development and will help ensure the Authority meets its first purpose to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the Park. It is also considered that this approach is likely to be supported by Historic England.

5.6 Officers' approach so far has been to visit the villages within the settlement hierarchy and identify the spaces on a plan. Each space has been provided with a written explanation as to why the space is considered to be important. This assessment has been based on a visual inspection from the public highway. Some spaces have also been included in response to comments raised as part of the First Steps and Current Thinking consultations.

5.7 Certain principles have been adopted in the approach taken and perhaps the most important is that officers have only assessed spaces/gap sites which would **fulfil the definition of infill** as outlined in the supporting text to Strategic Policy M, in that the space has a **street frontage and located within the settlement**. Developments outside or on the edge of a

settlement or on back land are unlikely to be supported as a matter of principle, unless it meets the policy requirements for development in open countryside or rural exception sites.

- 5.8 Areas of Common Land or designated Village Greens and highway verges have not been identified as Visually Important Spaces as these areas already have a certain degree of protection and also to avoid duplicate protection.
- 5.9 Also, the identification of a space may not preclude its possible development as a Rural Exception Site as a development to meet an identified local need for 100% affordable housing could outweigh the loss of an open space.
- 5.10 In identifying these areas within the settlements, consideration has been given to:
- Protecting the setting, character and amenity of settlements;
  - Protecting the setting of Listed Buildings and other historic and architecturally important buildings within the area;
  - Preserving the area's character and appearance;
  - Retaining green areas, open spaces and trees.
- 5.11 Officers have used the following criteria to identify these areas:

***Where a space forms a small gap in a continuously built up frontage the following criteria have been used to assess whether the space forms a visually important space:***

- 1. The space makes a positive contribution to the overall form, character and appearance of the settlement;***
- 2. The space makes a positive contribution to the setting of a building or groups of buildings either listed or of historical or architectural interest;***
- 3. The space provides a vista/viewpoint into the surrounding countryside;***
- 4. The space provides a visual relief in a settlement where there is a change in the pattern or character of development***
- 5. The site has archaeological or historic interest;***

***The space provides an open setting for a visually important tree(s) or is important for biodiversity.***

- 5.12 It is worth noting that many of these sites have previously had planning permission refused on landscape grounds. What this work aims to do is to provide greater certainty and clarity to landowners, developers and other interested bodies on which spaces the Authority considers important and could harm the character of the village by their development.
- 5.13 This piece of work is not intended to replicate or replace any spaces identified through Conservation Area Appraisals and where Appraisal have been carried out, the two pieces of work should be read in conjunction.

## 6. Types of Spaces Identified

- **Fields/Orchards/Paddocks Between Buildings**

These spaces are usually in private ownership and often provide an important visual 'relief' in the streetscene. Sometimes they provide an important view out to the surrounding countryside or contribute to the rural character of the village by bringing the countryside into the village. Relic orchards have both a landscape and sometimes historical/cultural value.

- **Domestic Gardens**

These are spaces which are usually in private ownership but they provide many benefits to the character and appearance of a village, such as a natural green gap in a streetscene which is otherwise continuously developed, or allow views of a particular feature, traditional roofscape or group of buildings which are important to the history of the village. These spaces are often at risk of being lost through development.

## 7. Policy Options

7.1 Officers consider that there are two options available:

1. **Keep the existing approach.** The emerging Local Plan would adopt a similar approach and wording to the current Core Strategy. The importance of the space would then need to be made on a case by case basis and be reactive rather than proactive. Also the loosening up of the infill criteria to allow up to two dwellings is likely to result in larger and more important spaces being proposed for development.
2. **Introduce visually important spaces** which identify the undeveloped spaces within villages which are considered inappropriate for development. This would introduce a consistent approach to help steer development away from the more sensitive spaces and provide greater clarity to local residents and potential developers. We are also considering changing the current restriction of one dwelling only within an infill plot to allow up to two dwellings only.

7.2 Option 2 is the preferred approach by officers and work has been done already in identifying these areas to assess the practicality of such an approach.

### **Draft Policy:**

#### ***ENV13 - Visually Important Undeveloped Spaces***

*Within areas identified on the Policies Map as a "Visually Important Space", there will be a presumption against development of the space unless a proposal can demonstrate that the proposal will not result in the loss of, or significantly harm, its qualities or functions for which it has been identified.*

## 8. Consultation Outcomes

**Current Thinking Consultation 5 October to 24 November 2017**

*Q12. Do you support the identification of 'Important Undeveloped Spaces'? Do you have any views on the criteria we have used or whether others may be more suitable?*

8.1 The changes made as a result of public consultations are outlined below:

**Current Thinking Consultation:**

**Important Undeveloped Spaces (now to be called Visually Important Spaces)**

Village	Ref No.	From	Reason for Objection/Support	Officer response	Outcome
Ainthorpe	IUS06	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the village which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Ainthorpe	IUS07	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the village which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Ainthorpe	IUS08	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the village which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Aislaby	IUS03	SBC	Site could be considered, in part or full, as rural exception sites for affordable housing. This is a long stretch of frontage along the main road through the village. There could be the potential to allow a small part of it at either end to be utilised for an exception site of up to 6 units, which would still leave a substantial length protected	The identification of the space would not preclude the site's future development as an exception for affordable housing as this space will be considered against other available sites in terms of its landscape impact when the housing need arises.  However the site is not considered to be infill and is to be deleted on this basis.	Space deleted

Village	Ref No.	From	Reason for Objection/Support	Officer response	Outcome
Carlton in Cleveland	New	Parish Council	Refer to map provided. Areas 1 and 2 are not infill.  Area 3, owned by Beech House is narrow but long and developers are inventive! Areas 4, 5 and 6 are all the central village areas; some are grassy and could theoretically be built on. Area 7 belongs to The Crescent and seems unlikely to be developed.	Areas 1 and 2 are not infill sites. Area 3 is a small access and considered too small to be developed. Areas 4, 5 and 6 do contribute to the character of the area but are not vulnerable to development as they are not infill sites.	None to be added
Castleton	IUS02	A Robson (C/o Savills UK)	This space could provide a potential site for small scale frontage development during the Plan period to help meet the identified housing need and demand outside that of Helmsley. The space forms part of a larger field and is not defined by a boundary to warrant such a designation.	The space has a large frontage and may not meet the definition of infill; however it is on the edge of the village where any development would change the character significantly. In order to protect the present attractive rural character the site should be retained.	Retain
Castleton	IUS03	NYMNPA	This is a large site on the edge of the village which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Castleton	IUS04	A Robson (C/o Savills UK)	If this site was ever to come forward as a development site then a scheme, which would be assessed on its own individual merits, would respect the neighbouring developments and take into consideration the nearby listed building. As such, it is considered overly onerous to identify this area of private land.	Any development on this would significantly change the character of this area of Castleton. (Previous planning application refusals on this basis – 2001.	Retain
Cold Kirby	IUS01 to 03	C Bacon	Supports all the spaces identified and notes that IUS-02 is supported by a 2001 appeal decision	Comments noted	Retain

Village	Ref No.	From	Reason for Objection/Support	Officer response	Outcome
Cold Kirby	IUS03	Land Owner	We are in agreement with your description of this space. We have no desire to develop this land more than as a garden and would not consider building anything here. Undeveloped spaces are a vital part of villages such as Cold Kirby and should be protected. I applaud your attempt to keep such spaces open and untouched.	Comments noted	Retain
Commondale	IUS02	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the village which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Coxwold	New	Parish Council	The fields across the road from Shandy Hall, a building of historic and archaeological importance, should be protected from development as it qualifies under all six criteria.	This attractive space was not included as it is outwith the built area of the village with no development on the western side and does not therefore meet the infill definition.	Not to add
Danby	IUS01	SBC	This space has potential as an exception site in full or in part.	The identification of the space would not preclude the site's future development as an exception for affordable housing as this space will be considered against other available sites in terms of its landscape impact when the housing need arises.  However the site is not considered to be infill and is to be deleted on this basis.	Space deleted
Egton	IUS05	Mulgrave	Not supported. This site has been submitted for allocation for residential development given the positive contribution it would make to providing much needed homes in a	The site's open character contributes to the edge of village rural character and should be retained	Retain

Village	Ref No.	From	Reason for Objection/Support	Officer response	Outcome
		Estate	suitable village location	as a VIS	
Egton	IUS05	SBC	This space has potential as an exception site in full or in part.	The identification of the space would not preclude the site's future development as an exception for affordable housing as this space will be considered against other available sites in terms of its landscape impact when the housing need arises.	Retain
Egton	IUS07	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the village which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Egton Bridge	IUS04	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the village which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Egton Bridge	IUS05	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the village which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Egton Bridge	IUS09	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the village which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted

Village	Ref No.	From	Reason for Objection/Support	Officer response	Outcome
Fadmoor	IUS02	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the village which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Fylingthorpe	IUS04	SBC	This space has potential as an exception site in full or in part.	The identification of the space would not preclude the site's future development as an exception for affordable housing as this space will be considered against other available sites in terms of its landscape impact when the housing need arises.	Retain
Fylingthorpe	IUS06	SBC  P Holdsworth	These are long stretches along street frontages of which the ends could be given consideration as exception sites for up to 6 units without significantly affecting the integrity of the protected space.  IUS06 and IUS08 are the only two sites close to amenities and transport, on level ground, and large enough to site a development of several houses without being too densely packed. In order to protect - acquire our community assets we have to have an approved Local Plan. In order for it to be approved it must have defined areas suitable to meet housing need. I can't see alternatives for these two areas.	The site is open and prominent and affords views to the coast.  However the identification of the space would not preclude the site's future development as an exception for affordable housing as this space will be considered against other available sites in terms of its landscape impact when the housing need arises.	Retain
Fylingthorpe	IUS08	SBC  P Holdsworth	These are long stretches along street frontages of which the ends could be given consideration as exception sites for up to 6 units without significantly affecting the integrity of the protected space.  IUS06 and IUS08 are the only two sites close to amenities	This space which is located on the edge of the village does not therefore meet the infill definition by reason of its size and position.  However the identification of the space would not preclude the site's future development as an	Space deleted

Village	Ref No.	From	Reason for Objection/Support	Officer response	Outcome
			and transport, on level ground, and large enough to site a development of several houses without being too densely packed. In order to protect - acquire our community assets we have to have an approved Local Plan. In order for it to be approved it must have defined areas suitable to meet housing need. I can't see alternatives for these two areas.	exception for affordable housing as this space will be considered against other available sites in terms of its landscape impact when the housing need arises.	
Glaisdale	IUS03	SBC	This site was identified as a potential exception site as part of a consideration of sites in Glaisdale Parish for affordable housing a number of years ago.	The identification of the space would not preclude the site's future development as an exception for affordable housing as this space will be considered against other available sites in terms of its landscape impact when the housing need arises. The site offers outstanding views and should therefore be retained.	Retain
Glaisdale	IUS05	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the village which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Glaisdale	IUS07	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the village which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Glaisdale	New	NYMNPA	New space to be added as Glaisdale Station area was not previously not surveyed)	N/A	New space to be added

Village	Ref No.	From	Reason for Objection/Support	Officer response	Outcome
Glaisdale	New	NYMNPA	New VIS to Glaisdale Station area (previously not surveyed)	N/A	New space to be added
Goathland	IUS01	SBC	This space has potential as an exception site in full or in part.	<p>The identification of the space would not preclude the site's future development as an exception for affordable housing as this space will be considered against other available sites in terms of its landscape impact when the housing need arises.</p> <p>However, the space contributes to the rural character of the village and although located in a central position is important to maintain that open loosely developed character.</p>	Retain
Goathland	All spaces	Parish Council	This has been discussed at the Parish Council meeting and it was felt that the National Park should consult and contact all landowners and neighbours this would impact. As a parish council we feel it is your duty of care to inform all residents/landowners this would concern. It would be most appreciated if you could contact the landowners at your earliest convenience to make them aware of the proposals.	Comments noted.	Landowners will be contacted at Preferred Options consultation
Hackness	New	NYMNPA	New space identified to protect an elevated space between the buildings as this is an intrinsic part of the character of the settlement.	N/A	New space to be added

Village	Ref No.	From	Reason for Objection/Support	Officer response	Outcome
Hawaby	IUS05	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the village which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Hawsker	IUS02	SBC	Again there is the potential for considering the southern end of this site for a frontage development for affordable housing without significantly affecting the integrity of the overall site. We are also of the understanding that the National Park previously considered this land as a potential exception site as part of wider consideration of sites in the parish.	The identification of the space would not preclude the site's future development as an exception for affordable housing as this space will be considered against other available sites in terms of its landscape impact when the housing need arises.  However, the space contributes to the rural character of the village and although located in a central position is important to maintain that open loosely developed character.	Retain
Hawsker	IUS03	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the village which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Hawsker	IUS05	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the village which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Hawsker	IUS06	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the village which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review	N/A	Space

Village	Ref No.	From	Reason for Objection/Support	Officer response	Outcome
			of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.		deleted
Hawsker	IUS07	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the village which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Hawsker	IUS08	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the village which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Hawsker	IUS09	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the village which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Hawsker	IUS10	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the village which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Helmsley	IUS01 Object	Helmsley Estate	The majority of the land south of Carlton Lane has already been developed and this large open space affords little amenity or view for people driving or walking past it. The area has no public access and therefore can only be designated as open space for purposes of views and	One of the few remaining gaps on Bondgate and therefore important. Views of the wooded hillside are however distant and interrupted. Re consider amending the extent of the space to include the Bondgate frontage space only.	Boundary amended

Village	Ref No.	From	Reason for Objection/Support	Officer response	Outcome
		Mr Saggars Town Council	nothing else. Should not be included without compensation. No reason given		
Helmsley	IUS03 Object	Helmsley Estate  Mr Saggars Town Council	This area is a series of buildings which are currently used for storage and stabling. There is activity within the yard in terms of vehicle movements and the National Park is aware that the Estate is considering a planning application for conversion of the buildings to residential. Such an application will not affect the openness and views to the Castle beyond of the yard itself. We therefore do not consider the designation to be appropriate.  Should not be included without compensation. Object, no reason given	Space to be retained as the open views is very important. Any future development should respect the openness of the space and should be retained as a marker.	Amend boundary
Helmsley	IUS04 Object	Helmsley Estate  Mr Saggars	The site is garden land and is surrounded by hedgerow. It therefore cannot be deemed to be of any community benefit by virtue of the fact that it has no public access and cannot be seen by passing members of the public. We therefore object to this designation as an area of land which is not accessible either physically or by the eye.  Should not be included without compensation.	Space is important to the setting of the adjacent Listed Buildings and entrance to Duncombe Park. Comments are noted but any development would be readily visible and have significant visual impact on the Conservation Area.	Retain
Helmsley	IUS05	Helmsley Estate	Although this area is partly open space, the majority of the green shaded land within the field north of Elmslac Road has already been granted planning permission for	Officers to check that space is in line with planning consent 2016/678/FL	Amend boundary

Village	Ref No.	From	Reason for Objection/Support	Officer response	Outcome
	Object		residential use. At the very least, therefore, the plan needs amending.		
Helmsley	IUS06 Object	Helmsley Estate	The scale of the plan makes the exact boundary hard to establish. However, part of the land to the north and west of the site is currently a farmyard and also used for the storage of heavy good vehicles used for livestock transportation. The extent of the space should not impede any future uses of the yard. It is important that the access to and from the yard is not impeded by any designation.	Space does not include the farmyard and therefore objections to relevant. However after further consideration the space is not considered to meet the infill definition and has therefore ben deleted on this basis.	Space deleted
Helmsley	IUS08	Mr Saggars Town Council	Should not be included without compensation. Object, no reason given	Site provided very important views and should therefore be retained to maintain these views.	Retain
Hinderwell	IUS02	SBC Parish Council	This site seems to have been used for some form of holiday park with caravans in the recent past and has therefore had some form of development use. It can't therefore be described as 'undeveloped'?	Site is used as caravan park, but still provides benefit to the area due to mature tree lined boundary.	Retain
Hutton Buscel	IUS02	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the village which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Hutton Buscel	IUS06	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the village which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be	N/A	Space deleted

Village	Ref No.	From	Reason for Objection/Support	Officer response	Outcome
			removed.		
Hutton Buscel	IUS07	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the village which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Hutton le Hole	IUS07	NYMNPA	Small narrow space within village which is unlikely to be developable.	N/A	Space deleted
Hutton le Hole	IUS08	NYMNPA	On review of criteria, space is considered to be too small an unlikely to be developed. Also next to Listed Building and therefore any development will be appropriately considered	N/A	Space deleted
Hutton le Hole	New	NYMNPA	Space contributes to the character of the village and has therefore been added.	N/A	New space to be added
Ingleby Greenhow	All spaces	R Hudson	Agree with the areas identified for Ingleby Greenhow.	Comments noted, however some changes to be made to reduce the number of spaces following other local comments.	See below
Ingleby Greenhow	IUS02	Parish Council TW and M	This is not seen as an important viewpoint within the village and could potentially be considered as a possible infill sites.	Comments noted. Spaces to be deleted.	Space deleted

Village	Ref No.	From	Reason for Objection/Support	Officer response	Outcome
		Proud	<p>Object for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better views can be found outside the village.</li> <li>• This space is surrounded by modern development so would in fact knit the village together.</li> <li>• Space is next to the School which allows open views of the countryside.</li> <li>• Development wouldn't be detrimental to the village, in fact quite the opposite and add to its character and charm.</li> <li>• This site has been in my family for the last 66 years and in line with NYMNP policy it would remain in my family so that future generations would have the option to develop the site so they may remain in the village.</li> </ul>		
Ingleby Greenhow	IUS05	Parish Council	<p>This site is elevated above the road and there is no view out to the open landscape beyond it, only to a gable of a modern brick property, however there is a view into the greenspace when entering the village from Stone Stoup (East) which could justify a narrower frontage strip being protected. The PC considered that this area is outside of the village and should be categorised as open countryside, rather than being identified as an undeveloped space.</p>	The space is large and on the edge of the village, the site does not constitute in fill and does therefore not meet the VIS criteria.	Space deleted
		R Wardman and family	<p>It has long been a consideration of that should any of our family wish to live and work locally and perhaps bring up families of their own in the village then this parcel of land would be the obvious place for them to do so.</p>		
Ingleby	IUS06	C Hawman	<p>The policy appears to be a blanket ban on any infill planning permission within the proposed villages and contradicts the Housing Strategy proposal of allowing two</p>	The space is large and on the edge of the village	Space

Village	Ref No.	From	Reason for Objection/Support	Officer response	Outcome
Greenhow			houses to be built on infill sites.	and does not therefore not meet the VIS criteria.	deleted
Lastingham	New	NYMNPA	New VIS added as the space makes a positive contribution to the streetscene and the rural character of the village.	N/A	New space to be added
Lealholm	New	NYMNPA	New VIS added as the space's open and undeveloped character, the space is considered to make a positive contribution to the streetscene character of Lealholm.	N/A	New space to be added
Lockton	IUS04 Object	Parish Council	This area was originally designated for Council housing but was later sold to a resident who built a bungalow at the back of the plot. This area has been used for business since 1954, initially a haulage business & since the 1980's an agricultural business. In 2005, NYMNP wrote indicating that this area would receive planning approval if applied for. The owner has a son who will need housing in the future and so he does not want this area to be included	Remove site on the basis of the objections received.	Space deleted
Lockton	IUS05 Object	Parish Council	There used to be a building behind the wall which has been removed though the foundations are still there. The current owner does not want to develop the area themselves but feels that as there has previously been a building there this area should not be included.	Remove as the Conservation Area status provides protection for the stone wall on the site frontage.	Space deleted
Lythe	IUS01 Object	Mulgrave Estate	Private garden with no access available to the public. The selection of these areas seems illogical and is otherwise protected by the Conservation Area and Article 4	The space is important to the setting of the adjacent listed buildings and the character of the village.	Retain

Village	Ref No.	From	Reason for Objection/Support	Officer response	Outcome
		(Properties)	Direction.		
Lythe	IUS02	NYMNPA	This small space is considered to be undevelopable without detriment to amenity.	N/A	Space deleted
Lythe	IUS03 Object	Mulgrave Estate  (Properties)  SBC	Private garden with no access available to the public. The selection of these areas seems illogical and is otherwise protected by the Conservation Area and Article 4 Direction.  This space has potential as an exception site in full or in part.	The space is not considered to constitute an infill site and does not therefore meet the VIS criteria.	Space deleted
Lythe	IUS04 Object	Mulgrave Estate (Properties)  SBC	Private garden with no access available to the public. The selection of these areas seems illogical and is otherwise protected by the Conservation Area and Article 4 Direction.  This space has potential as an exception site in full or in part.	The space forms an important setting for the buildings at the entrance to Mulgrave Castle.  Identification as a VIS would not necessarily preclude the site's future development as an exception to policy for affordable housing. The site's suitability as an exceptions site will be considered when the housing need arises and will be considered against other available sites in terms of its landscape impact on the character of the settlement and the wider National Park.	Retain
Lythe	IUS05 Object	Mulgrave Estate  (Properties)	Private garden with no access available to the public. The selection of these areas seems illogical and is otherwise protected by the Conservation Area and Article 4 Direction.	The space is not considered to constitute an infill site due to its size and does not therefore meet the criteria.	Space deleted

Village	Ref No.	From	Reason for Objection/Support	Officer response	Outcome
Mickleby	IUS02	NYMNP	This is a large space on the edge of the village which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Newholm	IUS02	Land Agent NYMNPA	This is a large space in the centre of the village which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Osmotherley	New	NYMNPA	This undeveloped space contributes to the open character of this part of Osmotherley where development is less dense towards the elevated edge/entrance of the village. The space also makes a positive contribution to the setting of the adjacent Listed Pinfold.	N/A	New space to be added
Osmotherley	New	NYMNPA	This undeveloped space, taken together with the open countryside on the opposite side of North End, contributes to the open character of this part of Osmotherley where development is less dense towards the elevated edge/entrance of the village.	N/A	New space to be added
Oswaldkirk	New	Parish Meeting	Area immediately to the south of the public footpath along the top of The Hagg should be designated. It provides numerous views through the trees of the village and surrounding countryside, as well as providing an excellent backdrop for the village from the south. A strip maybe 30-40m wide would suffice.	Only spaces considered to be vulnerable to development are included. A strip of land to the north side of the village adjacent to the PROW is therefore not considered to meet the criteria.	Not to be added

Village	Ref No.	From	Reason for Objection/Support	Officer response	Outcome
Port Mulgrave	IUS02 Support	J Lonsdale	This must be protected as I am a resident of Long Row.	Comments noted	Retain
Port Mulgrave	IUS03	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the settlement which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Port Mulgrave	IUS04	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the settlement which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Ravenscar	IUS01	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the settlement which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Rosedale Abbey	IUS05	NYMNPA	An appropriately scaled and designed development in this location would not unduly harm the character of the area particularly in the context of the modern development on the southern side of Heygate Bank and for this reason the space has been removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Rosedale Abbey	IUS07	NYMNPA	This is a large space which contributes to the setting of the village but would not because of its size and location be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the	N/A	Space deleted

Village	Ref No.	From	Reason for Objection/Support	Officer response	Outcome
			designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.		
Rosedale Abbey	IUS08	NYMNPA	This is a large space which contributes to the setting of the village would not because of its size and location be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Sleights	New	Parish Council	Suggest the wooded area between Echo Hill bridge and the railway line is included as an important undeveloped space.	It is not felt that the space would meet the definition of infill but could be considered as a Community Space. Site visit made to inspect and further consultation needed with PC to ascertain ownership and use.	Further discussions needed
Sinnington	IUS03	NYMNPA	Following a review of the identification criteria, it was felt that this space wouldn't meet the definition of infill and therefore shouldn't be vulnerable to development.	N/A	Space deleted
Sneaton	All spaces	Parish Council	In Sneaton we have 3 undeveloped spaces which you have used the same generic explanation to describe them. All 3 sights are in fact quite different from each other. The view on IUS 01 is actually over the top of a 5 foot wall and part of the view in summer is covered by mature trees.	IUS 01 to be deleted on the basis of the objections received and that the space is too large to be considered as an infill site and does not therefore meet the criteria.  IUS 02 and IUS 03 to be retained in view of the contribution to the street scene of IUS 02 and in view of the Planning Inspector's comments on IUS 03 in 2007.	IUS 01 deleted  IUS 02 and IUS 03 to be retained.
Swainby	IUS02	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the settlement which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review	N/A	Space

Village	Ref No.	From	Reason for Objection/Support	Officer response	Outcome
			of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.		deleted
Thimbleby	New	Parish Council	By including Thimbleby as a 'village' and identifying IUS, Thimbleby would be protected but there would be greater planning flexibility than if it was reclassified as open countryside.	Meeting took place with Parish Council to discuss the status of Thimbleby. It was explained why it should not be a village in the hierarchy and this would afford it more protection.	No change
Thornton le Dale	IUS08	NYMNPA	Having reviewed the criteria, this small space considered to be too small to be developed and without detriment to amenity.	N/A	Space deleted
Ugthorpe	IUS01	NYMNPA	This space forms church land and is therefore identified as a Community Space instead.	N/A	Space deleted
Ugthorpe	IUS02	NYMNPA	This is a large space in the settlement which would not by reason of its size be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Wass		Parish Council	One landowner in Wass has identified their site as an important undeveloped space. The PC on behalf of the village would not be able to support development on this site, part of which is an historic monument. Furthermore, despite the statement attached to the map on the Paper, the PC has yet to be invited to comment. The PC has representations to make.	Further consultations are to take place at Preferred Options stage and the space referred to is not considered to be an infill space.	No changes

Village	Ref No.	From	Reason for Objection/Support	Officer response	Outcome
Wass	IUS03	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the settlement which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
Wass	New	NYMNPA	The space allows views through to the wooded backdrop behind where development would harm the character and appearance of this near edge of village site where the character is partly established by the well-spaced form of development in large verdant plots.	N/A	New space to be added
West and East Ayton	IUS05	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the settlement which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
West and East Ayton	IUS07	NYMNPA	This is a large space on the edge of the settlement which would not be regarded as an infill site. Following a review of the designation criteria sites of this nature are to be removed.	N/A	Space deleted
		A Cromack	The spaces which are the views from and over the Park should also be designated as important whether they are in AONB or not - the views over the land visible from Sutton Bank is a great example.	Comments are noted but identification would not be appropriate in such circumstances.	No changes

**If you would like further information, please contact us:**

Planning Policy – [policy@northyorkmoors.org.uk](mailto:policy@northyorkmoors.org.uk)

Development Management – [planning@northyorkmoors.org.uk](mailto:planning@northyorkmoors.org.uk)



01439 772700



northyorkmoorsnationalpark



@northyorkmoors

The text of this document can be made in large print. Please contact the Planning Policy team using the contact information above.



## **North York Moors National Park Authority**

The Old Vicarage, Bondgate, Helmsley, York YO62 5BP

01439 772700

[www.northyorkmoors.org.uk](http://www.northyorkmoors.org.uk)