

## Appendix 2 – Visually Important Spaces. Summary of All Responses.

Due to the volume, size and similarity of comments made to Policy ENV13 comments from respondents are summarised in the table below by assigning a letter (a-s) to each to show the nature of the objection. The list below sets out the reasons (a to s) for the objection. Individual responses are available on request.

Policy ENV13 was supported by Historic England, Natural England, North Yorkshire Moors Association, two members of the public, one member of the public (VIS11 at Lastingham), one member of the public (VIS01 at Oswaldkirk), one member of the public (VIS05 at East Ayton), one member of the public (VIS03 at Appleton le Moors), one member of the public (VIS04 and VIS05 at Carlton in Cleveland), one member of the public (VIS04 and VIS05 at Carlton in Cleveland), one member of the public (VIS02 at Port Mulgrave), two members of the public (VIS17 at Thornton le Dale)

13 Neutral comments were received from one member of the public (VIS03 at Ampleforth), Dawnay Estate (VIS02 at Glaisdale), Mexborough Estate (VIS01, VIS02, VIS04 at Hawnby), one member of the public (VIS03 at Kilburn), one member of the public (VIS07 at Lastingham), one member of the public (VIS02 at Robin Hood's Bay), one member of the public (VIS05 at Robin Hood's Bay), one member of the public (VIS09 at Thornton le Dale), one member of the public (VIS16 at Thornton le Dale), one member of the public (VIS18 at Thornton le Dale), two members of the public (VIS21 at Thornton le Dale)

### Policy ENV13 – Visually Important Spaces – Reasons for Objections

- a) The normal planning process is sufficiently robust to enable all aspects of an application to be considered, in accordance with the relevant policies and taking into account the current protections including the National Park designation, Listed Buildings, Conservation Area and TPO etc. This further layer of protection is an unnecessary duplication.
- b) The designation of visually important spaces 'closes off' much infill potential in many villages. Villages, local families and businesses need opportunities for flexible, sensitive, organic growth. There are very few spaces in some villages that could be put forward for future development and this policy approach would prevent the development of the few opportunities that might be available and that may be permitted under CO7 and CO8. This represents is an unsustainable approach which could harm the vitality of villages and communities in the medium to long term.
- c) The designation of the space does not comply with the evaluation criteria stated or does not have the characteristics/features stated.
- d) The space is not 'visually important' as it is not readily visible/it is screened from public view by existing features.
- e) The space is does not meet the definition of infill and should not be designated.
- f) The space includes private garden land.
- g) Whether spaces were seen as visually important is a subjective matter meaning that the process of designation was arbitrarily applied on the basis of the view from the

highway. Sites should instead be dealt with on a case by case basis (each on its merits) as it is under the current policy.

- h) The designation would prevent any future development on the land including extensions, farm buildings, refurbishment/new access arrangements and car parks.
- i) The delineation of the space is seems arbitrary or is incorrect.
- j) The designation would devalue land and properties.
- k) The policy would unjustly encroach on the rights of the landowner.
- l) The Policy is unsound and appears to be in conflict with national policy or guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework. (para.16, 77, 78, 122, 117) The justification for the policy appears to be an attempt to tighten policies relating to infill development and is a presumption against development.
- m) This is approach is contrived, ill-conceived and flawed in methodology. The site descriptions are inadequate and are not accompanied or evidenced by a Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisals. The descriptions of the sites are an inadequate attempt to convey importance and significance of a site without evidence and to resist housing development.
- n) It is attempt to reduce pressure on planning officers to conduct thorough assessments of planning applications in these spaces, by writing off potential spaces for development based upon their 'visual importance' before a true and fair assessment of a proposed application and all of its distinct costs and benefits in relation to the application's own context.
- o) Unaware of the proposed policy at the previous consultation.
- p) The VIS policy and spaces should be reconsidered and the infill criteria should be widened, which together with specific allocations would enable villages to grow.
- q) The development of the site would provide funds to undertake essential maintenance of a significant historic building, or provide funds to support an Estate or farm.
- r) The development of the site could provide much needed local needs/affordable housing in the future which would contribute to maintaining the vitality of the village.
- s) The site provides an opportunity for a sensitively designed scheme which would make either a positive contribution to the area or would not harm the character of the area.

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
A member of the public.		<b>Ainthorpe</b>	VIS01 <b>Object</b>	Normal planning process is sufficiently robust to take in all aspects of an application. A flexible approach to sensitive development based on need within the village should in our opinion be adopted. Former building on site which still exists as foundations under the garden Plot may at some point be required for agricultural purposes.	a, b, f, h, k
A member of the public.		<b>Ainthorpe</b>	VIS05 <b>Object</b>	Space is only a small part of a 4.5 acre field presently growing potatoes. The view of the surrounding countryside is not visible through the hedge during summer. Danby School is separated from this space by the road. Due to the curving nature of the field boundary hedge will always be visible from the western approach to fully appreciate the schools setting.	a, d, f, h, k
A member of the public.		<b>Ainthorpe</b>	VIS03 & VIS04 <b>Object</b>	Planning applications are normally considered on their merits of the individual situation. This arbitrary designation is inciting pre-emptive bias towards refusal in advance of a fair assessment. Designation would undoubtedly significantly devalue my property. Method of identifying these spaces is entirely inappropriate. The visual importance a fundamentally subjective quality. The view is not actually easily visible from the public land as the road is lower than the fields on both sides of the lane.	g, j, k, l, n
A member of the public.		<b>Ampleforth</b>	VIS03 <b>Neutral</b>	Support the need to maintain the rural character of this village and appreciate the need for VISs, however reconsider and reduce the identified area.	d, f, h, j.
A member of the public.		<b>Ampleforth</b>	VIS04 <b>Object</b>	The space does not afford open views of the sloping hillside from the main road. Planting may mean no view of the sloping hillside from the road.	c, f, o
A member of the public.		<b>Appleton le Moors</b>	VIS03 <b>Support</b>	Agree with comment about the garden area to the south of my property enhancing the general streetscape of the village	
Two members of the public.	Cheryl Ward Planning	<b>Boltby</b>	VIS01 <b>Object</b>	There are very few sites in the village that could be put forward for future development. The proposal to create 'visually important spaces' appears to conflict with the NPPF and narrowly closes the gap on the already limited opportunities for housing development in Boltby.	b, g, l

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
Two members of the public.		<b>Boltby</b>	VIS02  Object	Object and request that this proposal is removed from the Local Plan in so much as it affects our property and its land.	h, k
A member of the public.		<b>Carlton in Cleveland</b>	VIS04  Object	Question the need for VIS as the planning authority have control of when and where developments are allowed. A restriction on its potential use could have serious financial implications for the business.	a, h, k
A member of the public.	Parish Council	<b>Carlton in Cleveland</b>	VIS04 & VIS05  Support	If area VIS05 and VIS04 were to be considered for any type of development, we would lose the only uninterrupted view of the Northern edge of the NP escarpment visible within the limits of the village, from the road.	
A member of the public.		<b>Carlton in Cleveland</b>	VIS04 & VIS05  Support	Objection to any proposed development on these sites.	
A member of the public.	Savills	<b>Castleton</b>	VIS03  Object	Object to the identification of the above two sites. The site is neither located at the eastern end of the village, nor highly prominent in its street scene. It is well screened by the stone walling, hedge and trees, The junction of Church Street and Ashfield Road does not provide an end-stop to the village. The site is not considered to make a positive contribution to the setting of the village and its overall form and character or to provide important views out into the surrounding countryside and Danby Low Moor. There is a finite supply of developable infill sites in villages and a need to stem the decline in population. The site could provide an appropriate infill site in Castleton.	b, c, d, g, p.
A member of the public.	Savills	<b>Castleton</b>	VIS02  Object	The site is not unspoilt green space. It does not make a positive contribution to the character of the eastern edge of Castleton because it forms an attractive open space between the historic part of the village and the more modern developments at Ash Lea and Ash Grove. The site cannot be described as an attractive open space. It is private land which can neither be entered nor clearly seen into or out of. There is a finite supply of developable infill sites in villages. This site could accommodate a new dwelling.	b, c, d, f, g, p.

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
Two members of the public.		<b>Chop Gate</b>	VIS01  <b>Object</b>	Site is a private garden. Space does not reinforce the linear pattern of the village or provides views of the rising landscape beyond” but this is not actually the case. The garden is bordered on both sides by mature hedgerows and has a number of mature trees within it. Hedges are maintained to a height of over 6ft for our own privacy and security. This is particularly the case for the hedgerow along Raisdale Road. You cannot see the views from either the B1257 looking up towards the Raisdale Road or from the Raisdale Road looking down towards the B1257. Point that it “provides views of the rising landscape” is not correct. If in the future, the school should close and the school and playground be re-developed, then any views currently possible across the school playground will be lost in their entirety. Since the school playground is not also being designated a Visually Important Space then a re-development of this area would be possible yet this will lose completely what little of the view you can currently see. We would also like further clarity on what is defined as “development” as this is not clear within the local plan document on your website. Would this include a greenhouse or out-buildings or an extension to our current patio area as development or plants or trees? This designation may also affect the price of our property and our ability to sell it into the future. Proposal would stop a further house being built in the garden – there is existing power to stop that through existing planning regulations, plus a large sycamore tree plus the existing septic tank in the garden also would make building an additional property in the garden impossible.	a, c, d, f, h, j

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
Newburgh Priory Estate	Savills	<b>Coxwold</b>	VIS02  <b>Object</b>	<p>A planning application was submitted in January 2018 to provide '4 no. open market dwellings with associated access, parking, garage/ car ports, amenity space and landscaping'. This application was submitted to raise essential funds required to undertake essential maintenance on the core buildings within the Newburgh Priory Estate, which are Grade I Listed and recognised to be of national significance. A corresponding application to provide up to 3 residential dwellings in the village was also submitted to provide much needed affordable houses on a site to the south of Coxwold. Within the Preferred Options Draft Local Plan. It has been acknowledged by council officers during the course of the current planning application, that the addition of dwellings in Coxwold would improve the vitality and community of the village, and secure its economic sustainability. The NPPF and PPG are both unequivocal that the Government expects councils to boost significantly the supply of housing and meet the full objectively assessed needs within the Housing Market Area. The 'Preferred Options' Draft Local Plan should aim to increase the housing offering across the Park and encourage growth. Generally, support is given to the Preferred Options Draft Local Plan, however the fundamental purpose of these representations is to object to Draft Policy ENV13 and in particular the inclusion of the land off Hushwaite Road as a Visually Important Space (Cox-VIS02). Whilst the importance of growth is acknowledged in both the Preferred Options Draft Local Plan and Paragraph 78 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the practical application of Draft Policy ENV13 will serve to choke development in rural communities and villages, where managed growth has significant potential to directly contribute to the sustainability and vitality of communities and the economy. Paragraph 5.2 of The Visually Important Spaces Topic Paper recognises that small scale development within villages is the most appropriate strategy for growth, it also states that sites have been included as 'Visually Important Spaces' in order to restrict the development on smaller 'infill' plots which could harm the rural character of the village. The Paper states that this approach seeks to 'steer any infill development to the most appropriate locations'. However, the emerging Policies Map relating to Coxwold</p>	b, c, e, q, r, l,

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
				<p>shows that every developable site within the village has been designated as being of Visual Importance. This will restrict any growth from coming forward in the Village. This represents an entirely unsustainable approach which could harm the community in the medium to long term. We fundamentally disagree with the Council's approach of protecting all 'infill' spaces in Coxwold. Not only is this approach too liberal and inconsistent with the principles set out in the Draft Plan, it also disregards the potential of some of these sites to deliver housing in sustainable locations, with minimal landscape impact. The Local Plan must recognise that the country's rural communities cannot stand still.</p> <p>The August 2015 DEFRA publication entitled 'Towards a one nation economy: A 10 point plan for boosting productivity in rural areas' is particularly useful in providing up to date background information on the matter: "Improving the conditions for people to live and work in rural areas would help create more flexibility of labour markets, ensure that people with the right skills can be matched to job opportunities in rural areas, and facilitate the creation of new businesses...Lack of housing is a national challenge but in rural areas it is a particular constraint to labour and entrepreneurial mobility." (p.18). As part of its measures, it sets a 10-point plan for rural areas, point 8 of which confirms that "the government wants to ensure that any village in England has the freedom to expand in an incremental way, subject to local agreement". This is further captured within the PPG which expands on paragraph 55 of the NPPF, stating: "A thriving rural community in a living, working countryside depends, in part, on retaining local services and community facilities such as schools, local shops, cultural venues, public houses and places of worship. Rural housing is essential to ensure viable use of these local facilities." (Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 50-001-20140306). The allocation of VIS 02 in Coxwold will also be a clear departure from guidance provided within the NPPF which relates specifically to the provision of Rural Housing. Specifically, Paragraph 77 highlights the importance of planning policies which remain responsive to Local Circumstances and supports Local Needs. The proposed development</p>	

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
				<p>of Land off Husthwaite Road is linked to the much needed affordable housing development proposals submitted for a site to the south of the village. The development of both sites is essential to deliver much needed market and affordable housing in the area and should not be restricted. Land off Husthwaite Road (ref COX-VIS02) Within its draft designation, the land off Husthwaite Road (VIS02) has been described as: 'The space which is located adjacent to the main northern entrance to the village in a prominent location makes a positive contribution to the overall form and character of Coxwold Conservation Area, The space provides views into the village towards the rear of the elevated village houses on Thirsk Bank and provides glimpses of the long garths to the rear of the houses which are of historic significance. The space is also adjacent to the Back Lane, a Public Right of Way, and this forms the northern extent of the historic garth village pattern.' Sites have been assessed against a set of criteria to identify if they can be considered to be of Visual Importance. However upon review of these criteria, it is clear that Cox VIS02 does not fit the description of a Visually Important Space and as such the designation should be removed. Importantly, the Land off Husthwaite Road does not represent a 'gap in a continuously built up frontage', nor is it an 'infill' site. Both of these are listed as key criteria for the identification of sites as Visually Important Spaces. We have assessed the site against each of the criteria individually below: Criteria 1- 'The space makes a positive contribution to the overall form, character and appearance of the settlement' Whilst we acknowledge that the Land off Husthwaite Road is located at a prominent location on the edge of the settlement, the development of the site would mirror the development on the opposite side of the road and as such does not make a contribution to the form, character or appearance of the settlement. Criteria 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' The land off Husthwaite Road is located to the North East of Coxwold. There are no heritage assets on or immediately adjacent to the site. Elphin House is a Grade II listed asset located 100m to the south, with frontage onto Thirsk Bank. The majority of Listed</p>	

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
				<p>assets in Coxwold are located to the west of the Village, adequately separated from the Land off Husthwaite Road by built development. Whilst the site sits within the Coxwold Conservation area, there is no conservation area Statement and as such the contribution of the site to the conservation area cannot be assessed. The site is located adjacent to a garage and post war housing additions to the village which have arguably already eroded the Conservation Area in this location. The site provides significant opportunity to be sensitively designed and developed to make a positive contribution to the area. Criteria 3- 'The Space provides a vista/viewpoint into the surrounding countryside' The site does not provide a view into the surrounding countryside; instead the justification for the draft designation makes reference to the view into the village. The Mature trees located to the North of the site, combined with the topography of the area restrict the views into the village to short range views. The site does not therefore fulfil Criteria 3 or the purpose of 'Visually Important Spaces' Criteria 4- 'The space provides a visual relief in a settlement where there is a change in the pattern or character of development' VIS 02 does not constitute a visual relief in Coxwold given its location on the edge of the settlement. Its location on the edge of the settlement currently provides a transitional space between the built up nature of Coxwold Village and the countryside beyond. Criteria 5- 'The site has archaeological or historic interest' No archaeological or historic interest has been identified on the site through the duration of the application on site. Having assessed the site against the criteria and the purpose of Visually Important Sites, it's clear that Policy ENV13 of the Preferred Options Draft Local Plan should be amended to remove Land off Husthwaite Road (reference Cox- VIS02) as a Visually Important space, as the site does not achieve the purpose of the designation, nor does it act against any of the identified criteria which justify a designation. It is therefore respectfully requested that the Local Authority review the allocation of Visually Important Sites within Coxwold, particularly where sensitive market housing may contribute towards the wider sustainability as recognised by the NPPF and mirrored in approaches taken by other National Parks.</p>	

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
Dawnay Estate	Sword, Robert	<b>Danby</b>	VIS02  <b>Object</b>	I am curious as to why this plot of land has been potentially described as a VIS as it forms a small part of a field to the s-w of Dale End Farmhouse. Being part of an agricultural holding on the immediate outskirts of Danby Village I do not see what benefit this designation will bring. It is very unlikely that a change of use will ever be made to the land, but it does form a key part of the amenity of Dale End Farmhouse. The farmhouse is currently vacant and will require a very extensive refurbishment to make it habitable. The refurbishment and improvement of Dale End Farmhouse as a separate dwelling will require further thought as to an alternative access other than through the farmstead, adding a paddock or further amenity to the south of the house, and maybe removal of some of the trees to the immediate west of the house, some of which are already undermining the foundations of the house. I am keen not to restrict the options for refurbishing this house, and do not consider that part of the field should be designated as a VIS.	h, k.
Egton Estate	Walker Morris	<b>Egton</b>	VIS01 & 02  <b>Object</b>	We object to both the principle of Policy ENV13 and the site specific references to this policy on draft inset proposals maps for Egton Bridge and Egton. Policy ENV13 has no basis or precedent in national policy or guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework. The justification for the policy points to an attempt to tighten policies relating to infill development and cites a presumption against development. Many settlements, including Egton Bridge and Egton are already covered by a conservation area and article 4 direction. Infill development, within these settlements, are therefore subject to policies relating to conservation areas as well as the already strict infill policies in Core Strategy Core Policy J and policy CO8. These policies only permit infill dwellings on suitable sites. Policy ENV13 is therefore a policy which is unnecessary; unwarranted and unsound. There should be no presumption against development on infill sites, especially given infill sites are the most suitable location for new local needs and affordable housing in the identified settlements. The policy justification is nebulously expressed providing reasons of protecting views but also as a means of restricting a successful policy (i.e. Infill development). The new policy, and its presumption against development, are an unnecessary blanket	a, b, l, m.

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
				<p>proscription on development of these sites. The application of the proposed policy to many, if not all of these sites, is effectively an embargo on infill development in some villages which identifies all land within the built up area as visually important. The effect of this policy would negate Policy CO8. Paragraph 4.97 expressly states that these sites have been identified by considering whether they would meet the definition in the 'infill' policies. The identification of Visually Important sites in Egton and Egton Bridge are not accompanied by a Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal of their importance. The topic paper which discusses this new policy is similarly absent of professional assessment of each site. Instead, these sites are described in two or three lines accompanying the inset maps for the settlements. The descriptions of the sites are wholly inadequate attempt to convey importance and significance of a site without evidence. The Topic Paper and the Preferred Options Local Plan provides no explanation of how the visual assessments were carried out and whether these complied with the standards on LVIAs. We make specific objections to visually important site references: VIS01 and VIS02 in Egton Bridge and VS08 and VS02 in Egton.</p>	
Mulgrave Estate	John Long Planning	<b>Egton</b>	VIS02 <b>Object</b>	<p>Object. The Estate considers that the policy is unsound and fails the NPPF's 'Justified' soundness test as it does not represent an appropriate strategy; and the 'Consistency with National Policy' soundness test as it is contrary to NPPF para.16. Notwithstanding the fact that the Estate has submitted objections to this policy and considers the designation to be contrived, ill-conceived and flawed in its methodology, it is considered that this particular piece of land fails to meet the criteria for VIS designation. The site is also included within the CA which is subject to an Article 4 Direction and therefore duplication of protection exists. The area of land is adjacent to farm buildings and part of the site is screened from public view by a wall, the remainder has a heavy tree screen along the roadside. The land is also already higher than the dwellings occupying the other side of the road. There are no public views into the site and the space does not provide a vista or viewpoint into the surrounding countryside; it does not have any known archaeology or</p>	a, d, e, l, m.

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
				historic interest not does it provide an open setting for visually important trees or is important for biodiversity. The space does not meet the criteria for designation and should be removed.	
Mulgrave Estate	John Long Planning	<b>Egton</b>	VIS05 <b>Object</b>	Object. The Estate considers that the policy is unsound and fails the NPPF's 'Justified' soundness test as it does not represent an appropriate strategy; and the 'Consistency with National Policy' soundness test as it is contrary to NPPF para.16. Notwithstanding the fact that the Estate has submitted objections to this policy and considers the designation to be contrived, ill-conceived and flawed in its methodology, it is considered that this particular piece of land fails to meet the criteria for VIS designation. The area of land identified is currently used for grazing sheep. It has no discernible landscape, amenity or biodiversity value. The space does not have archaeological or historic interest; nor does it provide an open setting for visually important trees or is important for biodiversity. The space does not meet the criteria for designation and should be removed.	e, l, m.
Egton Estate	Whiteford, Graham	<b>Egton Bridge</b>	VIS02 & 08 <b>Object</b>	Comments made as per Egton VIS01 and 02 above.	a, b, l, m.
Two members of the public.		<b>Faceby</b>	VIS01 <b>Object</b>	We would stress to you that this field has always been in agricultural use, mainly for livestock. At the moment it is in grass with sheep grazing but it could be arable. Therefore we do not wish to have any of your councils restrictions imposed upon any part of it in any way at any time. It has been in this family's ownership for about 50yrs. It has always been well farmed, very tidy and well fenced and in our view we have kept it as an asset to Faceby village.	k

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
Cheryl Ward Planning		<b>Fylingthorp e</b>	VIS03  <b>Object</b>	Paragraph 117 of the NPPF is keen to make effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses. As well as planning policies and decisions being supportive of development that makes efficient use of land and considering the desirability of maintaining an areas prevailing character and setting (inc. residential gardens), para.122 also refers to promoting regeneration and change and the importance of securing well-design, attractive and healthy places. VIS03 forms part of the residential curtilage (garden) to my client's property, Glenholm. A PRoW borders the garden to the s/w and to the north the land is met by Thorpe Beck. Glenholm is a semi-detached property, it is set back and sites below Thorpe Bank and its main outlook faces n-w. The rising topography and site levels make access somewhat difficult. It is appreciated that new development should not harm the special character of the area and the adjacent CA and listed Church. My client is compassionate to the fact they live in a NP and the special qualities they take benefit from a permanent residents. They fully respect the importance of green space without having their garden designated as visually important open space and have asked the following points to be considered: 1) Creating a designated area in what is the domestic garden of Glenholm could have a direct impact on any future purchasers of the property. 2) Prevent future development no matter how sensitive or modest - their plans (at some point) to introduce a vehicle access and drive may be looked upon completely differently. The house at present is only accessed by foot via 20 steps. 3) Existing and emerging policies are already restrictive. Dual designation of the area may restrict existing and future occupiers plans - which is any case are required to be sympathetic to the character, form and environment of the village. Rather than place further restrictions of the village, particularly outside of the CA my client would prefer VIS03 does not become ring fenced and instead can be dealt with on an individual or case by case basis.	f, g, h, k, l.
Dawnay Estate	Sword, Robert	<b>Glaisdale</b>	VIS02  <b>Neutral</b>	The Estate does not own this parcel of land, which adjoins part of Danby Common which is owned.	

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
Cheryl Ward Planning		<b>Glaisdale</b>	VIS05  <b>Object</b>	VIS05 comprises a small gap in an otherwise continuously built up frontage. It is located on the north side of the main village thoroughfare close to Glaisdale's western entrance from Lealholm and Fryup. The site lies between the domestic curtilage to Lanes Barn on the left and a pair of semi-detached dwellings which follows through to a continuous row of single storey traditional buildings on the right. All these buildings occupy a roadside position. Whilst it is generally accepted that small scale development only takes place in the NYM villages and that such gaps contribute positively to the overall character of the area, para.117 of the NPPF is keen to make effective use of land in meeting the needs for homes and other uses. Para.122 refers to promoting regeneration and change and the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places. There are very few limited opportunities in Glaisdale and it is for this reason that VIS05 is one that we consider could have the potential to create a one-off future opportunity for the village to grow and thrive. A well-designed proposal supporting active local services for local people is unlikely to change the prevailing pattern or character of the area. The proposal to create VIS appears to conflict with the NPPF and narrowly closes the gap on the already limited opportunities for future housing development and other development in Glaisdale. In summary, infill sites such as VIS05 are becoming scarce and it is requested that they don't become ring fenced in an area already heavily protected by virtue of its NP status and where ordinary development wouldn't conflict with NP purposes and the NPPF.	a, b, l, s
A member of the public.		<b>Goathland</b>	VIS05  <b>Object</b>	1) I believe NPs have enough rules available to them to stop any developments that they do not wish to progress. 2) The survey appears to be a desk survey simply as a box ticking affair. 3) There are more pressing matters that the Parks should be dealing with. In the first case there are few planning applications that do not have a slew of conditions to be met even when they are passed. From my years as a parish councillor in Goathland I am aware of cases where the imposition of constraints appears to be totally unreasonable. There is no need for extension. It appears that the Parks have little idea of what the village should be and are merely trying to preserve the status quo with no	A, b, c, d, m,

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
				<p>concerns for the residents. The qualifying definitions, apart perhaps from no.5, are very vague and open to interpretation. The comments made in the reasons for allocation a location as a visually important space suggests that any space is visually important and generally contributes to the open character of the village, even when it is a solid belt of trees. The survey on which the paper is based on appears to be a desk survey, it certainly does not relate to reality. There is mention in at least two cases (VIS05 and 06) of views of the moorland to the east. There is no view of moorland to the east. Even if the densely planted trees at the front were removed. There would still be no views, due to lack of maintenance the hedges on the edge of the conservation area. These hedges have grown into trees and block all views. There is a general problem with trees, they continue to grow and while the old photographs show virtually no trees in the village, the village has now become quite well wooded with some very tall trees. The present trees in the village are far from the original character of the village and unless more freedom is available the village will not continue to change. It is entirely possible that trees could be planted on VIS08,09,10 and would change the character even further or are there plans to prevent more trees being planted? All in all it appears that someone has dreamt up a scheme based on a very vague interpretation of what constitutes an aesthetic appeal to be assessed by the planning department. The result is more hurdles in the way of residents and further justification of the work of the planning department. The Parks should be thinking about the general deterioration of the NP. Much of the moor is turning to scrubland with small trees establishing themselves and no doubt eventually growing into larger trees. Examples of this can be seen in the area to the back of RAF Fylingdales site and all along the A169 where the sheep fence was put in by the Parks. The bracken is advancing at the rate of several metres per year, this applies everywhere in Goathland. The roads in and out of Goathland are rank with nettles and thistles which get worse every year. The main claim of the park is the existence of a large area of open heather covered moorland. The parks are singularly failing to address these issues.</p>	

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
Two members of the public.		<b>Goathland</b>	VIS07 <b>Object</b>	As the owner of the land identified we would like to take this opportunity to express our objections to your proposal. Our reason this this are: Your proposal will significantly reduce the future sale of our property/land. Our understanding is that planning decisions should not negatively impact the future value of a property. Our estimation is that your proposal would reduce the value of the parcel of my land by as much as 95%. The land is only accessible via Orchard Lane, a private road, not a public highway and therefore not on view to the general public. Your narrative is wrong - it does not provide views towards open moorland to the north. It faces south. Are you sure you have identified the correct parcel of land? Goathland is already a mix of houses from many eras, from grand Victorian dwellings to 1950/60/70s uninspiring properties; surely this mix is more harmful to the character of the village than any further sensitive development.	c, d, j, k, s
A member of the public.		<b>Goathland</b>	VIS12 <b>Object</b>	This survey has very limited use as it is entirely subjective and based on the opinions of those who carried out the survey at the time. Arbitrary lines have been drawn on the map but why should a point within an identified area be treated differently to another point just outside? Each piece of proposed development must be treated on its merits and one person's infill may be another's VIS. The survey may be helpful in a few cases but should not become one of the criteria in a local plan. It may also be the subject of legal challenges and appeals in the case of planning applications. This policy appears to be at odds with the current survey. I appreciate that local authorities are required by law to publish a local plan but the content appears to vary around the country.	g, j, m.
Mexborough Estate	Savill, J	<b>Hawnby</b>	VIS01 <b>Neutral</b>	This is a steep grassed area immediately north of the Hawnby Hotel. It has previously been used as a vegetable garden. A fundamental issue the Estate and the PC have been considering is the shortage if adequate car parking spaces in the village. At present many of the cottages are empty or undergoing renovation and we are also seeking a new operator to occupy the Inn at Hawnby. With the majority of modern day families requiring two cars, the need to sensibly and sustainably plan extra car parking spaces is an urgent necessity. The Estate is considering proposals and intends to shortly submit these to the NPA. However, in	

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
				the medium term we would resist the adoption of the space being designated as it may well form a preferred option for a cut and fill parking area with natural stone retaining wall.	
Mexborough Estate	Savill, J	<b>Hawnby</b>	VIS02 Neutral	This area, also grassed and steep ad forms part of the Inn at Hawnby beer garden. It benefits from good views down the Rye Valley and is important attraction to the Inn. The Estate does have plans to make an application to create further flagged terrace on the space to accommodate further tables and chairs for customers of the Inn.	
Mexborough Estate	Savill, J	<b>Hawnby</b>	VIS04 Neutral	As per VIS01, the area to the east of here is a possible overflow car park area subject it necessary highways and authority consent.	
Dawnay Estate	Sword, Robert	<b>Hutton Buscel</b>	VIS01 Object	This land belongs to the Wykeham Estate and forms part of the semi-parkland surrounding the walled garden, The chosen boundaries do not correspond with existing field boundaries and the proposed designation on its own does not form a sensible entity. The land is already in a CA and therefore I do not see the importance of further designation as a VIS. At present the land surrounding and forming part if the Walled Garden is in grass and fenced/walled fir grazing by horses. It is not an 'open or communal space' being surrounded by walls or fencing and occupied by local farmers. It does not have open views to the countryside beyond as the walled garden blocks the view. The Estate does not deem it necessary to designate this land.	a, c, d, j.
Dawnay Estate	Sword, Robert	<b>Hutton Buscel</b>	VIS05 Object	This parcel of land belongs to the Wykeham Estate and forms part of the garden to 79 Hutton Buscel. I would not describe this land as 'open or communal space' as it is enclosed by a wall and forms part of a garden. There are no views either into or out of it. Furthermore it has the potential for development as a single house or extension/garaging for 79. The Estate strongly opposes this designation.	d, f, h, s.

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
Two members of the public.		<b>Hutton le Hole</b>	VIS04 <b>Object</b>	The six criteria by which the space has been identified do not apply to this piece of land. In HLH-VIS04 it suggests land allows views out into the wooded slopes beyond. This is not the case. The land from the village roads is obscured by existing buildings, the steep rise in our premises, a row of trees, various individual trees and three high hedges. The road immediately outside Greystones is narrow and offers no vantage point and from the main road is obscured by other buildings. When purchasing our property, 15 years ago, we were very careful to avoid properties with restrictions, listings etc. as these have a negative effect on both property values and saleability. If the Parks Department were to impose this proposed policy our premises would be vastly devalued and difficult to sell. Although we use the adjoining piece of land for gardening, it was bought at a premium price knowing that it was available for future provision for a smaller retirement property. In the HLH-VIS04 it mentions loosely arranged development. This would still apply even with a property straggling this land as there is an acre on the total site. We feel that we are now potentially being heavily penalised for our hard work in keeping our grounds interesting and attractive over the last 15 years. We feel strongly that this strip of land should be removed from the list of VIS's in your proposed new Local Plan and would appreciate communication of any progress in this respect.	c, d, j, k, s.
A member of the public.		<b>Hutton le Hole</b>	VIS08 <b>Object</b>	We fully understand and appreciate the need to retain the character of the village. However, we object to the garden being classed as a Visually Important Space (VIS) for the following reasons; First and foremost the space does not appear to comply with the inclusion criteria stated in paragraph 5.7 of the Visually Important Spaces topic paper (July 2018) in that it has no street frontage. There is therefore no access and the space is too small for an additional development. Secondly, the justification for inclusion states that the garden of Stoneleigh provides 'views through to the back lane from the main street'. The space provides no such view to either Back Lane or West Side Lane but Stoneleigh is surrounded by common land, land which does provide good views to West Side Lane and provides a very open feel to the southern end of the village. Thirdly, the listed Ford cottage	a, c, e.

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
				stands in a very prominent position, the front of which faces South and is clearly viewed from the road and across common land when entering the village. The garden is adjacent to the Eastern side of Ford Cottage so it is unlikely that this would be developed due to the restrictions of its position.	
A member of the public.		<b>Hutton le Hole</b>	VIS09 <b>Object</b>	I therefore have no intention what so ever to apply to develop the paddock with houses. However I must take issue with your proposal for VIS09 for the following reasons: 1) The paddock is not visible from the village centre, and barely visible from the adjacent road due to the variation in height between road and paddock. 2) There is no clear view of the wooded valley side from anywhere other than my house. 3) It is a paddock for horses and, during the sort of winter experienced in 2017/18 they need protection from the elements. Would your designation prevent me from either enhancing their protection by installing a 2m high hedge at the property boundary or by erecting a field shelter? Most fields containing livestock are bounded by hedges.	d, h.
A member of the public.		<b>Ingleby Greenhow</b>	VIS02 <b>Object</b>	While we agree that it is important to protect the character of the National Park, we object to our front garden (ref. VIS02) being included in the proposal, while other open spaces in the village have been excluded, which we believe to be unfair. We only bought the house in April this year and this was not flagged on the searches. We are also concerned if the intent is for any additional restrictions to be imposed on the property and outbuildings (which are outwith the VIS areas highlighted on the map), all of which require maintenance and improvement to bring them up to standard. Indeed, we would like to replace the extensive outbuildings with something more visually appealing to the character of the location and village.	h, k.
A member of the public.		<b>Kilburn</b>	VIS03 <b>Neutral</b>	In principle we have no objection to the KIL-VIS03 designation and the designated conservation area but we would like a better understanding of what restrictions this places on us regarding use of our paddock and woodlands areas. However, we find the VIS proposal and conservation area designation to be entirely inconsistent with the apparent decision by the planning department to permit the shared boundary to be potentially used as a CL by the Caravan & Motorhome Club. The caravans and	

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
				motorhomes are potentially directly in the line of sight as you come up the road next to the VIS (less than 50 yards) and that the proposed CL has a boundary designated as a conservation area (our very well and expensively maintained high hedge).	
A member of the public.		<b>Lastingham</b>	VIS07 <b>Neutral</b>	As clerk of Lastingham PC I would wish you to note that although Rosedale House, inc. St Chads Well, is for sale it has been allowed to be taken over by trees and shrub. It originally had only just 4 main trees around the while property, being of great visually benefit. The visual effect at present does nothing to the undeveloped and community spaces as the Listed Well and its surroundings are not in keeping with important visual spaces in such a conservation village. As clerk of the Parish I would ask you to physically view VIS07 and to press the planners to review this area, if an when, new plans are brought up which I expect to be not long away.	
A member of the public.		<b>Lastingham</b>	VIS08 <b>Object</b>	Doesn't agree with gardens being identified. PP granted for garage and outbuildings so space unlikely to be development any further.	f.
Mulgrave Estate	John Long Planning	<b>Lythe</b>	VIS01 <b>Object</b>	Object. The Estate considers that the policy is unsound and fails the NPPF's 'Justified' soundness test as it does not represent an appropriate strategy; and the 'Consistency with National Policy' soundness test as it is contrary to NPPF para.16. Notwithstanding the fact that the Estate has submitted objections to this policy and considers the designation to be contrived, ill-conceived and flawed in its methodology, it is considered that this particular piece of land fails to meet the criteria for VIS designation. The site is also included within the CA which is subject to an Article 4 Direction and therefore duplication of protection exists. The area of land is currently an unused, overgrown piece of former garden land between existing buildings surrounded by a hedge. Its makes no positive contribution to the overall form, character and appearance of the settlement, nor does it make a positive contribution to the setting of a building or groups of buildings either listed or of historical or architectural interest. It does not provide a vista/viewpoint into the surrounding countryside and thee are buildings behind it. It does not provide visual relief in a settlement where there is a change in the pattern or character	a, c, d, l, m.

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
				of development. It does not have any known archaeology or historic interest aside from being within a CA nor does it provide an open setting for visually important trees or is important for biodiversity. It has however been promoted by the Estate as a potential infill site development through the call for sites process and that is why it has been deliberately targeted in this way. The space does not meet the criteria for designation and should be removed.	
Mulgrave Estate	John Long Planning	<b>Lythe</b>	VIS02  <b>Object</b>	Object. The Estate considers that the policy is unsound and fails the NPPF's 'Justified' soundness test as it does not represent an appropriate strategy; and the 'Consistency with National Policy' soundness test as it is contrary to NPPF para.16. Notwithstanding the fact that the Estate has submitted objections to this policy and considers the designation to be contrived, ill-conceived and flawed in its methodology, it is considered that this particular piece of land fails to meet the criteria for VIS designation. The site is included within the CA which is subject to an Article 4 Direction, immediately adjacent to the main entrance to Mulgrave Castle which is Grade II* in its own right with a Registered Park and Garden also Grade II* which protects the adjacent listed Lythe lodge and its setting and therefore duplication of protection exists. The space itself is not open in any way nor is it visible from any public viewpoint, it is domestic garden to a listed building and there is a 6ft+ well maintained hedge which is characteristic of the delineation of the entrance to the Causeway. Any contribution the space makes to the character of the area is already protected through its inclusion with the CA. The space does not provide a vista/viewpoint into the surrounding countryside nor does it provide an open setting for visually important trees or is important for biodiversity. The historic value and contribution to the character of the area is already protected under the CA legislation. It therefore does not require additional protection. The space does not meet the criteria for designation and should be removed.	a, c, d, f, l, m.

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
Two members of the public.		<b>Osmotherley</b>	VIS09 <b>Object</b>	<p>The justification for identifying this space is in our opinion ill informed. Criteria 3 - The space is wholly privately owned and there is no public access. The site is not visible from the public road save for the access track into the field and our barn/garage which stands on the land. The height difference is some 2m. The topography of the field then rises by another 2m to the rear of the barn and slightly lower to the south side by half a metre. The land continued to a ridge some 30m to the east. The crest of the ridge runs to the south with a fall across the site of 4m. Back Lane falls by some 2m from the north of the site to the southern boundary. There is a fall of approx. 2m from the field to the tarmacked road. There is thus no view available to the public other than of sky. The site is not highly visible on the street scene. It is not providing important views out into the surrounding countryside for the public. The bend in the road is not an issue; it does not create any more visibility of the site because of the reasons set out above. Criteria 1 - The general character of Back Lane is not outstanding being made up of a mix of older traditional buildings and late 1950's+ buildings, particularly on its east side. The majority of houses to the east are modern, mainly preceding the inclusion of Osmotherley within the NP, having formerly been, we understand, in the valley by Codbeck. The view north up Back Lane to the east is of 10 new build properties of which only two have a serious attempt at the vernacular. Most are set on or near the lane though two are notably set well back yet clearly visible from the lane. At the north east corner of Back Lane the view prior to the site is an older property that is particularly elevated and partly dug into the gradient. On this north border is an extensive excavated parking and garage area and the designated site is beyond. The fall of over 2m comprises a rock face wall (not in the local vernacular) and the land is fenced above with a 4-bar fence. The west side of Back Lane is principally faced stone mostly between 1.5 and 2m high. The land to the west contains the Vicarage and to its north two semi-detached 2-storey cottages. These buildings are significantly lower than the Back Lane as the land falls away relatively steeply. The designated site to the west of the cottages comprises a near vertical bank of some 2m topped by a hawthorne and</p>	c, d.

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
				<p>prunus hedge with ash and sycamore trees with pasture rising to the west though not visible from the lane. The vista is narrow at this point and the eye focusses on a late 1950/1960 dormer bungalow with a wide concrete drive leading to large and extensive stable block and separate garage. Back Lane drops away steeply to North End, travelling west. The street scene looking north up and west down Back Lane is quite urban. Approaching the designated site from North End requires a steep ascent up Back Lane. The barn/garage is clearly visible against the skyline as is the access and gateway. The south side of the Lane is used by resident's parked vehicles and has a stone wall boundary with the gardens of properties on Back Lane and North End. To the north as you ascend the lane is the previously described urban street scene of the bungalow. The edge of the drive and field access mark the transition from public to private space. In short, the street scene along Back Lane and in particular the norther end cannot reasonably be considered to be an important part of the village in terms of its overall character. The boundary of the site does not provide a positive contribution to the overall form of Osmotherley.</p>	
Garner Planning	Garner, Chris	<b>Osmotherley</b>	VIS07 <b>Object</b>	<p>The explanation refers to the different character of development in Back Lane which provides views of the open countryside across open spaces and specifically refers to "This space makes a positive contribution to the more open form and character of this part of Back Lane and provides views out into the surrounding countryside". The designation of this land is considered to be inappropriate. Whilst there are views from Back Lane across the plot to the open countryside, the provision of a dwelling on this plot would not affect the outlook from any properties in western side of Back Lane. A detached dwelling could be accommodated on the plot and still provide the opportunity for views towards the open countryside from Back Lane. Conversely any views from the open countryside towards the village would not be adversely affected by built development on this site as there is a backdrop of existing housing on Back Lane. Given the nature of the village, which is primarily ribbon development, the opportunities for new housing in the village is limited as there are few gaps between dwellings. Where there is scope to provide new housing</p>	b, g, s.

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
				to meet local needs then such opportunities should be exploited rather than precluded. The site is a very obvious infill opportunity. The designation should be deleted to allow the opportunity for the merits of a new dwelling on the site to be considered in the context of a planning application.	
A member of the public.		<b>Port Mulgrave</b>	VIS01 <b>Object</b>	The land is in use by the owners and has been during their ownership and is maintained, not weekly but periodically by them. As such they fully object to any change of status of this land and would vigorously resist any perceived or anticipated change including legal action if required. They wonder under what power or authority can any material classification change be imposed, simply the land belongs to them and they wish it to remain in their sole use.	k.
A member of the public.		<b>Port Mulgrave</b>	VIS02 <b>Support</b>	I welcome that this area has been considered a VIS and feel very strongly that it should remain so. Positioned as we are on the cliff top with a landslip in 2016 and continual cliff erosion and rock falls any development in this area would be suicidal to say the least but would further impact on the fragile eco system and bio diversity of the area.	
A member of the public.		<b>Robin Hood's Bay</b>	VIS02 <b>Neutral</b>	I support the principle of Policy ENV13 in its intention to protect the open views of the coast that are available from part of the land comprised in RHB-VIS02. However, the current draft proposal and Local Plan map appear unsound because they do not properly focus on achieving their stated objectives. I would like to make the following points for consideration by the NYMPA when working on the Local Plan: a) The open views across the Bay which the policy wishes to preserve are only available from the eastern part of the land comprised in VIS02, closest to the sea. These views cannot be seen from Mount Pleasant North or the entrance to the cliff path. b) The western end of the field, particularly on its southern edge adjoining the neighbouring property The Moorings is low-lying and occupied by leylandii conifer trees and other shrubs which have no visual importance or biodiversity. With or without these trees, this area does not provide any visual relief to the village or fall within the other criteria set out in ENV13. c) As it is the northern and eastern areas of the land comprising RHB-VIS02 which fall within the ENV13 criteria, the remainder of the area presently included within it should be excluded	

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
				from the scope of the draft policy and accompanying plan. The exclusion of the western and southern portions would result in a reduced, triangular-shaped area remaining subject to the plan, rather than the oblong area currently covered.	
A member of the public.		<b>Robin Hood's Bay</b>	VIS04 <b>Object</b>	I object to the inclusion of the space as a VIS. Whilst I note the intentions of the policy the proposed inclusion of VIS04 is unsound and should be removed from the policy and accompanying map for the following reasons. 1) The draft description states that this is a relatively small space adjacent Tudor Mead - this wording is not factually correct so not justified/not effective. 2) the space is actually private garden land belonging to the residential property of Tudor Mead for the amenity value of its occupiers and such is not considered relevant, justified or necessary as part of the policy. The character and nature of the space comprises garden plants and mature hedgerow that actually serve to enclose Thorpe Lane and provide a visual buffer to the adjacent bus stop. This is contrary to the wording that this space contributes to that open character. 3) Unlike other properties along Thorpe Lane, Tudor Mead has a side facing rather than rear facing gardens. The side garden of Tudor Mead, i.e. VIS04 is the only garden land available within the entirety of Tudor Mead plot. As such, it is considered that whilst some ancillary supporting residential uses could be possible in town planning terms, development of any further dwellings (the matter which the policy seeks to control) is considered unlikely. On this basis the proposed allocation of VIS04 is not necessary or relevant to the site and should therefore be removed. 4) As stated in the description, the garden comprises a mature sycamore tree that is subject to a TPO. On this basis, the TPO in its own right and associated root protection area acts in a self-servicing way to prevent any future development of an inappropriate scale. The draft allocation of VIS04 therefore duplicates existing national TPO legislation and is therefore not necessary (not effective) and should be removed.	a, f, h, k.
A member of the public.		<b>Robin Hood's Bay</b>	VIS05 <b>Neutral</b>	Questions under what authority to NYMNPA can designate spaces.	
Messrs D&M	ELG Planning	<b>Sneaton</b>	VIS01	Object. The basis behind this policy is to provide a further layer of	a, c, e, g, l, n

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
Morley			Object	<p>control over the future use and development of land in the context of established settlements in the Park; beyond that already catered for in the present/emerging policy context for the area under broader policies (SPC and G for instance). The approach would simply be a duplication of controls under other policies. The present approach requires an assessment of sites on an individual basis as to whether such contributes to the amenity, character and setting of a locality and what characteristics are significant. The appropriate planning balance is then applied. The proposed policy, while identifying certain sites on a plan basis, requires the same assessment to be made still; albeit with the onus on the applicant to demonstrate no loss of, or significant harm to the qualities or functions for which the space has been identified. Therefore the policy is not prohibitive of development in principle, which is acceptable, but equally designation needs to be based on a sound assessment of each potential space in the first instance. If not, then there is no real clarity as to what the 'qualities or functions' are, against which a proposal may be assessed, and it adds nothing further beyond the criteria and considerations required when applying other policies. It is assumed that a cross reference would be made to the criteria in the Topic Paper (p. 5.11) in also implementing the proposed policy and commentary provided specific to each designation; above and beyond simply highlighting which of the criteria are met. A concern is that the designation becomes, when applied, a basic constraint upon development in principle notwithstanding the tone of the policy wording and accompanying text. It is unnecessary duplication and contradicts the approach under para.16 (f) of the NPPF. The basic policy approach to development in Smaller Villages is to allow small infill sites capable accommodating no more than 1 or 2 dwellings. Site VIS01 extends to approx.100m in terms of road frontage and it is questionable whether such would constitute an infill site as a result. This is especially so as this relates to open land (not the setting to important buildings) and given the prescribed dwelling sizes and subsequent plot sizes that would constitute an infill opportunity. Therefore we question whether the site should be considered for designation on this basis. The delineation of</p>	

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
				<p>VIS01 encompasses an area of trees/woodland protected by a TPO. The key characteristics which is seen to justify designation is criteria 1 - contribution to overall form, character and appearance. There is no other reference. It is contended that the key characteristic lies in the wooded road frontage and its association with similar opposite and not the wider land beyond. Views beyond and through the tree road frontage are limited and the depth of this tree belt ensures the wooded context and break in the developed road frontage (the key contribution) would be assured as a result of the adherence to the TPO with replacement planting required to maintain this feature. There is no expansive vista or view to protect, setting of a building or historic interest and any 'visual relief' provided by the land would be maintained given the above circumstances. The woodland is the key feature, protected by the TPO, and the designation is not necessary to retain this characteristic. It is unnecessary duplication as, in assessing impact in the protected trees as the key quality; the assessment needed in applying this policy is a repeat of this exercise. This is compounded by other policies relating to wider landscape issues and context which are also relevant. The previous refusal of PP in 2009 illustrates the ability of the authority to control development that is perceived to give rise to landscape harm and under the wider development management policies which are reiterated in the emerging policies. It also reconfirms the site as not being considered an infill opportunity as per the reason for refusal (extract of refusal provided). In reference to BIS01 the proposed designation should be deleted.</p>	
A member of the public.		<b>Sneaton</b>	VIS02 <b>Object</b>	<p>The space in question is two houses away from the end of the village and I cannot see what positive contribution this makes to the overall form and character of Sneaton. The wide open space is used as an access to our living accommodation. The panoramic views are obstructed by trees and farm buildings. These restrictions will stop any expanding of the business at a later date and thought the National Parks were trying to encourage local businesses and young people living within the parks.</p>	b, c, d, h, r.

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
A member of the public.		<b>Swainby</b>	VIS01 <b>Object</b>	I would argue that a sensitively designed small-scale development could actually enhance the village scene. The views of Whorlton Castle are severely restricted from where my property starts until you reach Black Horse public house car park. The car park gives the best views from the High Street towards the castle and the hills beyond. A low key development of single storey design could actually open up better views towards the castle because most of the existing hedge would have to be lowered and parts removed to provide vehicular access and visibility splays. At the moment this land is part of my private garden. The eastern boundary you have drawn does not appear to relate to anything physical on the land. I would like to know how the position of this was determined. I note that the Park Authority is looking to encourage small developments of affordable housing of less than 93sq.m total floor area where appropriate. If you think a proposal of this kind might be worth consideration.	c, d, i, s.
A member of the public.		<b>Swainby</b>	VIS04 <b>Object</b>	Paragraph 5.11 of the Topic Paper and paragraph 4.97 of the Local Plan Preferred Options both state that certain criteria have been used in order to assess whether or not a site should be designated as a VIS. It is clear that none of them apply to the land in question. Criterion 1 - There is an unsightly garage on the land at present which means the entirety of the space cannot possibly be said to make a contribution which is positive. The remainder of the land is plain in appearance; it has the appearance of an ordinary garden at best and makes no positive contribution, or certainly no more positive contribution than the vast majority of residential garden in the village. It begs the question as to why this land is considered appropriate as a VIS when so many attractive residential gardens are not proposed to be designated. Criterion 2 - This is simply not relevant and a site visit would make that clear. Criterion 3 - The land is entirely enclosed by trees save for trees s/w boundary adjoining the highway. The only view from the highway across the land is a view of the land itself which as described above has no particularly attractive features. It is much easier to see how this is fulfilled in other sites which afford views of the Cleveland Hills for example, but in relation to this land is simply irrelevant. Criterion 4 - The land houses a garage and a	c, e.

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
				<p>relatively bare area of land with trees either side. It can no way be said to be providing visual relief where there is a change in the pattern or character of development. Criterion 5 - Not relevant. Criterion 6 - The land at best has limited biodiversity value. It is not occupied by wild self-seeded plants and flowers which more readily lend themselves to having biodiversity value. There are no visually important trees and nor does the land provide a setting for a visually important tree. Whilst there is a boundary hedge there is nothing special about it. Furthermore, para. 4.97 of the Preferred Options document makes it clear that visually important spaces are intended to only be spaces that form a small gap within a continuously built up frontage within the main part of the settlement, or spaces which protect the setting of a particularly attractive range of buildings. The land forms neither function as is evident from a site visit. Paragraph 6 of the Topic Paper identified two types of site which have been identified - fields/orchards/paddocks between buildings and domestic gardens. The land forms neither of these categories. Whilst part of the land could potentially be said to have the appearance of an ordinary garden it is fairly barren and does not form part of the curtilage of a house. Even if it was found to constitute a domestic garden, it cannot be said to provide "many benefits to the character and appearance of the village" which is a requirement for inclusion. Whilst part of the land is arguably not currently unattractive it would still at best be a gross exaggeration that it provided "many benefits". It is not a "natural green gap in a street scene which is otherwise continuously developed"; indeed there is little natural about it. Nor does it afford views of a particular feature, traditional roofscape or group of buildings which are important to the history of the village, which is another quality of such proposed sites. It affords no views beyond the land itself. If it did afford views beyond its own boundaries, such views would be of a caravan site. This all only serves to compound the position that the land simply does not comply with the Council's own criteria for designating. The policy is somewhat prejudicial and it seems the Council has already judged these sites to be inappropriate for development. Furthermore this land is not an undeveloped space. Part of the land is in fact developed,</p>	

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
				being home to an unattractive garage. Again this serves to add weight to the already compelling argument that this land should not be designated; it simply doesn't comply with the Council's own criteria. The site is described as being located at the "gateway to Swainby". As can be seen from examining a map and or carrying out a site visit there is no way this land can be described as being gateway. The description also states that the land is "an attractive green space". That is misleading. It is a fairly ordinary piece of land with a garage. It is some leap to refer to it as "attractive green space".	
A member of the public.		<b>Swainby</b>	VIS04 <b>Object</b>	Same comments as above.	c, e.
A member of the public.		<b>Swainby</b>	VIS04 <b>Object</b>	I wish to object to your proposals. I disagree with this subjective view. The overall form, character and appearance of the settlement does not occur until a point between this site and 132 High Street with houses in one side of the road and stream to the other. There are no groups of buildings either listed or of historical or architectural interest that the site makes any contribution to. Only if someone was trespassing on the site can there be a vista/view point into the surrounding countryside. The most obvious view is of the caravans on the opposite side of the stream. You state that the space provides visual relief in a settlement where there is a change in the pattern or character of development. This is not the case. The site has no archaeological or historic interest. You state that the space provides an open setting for a visually important tree or is important for biodiversity. The trees are outside of the space and the space does not provide an open setting, nor is it important for biodiversity. Whilst the trees remain part of the west side of the river bank, they only provide a shield to hide the caravan site.	c, e, g.
A member of the public.	Mark Southerton	<b>Swainby</b>	VIS05 <b>Object</b>	There are three main strands to this objection – 1. The proposal serves no additional purpose given existing 'designations' and so represents an undesirable duplication of control; 2. The designation is not centred on an assessment of the merits of the land parcel as such but is being put forward as a means of limiting housing development on potential 'infill' sites; 3. There is no evidence to demonstrate the site is considered to be of any special merit to the local community or visitors with the only	A, b, d, g, m

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
				<p>appraisal seemingly being a 'look by officers' such that there is nothing to indicate the proposal adds anything in terms of serving the public interest. 1. Duplication – The land benefits from the strong protections arising from its location within the National Park with further layers of statutory protection (and associated locally found policy protection) arising from it being within a designated Conservation Area together with being within the curtilage of a listed building and important to the setting of listed buildings sited to either side. These protections extend to the wider setting of the buildings and Conservation Area such that the suggested additional designation serve no beneficial function, adding nothing but an additional complication to a site already protected, both in itself and in terms the views out to the fields and hills beyond. This proposal represents an excessive duplication of control via an unnecessary policy, contrary to best practise. Any proposal impacting on the identified 'attributes' of the site which requires planning permission and/or listed building consent can be properly judged and determined in the context of the existing strong controlling designations and policies. In point of fact, the listed building curtilage and listed building setting considerations are stronger controls as nationally designated assets such that any VIS designation would essentially be secondary/subservient to these national protections so emphasising the pointlessness of the proposal. The commentary in the report saying (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' serves to make the point that land with pre-existing 'protection' should not be subject to duplicate protection by way of VIS designation. The land subject to suggested designation here (SWA-VIS05) is subject to equally and arguably stronger protection through status as listed building curtilage/setting of listed buildings/within the Conservative Area – a further designation is excessive and unacceptable. 2. Purpose – It is apparent that officers have only assessed sites meeting the definition of infill within settlements because of concerns that such gaps, if visually important, may come forward for</p>	

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
				<p>housing as potentially compliant with housing policy but that is not serving any useful/additional function generally because the merits of the site fall to be appraised come what may such that their intrinsic value/importance as an open space can already be fully taken into account, especially so here next to Church Farm given the other, long established designations. At the very least sites offering similar/probably greater development potential, such as edge of settlement land with potential to be an 'exception' site and having a potentially greater impact on the character of the locality, need to be assessed if this process is to serve a proper function. It is suggested the whole process is fundamentally flawed in its approach - if to serve a proper, beneficial planning purpose generally a more holistic approach is called for whilst the designation of this particular site serves no purpose whatsoever. To endeavour to use this policy as a mechanism to control housing development is misguided. 3. Appraisal - Local Plans are meant to be the key to delivering development that reflects the vision and aspirations of local communities. In this context, evidence of the land's value to/appreciation by the local community to show it has some particular local significance over and above its value as part of the Conservation Area and in terms of the setting of adjoining listed buildings has not been tested/appraised. No landscape character assessment/street scene appraisal has been prepared nor any proper assessment of historic landscape character and any linkages with the wider landscape setting – the motivation for designation instead seems to be centred on resisting housing development because of the view that it may be suited to such development. Other than the Conservation Area and listed status of adjacent buildings, there is no evidence of the land's value to either the local community or visitors to demonstrate that the land holds a particular local significance. It is not intrinsically important/exceptionally attractive and its contribution to landscape, character and/or setting of the settlement is not something that has been identified by the local community. It is not of any special note as an open area which would contribute to local identity, character or sense of place. It does not make an important contribution to the physical form and layout of the</p>	

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
				settlement. It may currently allow views through to beyond the settlement which could be valued if anyone actually stopped and positioned themselves in the limited area to see through the site but in point of fact there is a very limited 'window' of view. Furthermore, the policy will simply encourage land owners to effectively cut off such views as there are by erecting tall fencing outside of the curtilage of the listed building or by simply planting fast growing conifers, laurels etc. to give a tall evergreen (but fundamentally alien!) screen blocking any views which would otherwise have remained and been appropriately protected by the Conservation area/listed building designations. As such, the designation will effectively be counter-productive in terms of what it sets out to achieve.	
A member of the public.	Savills	<b>Thornton le Dale</b>	VIS02 <b>Object</b>	Site TLD – VIS02 is located north of Brook Lane and is located within the main built up area of the Larger Village of Thornton le Dale and is located within the village Conservation Area. The land is owned and used by our client as a vegetable garden and the site already has a building onsite (a glasshouse). It is not, therefore unspoilt green space. The justification as to why this site has been identified as a Visually Important Space, is that the Authority considered that the site provides an attractive open space visible from the nearby High Street and affords views to the wooded hillside beyond. The justification goes on to say that the space is also readily visible from the adjacent Public Right of Way (PRoW). Finally the justification states that the site provides an attractive green setting of the adjacent traditional dwellings. We strongly contest the above for the following reasons. Firstly, with regard to views, there is an existing hedgerow that prevents views into the site from the High Street. This site could therefore accommodate a new dwelling which would hardly be visible from High Street when taking into account this existing hedgerow. Furthermore, even if the site was developed, the wooded hills in the distance would still be visible from both Brook Lane and High Street as the wooded hills extend well beyond the height of the existing dwellings along Brook Lane. Additionally, the adjacent PRoW is not immediately adjacent to the site but actually skirts round to the east past New House. The footpath does not impact on this site and any	c, d, s

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
				views to the site from the footpath are impacted and blocked by other adjacent properties situated alongside Brook Lane. Thirdly, and finally, the land does not fall within the ownership of the adjacent dwellings. Therefore due to its current use and the aforementioned reasons, it is considered that it is not appropriate nor justifiable to allocate this land as a Visually Important Space. In short, it is not considered that infill development of this site in the future would result in the loss of an open space which contributes to the amenity, character and setting of a settlement. Please see some photographs of the site from both High Street and Brook Lane for reference.	
A member of the public.	Savills	<b>Thornton le Dale</b>	VIS03 <b>Object</b>	This site is known as land to the east of Manor Farm and is located to the north of Beck Isle. The site has previously been subject to a planning application (NYM/2004/0569/FL) however, this was refused due to access concerns. Notwithstanding this, it is considered that the access concerns can now be overcome if a future application was progressed. The 2004 application was not refused on any other ground. The justification for identifying the site as a Visually Important Space is that it is located in “one of the most picturesque areas” of the village “where Beck Isle Cottage (thatched cottage) is located next to the Beck”. The space is “located to the east of Manor Farm and makes a positive contribution to the overall form and character of Thornton le Dale Conservation Area. Manor Farm is Grade II Listed and is seen in association with Beck Isle Cottage, also Grade II Listed, this space provides an attractive open setting for the Listed building and its associated wall and gives the area a spacious feel adjacent to the area of Common Land to the north of the Beck. The space is readily visible from the immediately adjacent and well used Public Right of Way”. Whilst it is acknowledged that Beck Cottage is nearby and that the site is located within the Conservation Area with Manor Farm being Grade II Listed, this should not preclude development. There is a finite supply of developable infill sites in villages and that the supply of infill sites is reducing. Furthermore, there is a requirement to cease the decline in population and to strengthen the communities in the villages throughout the National Park. There is a need, therefore, for a balance between	b, s.

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
				protecting sites that actually contribute to special character of a settlement (such as village greens) with meeting the housing need, in order to maintain the vitality of local communities. As set out in the Visually Important Spaces Topic Paper, "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". Due to the location of this site, and its proximity to the main built up area of the village, it is considered that, with careful design, this site could provide an appropriate infill site in Thornton le Dale without having an adverse impact on the Listed Buildings, or Conservation Area. We therefore request that this site is removed from the list of Visually Important Spaces.	
A member of the public.		<b>Thornton le Dale</b>	VIS09 Neutral	My worry is that if in future years I wish to put a small conservatory on the side of Amber Croft I may not be allowed to.	
A member of the public.		<b>Thornton le Dale</b>	VIS10 Object	My view is that it is hard to see how this space can be a visually important site given that the view is of a concrete and steel grain store of relatively modern construction. Furthermore you state 6 criteria for identification of these spaces and I fail to see that this pocket of land meets any of them. Given that my immediate environs to become so built up over recent years, whereby it is becoming increasingly difficult to farm on a site that was a farm long before practically all the houses around were constructed, I believe it will be a severe restraint of trade to this small business to remove any possibility of ever putting a structure in this very small piece of land which is already surrounded by buildings. I list more reasons why I believe this proposal is unjustified and unfair: The land is not within the conservation area; in law no one is entitled to a view; private land not public land and has never been considered as a public open space or having amenity value; does not afford any view or vista of open countryside; as a custodian of the land I have striven to maintain the property and this land in good order and tidy. This kind of restriction may affect the viability of the business and act as a disincentive to keeping the land and farmstead in good order; if the current status remains unchanged, any proposal will be subject to normal planning conditions and recommendations; whilst there are no	b, c, h, q.

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
				<p>immediate plans to build on this space it is possible that it might be needed as somewhere to construct infrastructure to improve the business and its viability; this plot becomes worthless if this designation is applied. A mission statement of the NYMNPA is "to seek to foster the economic and social wellbeing of local communities" - the proposed designation could be considered a restraint on trade on a local business of a lifelong resident of this lane as well as denying any future opportunity to provide housing for family members who are native to the area; in respect of the perceived need to retain some open space in South Lane there is an open field immediately east of Stonehaven which does afford a vista into open countryside; why should this space become an exception, all bar one other farm within the village has been developed to the benefit of landowners. Around 10 farms have ceased to operate within the village and all have been replaced by domestic dwellings; I am in favour of community open space but I believe it unfair to effectively take private land for such a purpose without compensation for providing a public asset, when such action will preclude any economic gain from the site; the space is almost completely bounded by agricultural buildings and a house, thus cannot be seen as having much aesthetic value; the land is only metres from the NP boundary and only metres from a great deal of development taken place recently; of the six criteria you state makes the space worthy of identification it does not have any attributes of the first five and regarding the sixth, the space does not contribute to biodiversity; we have always been led to believe by the Planners that this space was an infill plot; the CLA's representative could not see any merit in the proposed designation.</p>	
A member of the public.	P Rayment	<b>Thornton le Dale</b>	VIS16 Neutral	This is within our client's ownership but I respectfully request that you correct the details in your description. 1. The mature tree within the site is a Sycamore and not an Oak tree. 2. The land to the south of the identified area does not provide views through to a field beyond as this land is now developed.	
Two members of the public.	GW Forster	<b>Thornton le Dale</b>	VIS17 Support	The owners recognise the importance of the 2 open spaces, namely the garden of Brookfield and the Pinfold within their ownership and support your initiative.	

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
A member of the public.		<b>Thornton le Dale</b>	VIS18 Neutral	We have made considerable efforts to improve and preserve the nature of the grounds referred to. In the recent past and before we purchased the property and about four years ago it is our understanding that several very large and very old mature trees had fallen down in the garden area abutting Maltongate. In respect of that advice my wife and I have spent several hours a day on general gardening in the areas you have referred to and identified as being of visual importance. The area abutting Maltongate was effectively totally a jungle area where such items as self-seeded sycamores, elderflower and snowberry and other invasive plants had run wild at ground level. Hopefully that situation has improved and we did not need to do anything to the larger more mature trees other than remove some small overhanging branches and ivy from them. As regards the area abutting Roxby Terrace which you have identified as of visual importance this is in a much more reasonable condition and the mature Scots Pine trees which give the area its defined look are a valuable asset which we treasure.	
Two members of the public.		<b>Thornton le Dale</b>	VIS21 Neutral	Whilst our property has a Whitbygate address and clearly fronts onto Whitbygate at the moment our only access to the road is via a pedestrian entrance. We have been in dialogue with the NP about making a vehicle access to the property and are currently looking to progress a planning application. If the proposals were implemented we would be concerned to understand how future development would be permitted - and especially the impact on our proposal. We also have 2 specific concerns - 1. The proposal seems to include part of the wall which marks the eastern edge of our property but for some reason seeks to include a large part of our garden which is currently not visible from the road. Can you please explain why part of our garden has been included and obviously from our perspective at this stage we would ask that all our private space is excluded. 2. The wall has been overgrown with ivy for many years and only recently we have been able to try to clear it so it is visible. In parts it is in poor repair and so before the proposal was progressed we would like to better understand what responsibilities would go with having this included.	d, f, h

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
A member of the public.	Savills	<b>Thornton le Dale</b>	VIS24  Object to designation of part of the site.	This site is located to the north of Church Hill (an A-Road running through the centre of the village) and is bounded on all sides by stone walls and mature trees. The justification for identifying the site as a Visually Important Space, is that it is located in one of the most picturesque areas of Thornton le Dale, adjacent to the beck and is readily visible from the main road through Thornton le Dale. It is described as a large pasture space located to the north of Church Hill, immediately adjacent and to the rear of Cherry Garth, an attractive stone and pantile dormered dwelling, which fronts directly onto the main road. The site is, "low lying with mature trees on its frontage and an area of wooded common land to the west of the dwelling, giving it a wooded appearance on the descent into the village". This space is argued to make "a significant positive contribution to the overall form and character of Thornton le Dale Conservation Area [and] provides a spacious feel to this loosely developed area of the village, adjacent to the Beck and provides a spacious setting for All Saint's Church, which is located on higher land to the east". Whilst it is supported that the most westerly part of the site is subject to existing woodland, and therefore forms a Visually Important Space, the remainder of the land is not considered suitable as a Visually Important Space. It is therefore proposed that the allocation is amended to only include the western half of the site that is subject to the woodland. The remainder of the land should be excluded from the VIS allocation as it is private land that is well screened by the existing stone wall and mature trees. As previously mentioned, there is a finite supply of developable infill sites in villages and that the supply of infill sites is reducing. With Thornton le Dale being a Larger Village considered suitable of addressing the housing need and in need of stabilising the settlement population, it is considered that this could provide a future development opportunity if deemed necessary.	b, r.
A member of the public.	CLA		Object	There are significant concerns that this is based on a wholly subjective test and paragraph 4.97 admits that the designation as visually important space has been arrived at by purely visual inspection from the highway. Given the difficulty in finding infill sites for small scale housing development in the NP, we feel this policy, unless very carefully and	g, b, r.

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
				sensitively handled, risks reducing further the opportunities for such development, much needed as it is.	
A member of the public.			Object	<p>There are several fundamental flaws within this proposal, most particularly in three main areas: the lack of a distinct and meaningful rationale, the underdeveloped methodological design of the policy, and its inconsistent application.</p> <p>The rationale for Visually Important Spaces policy relies upon the notion that there will be increasing ‘pressure’ on the finite supply of potential developable infill sites within villages of the North York Moors. Existing “Core Policy J has made it clear that ‘not every gap will be considered as an appropriate infill site’. Moreover, you state that the existing policy has ‘been generally successful in protecting visually important spaces both inside and outside Conservation Areas’. The existing approach therefore provides a comprehensive assessment of potential planning proposals: applications are already examined and assessed for a broad range of features including the visual impact of development. The proclaimed reduction of pressure on the spaces that this new policy would provide, instead seems to be an attempt to reduce pressure on planning officers to conduct thorough assessments of planning applications in these spaces, by writing off potential spaces of development based upon their ‘visual importance’ before a true and fair assessment of a proposed application and all of its distinct costs and benefits in relation to the application’s own context. You acknowledge that it is extremely important that planning applications in rural spaces take into account a broad range of potential social, cultural and economic benefits to the local area, as well as the potential benefits and costs to the immediate environment. This proposal seems to removes the onus on planning officers to conduct thorough and holistic assessments of each proposal, rather than removing the imagined future pressures on the physical spaces by unknown development projects. The proposed new approach also alleges that it will “provide valuable information” regarding potential development: “Support the development (in particular housing) policies contained within the emerging Local Plan for the villages outlined in the</p>	a, b, d, G, h, m, n, r

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
				<p>Settlement Hierarchy in order to help steer any infill development to the most appropriate locations.</p> <p>That these spaces were identified and categorised as VISs on visits to the villages by just two National Park officers is a wholly inappropriate and insufficient methodology of policy development, particularly for a proposal which, if continued, could have such a large impact upon the local community and its potential future development.</p> <p>Following analysis of several villages within the NYMNP, it is evident that a very large proportion of spaces which could be considered infill have been identified as VISs. This means that if passed this proposal has the capacity to have a very significant and potentially detrimental impact on the villages' potential future organic sustainable development. The application of this policy, meaning its use to classify certain spaces as VIS, should therefore have been considered extremely carefully, and infill spaces should have been systematically and transparently compared to the (ambiguous) criteria outlined utilising a comprehensive system of assessment.</p> <p>1. In what way is the existing system of assessment in not actually adequately addressing these asserted issues of increased pressure on infill sites in a way that the declaration of VIS will meaningfully address? Why will the designation of VISs will alleviate the "greater pressure" on potential infill sites in a way other than preventing or deterring potential planning applications for these sites.</p> <p>2. This information is not already available at the time of planning, where the criteria for VIS locations already form a part of individual planning applications</p> <p>3. Is the opinion of two planning officers that a space is 'Visually Important' count as "valuable information"?</p> <p>4. Is the "visual importance" of these locations an adequate understanding of their significance to the surrounding built environment, natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the Park?</p>	

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
				<p>5. In recognition of the relatively low wages due to a concentration of employment in the agricultural and tourism sectors, versus relatively high house prices which make it difficult for the low wage earners who sustain the unique qualities of the National Park to make competitive bids for homes, in a hypothetical scenario where (all other things equal) a “visually important space” was also the only potential location for a local young person to build an affordable home on their own property, leaving other oversubscribed affordable homes for other local people in need, which element would take precedence?</p> <p>6. What method was used to identify new VISs?</p> <p>7. Did members of the public assist in identifying potential spaces?</p> <p>8. How many officers visited each location, and on how many occasions, to assess it against the criteria given?</p> <p>9. How many infill spaces were identified in each village, and how many of those considered initially?</p> <p>10. What proportion of the infill spaces identified in each spaces were not proposed for VIS categorisation?</p> <p>11. What proportion of infill space do you consider to be a responsible level of spaces identified as VIS whilst still allowing the capacity for potential development in other infill locations?</p> <p>12. In what way would a Visually Important Spaces policy impact the development of agricultural buildings or potential farm houses? (The policy only explicitly refers to housing, so can you please make explicit how agricultural development may be impacted by these policies?)</p> <p>13. In reference to criteria 3, does the significance of visually important locations relate to a) the ability to see through them or over them to another location, or b) the aesthetic qualities of the physical space itself? If this vista is readily available from multiple other locations within a settlement, why would a particular view an adequate justification for VIS categorisation?</p> <p>14. If a) What makes these spaces visually important if the proposed view is not publicly accessible?</p> <p>15. If B) what further restraints will follow this inscription for landowners. Can they still plant trees on the property which may obscure its existing</p>	

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
				<p>“visual importance”?</p> <p>16. In what way does the space provide a visually important positive contribution to “overall form, character and appearance” if the view is not publicly accessible?</p> <p>17. Can you define what is meant by a “positive contribution” to a settlement? Is the positive contribution its visibility over a space or the space itself?</p> <p>18. Please define the characteristics of “Visual relief”.</p> <p>19. For visual relief (Criteria 4) to be a legitimate reason for VIS categorisation, do you agree that this view should actually be visible from a public location?</p> <p>20. The rationale for VIS references housing but not agriculture as important sustainable development in NYM villages. In what ways will VIS inscription impact agricultural properties?</p> <p>21. In relation to 13 (above), do visually important areas need to be visually accessible (have a view) from a public location? (Please note that many of these sites and their subsequently described important viewpoints are not visually accessible from any public location)</p> <p>22. If not, what makes them visually important to anyone other than private landowners? Why should private landowner views of another landowner’s property be protected in this way?</p> <p>23. Why should an imagined view that is not visible from a public location be protected?</p> <p>24. Does the view from VIS locations become protected in the same manner from a VIS’s inscription?</p> <p>25. If yes to (23), in what way will the view from one VIS infill location impact another infill location, visible from the VIS, which is not categorised as VIS? 26. Has every potential village infill location within the north York moors been systematically analysed in reference to the criteria outlined?</p> <p>27. Can you identify reasons why some, if any, infill locations have not been proposed as VIS locations?</p> <p>28. If two infill locations can be argued to have the same ‘Visual Importance’, why might it be that one would be proposed for VIS and the</p>	

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
				<p>other is not? 29. Can you identify the features of a space which were assessed to consistently categorise examples of “positive contribution” to the overall form, character and appearance of the settlement?</p> <p>30. Can you identify the features of a space which were assessed to consistently categorise examples of “positive contribution” to the setting of a building of historical/architectural interest?</p> <p>31. In what way does existing regulation, such as restricted public access, impact the “visual importance” of a space? 32. Please identify the feature points which were assessed to consistently categorise examples of “visual relief”.</p> <p>33. Do you recognise that points 4 and 5 of the NYM 2035 Vision are inherently interrelated?</p> <p>34. If a noted “particular feature” in justification of a VIS is also a feature of neighbouring residential and agricultural properties, for instance, dry stone walls or a particular view, what makes this feature (which obviously need not necessarily be removed or obscured by different forms of development) a means for highlighting that development here could cause potential harm to the villages’ rural character?</p>	
A member of the public	Savills		Object	<p>We consider that the allocation of some sites as Visually Important Spaces are incorrect. It appears as though the Authority has identified as many potential infill sites as Visually Important Spaces as possible and has not therefore taken a pragmatic view to such allocations. For example, Strategic Policy B states that for Larger Villages, “Development should support the service function of Larger Villages by providing additional housing (including principal residence and affordable housing), employment and training premises and new facilities and services for the immediate and wider locality”. Thornton le Dale is identified in the Settlement Hierarchy as a Larger Villages (listed in Table 1 of the consultation document (page 32)). The fifteen identified Larger Villages have a more ‘self-contained’ character, a range of facilities serving the wider community. The emerging Local Plan allows for small scale development in or adjacent to these areas to meet local housing, employment and community needs, including ‘principal residence’ housing on infill sites (Policy CO7). No development</p>	b, r.

Name	Agent/ submitted by	Settlement	Space	Summary of Comments	Comments/Objections for the following reasons
				<p>boundaries or limits are defined and the suitability of a site for development will be defined on a case by case basis. However, when considering potential development opportunities for the village, it appears as though the Visually Important Spaces are being used to stifle development. It is considered that the Authority have identified incorrect sites. We note that the justification text states that the policy as written does not necessarily preclude development on these spaces; rather it is intended to provide a presumption against development where the proposal would harm the qualities for which the space has been identified. However, it is considered that some of the identified Visually Important Spaces are small infill sites that would suitably accommodate singular properties without detriment to the existing settlement. The Visually Important Spaces that have been identified are shown on the Policies Map and the Authority confirm that the assessments of the spaces were made on a purely visual inspection from the highway and consists generally of spaces which form a small gap within a continuously built up frontage within the main built up area of the settlement, (i.e. in that they could meet the definition of infill), or in some cases a space may have been identified in order to protect the setting of a particular attractive range of buildings.</p>	
A member of the public.	Savills		Object	As above.	b, r.