

**Gladman Planning Application 17/01449/MREM  
Public Submissions**

**Subject:**Gladman Planning Application 17/01449/MREM

**Date:**Fri, 29 Dec 2017 11:37:40 +0000 (UTC)

This application is for approval of details for the last outline application approved at appeal. The access requested is functionally identical to that rejected by the appeal inspector after careful consideration of congestion around the school.

The inspector stated that

"in a situation where the scheme access would be to the A170 and incorporate two right turn features, a shared cycle and pedestrian route, two bus stops and the access to the school and the recycling facility the potential for vehicle/pedestrian/cycle conflict is clear and this was confirmed when visiting the site"

He also said

"Crucially, I am satisfied that an acceptable form of junction layout can be achieved on land in the Appellants' control or within the public domain"

This appears to me to be a major ground for object.

Michael J Gray

**Subject:**Application 17/01449/MREM- Public Participation

**Date:**Tue, 2 Jan 2018 18:05:04 -0000

Ryedale District Council  
Development Planning, FAO Ms K Hood  
Dear Karen,  
Happy New Year.

We last corresponded a few years ago during the various applications by Gladman for Outline Approval to build 225 homes on the edge of Kirkbymoorside.

I was alerted a few days ago to the imminent requirement for public comments on the next stage of Gladman's proposal, 17/01449 (Reserved Matters).

I understand that Gladman should by now have finalised certain documents covering his proposed development's scale, layout, access, appearance and landscaping, and should have been seeking to obtain written approval from the Council for them. From reading through both the Annex A to the 13/01314 Appeal Report and the RDC Officer's Report (Conditions) from 13/01314's (refused) Planning Meeting, it would seem that under "Reserved Matters" only the following three deliverables are specifically required to be agreed:

- a.. Detailed Open Space and Landscape Master Plan incl Tree Survey Plan and details of planting and phasing [RDC documentation for 17/01449 provides drawings of tree locations]
- b.. Details of POS, LEAP and NEAP (maintenance provision to be in Sect 106) [RDC documentation for 17/01449 provides some landscaping information]
- c.. Mitigation Scheme for Protecting Proposed Dwellings from Traffic Noise (details in officer's report item 24) [RDC documentation for 17/01449 gives no details of any such scheme]

The following other documents are referred to as being “required to be approved before any development commences” but the word “deliverable” has not been specifically assigned to them for agreement under “Reserved Matters”. However, it is difficult to imagine how the meeting’s objective could be achieved unless most of these documents had been finalised at the same time:

- a. Design and Access Statement [RDC documentation for 17/01449 provides this]
- b. Illustrative Master Plan
- c. Statement of compliance with Plan 4751-D-01, detailed Landscape Proposals in N and W Areas
- d. Archaeological Investigation Scheme
- e. Scheme for Disposal of Surface Water
- f. Biodiversity Management Plan
- g. Construction Method Statement
- h. Details of Phasing (and manner) of Construction and of Occupation [RDC documentation for 17/01449 provides location plan and accommodation schedule only]
- i. Full details of houses’ design [RDC documentation for 17/01449 provides pictures of houses and elevation and floorplan drawings only]
- j. Full details of materials to be used [RDC documentation for 17/01449 provides a drawing of brick and tile colour scheme only]
- k. Access Plan [RDC documentation for 17/01449 provides drawings of site entrance, emergency/pedestrian/cycle access and existing public footpath only]
- l. Fully detailed engineering drawings of site (see item 12 of Officer’s report)
- m. Independent Stage 2 Safety Audit (road safety) iaw HD 19/03
- n. Approved Travel Plan
- o. Contamination Investigation and Risk Assessment (see item 36 of Officer’s report)
- p. Remediation Scheme
- q. Details of Finished Site Levels

The public has seen earlier versions of several of the above documents, or statements of intent by the developer to supply them, but we need to see the developer's final offerings in this respect if public input to the "Reserved Matters" discussion is valued. Whilst the Planning Officers doubtless have the documents they need to form their view the public is disadvantaged both by not seeing the full suite and by not knowing which document has already been accepted and which superseded.

Is there planned to be a further stage later in Gladman's application's approval process where the final documents will be presented and agreed or should the 17/01449 meeting be achieving all of this?

I would be grateful if you would clarify whether the scope of 17/01449 is only to finalise scale, layout, access, appearance and landscaping, or whether it is the public's last opportunity to comment on the development as a whole prior to its proceeding. In either case the public needs to understand and see what exactly has been delivered by way of documentation to enable it to comment usefully to the Council.

Additionally, you will be fully aware that the short timescale imposed for deliberation of 17/01449 makes it almost impossible for the public, and indeed for Kirkbymoorside Town Council, to carry out any in depth assessment of documentation even if it received it as a complete package; so it would be much appreciated if the deadline could be moved to the right by several weeks.

Steve Peters

**Subject:**Kirkbymoorside Town Council: Gladman planning application

**Date:**Thu, 4 Jan 2018 22:05:49 +0000

Gladman Application – January 2018 – Reserved Matters Application: 17/01449

My objection to RDC:

My original objections to this application remain valid in respect of the reserved matters for which approval is now being sought. In summary these are:

1. The access provision in this application is fundamentally the same as that in the original application. The Government Inspector, when granting approval for the application in December 2014, determined that the access was a concern, stating there was "potential for vehicle/pedestrian/cycle conflict" (point 3 of the Inspector's report). Due to this concern, the Inspector only granted permission for the development providing suitable access was developed and included this within the reserved matters. As this application fails to address the concern over access and does not provide a new plan for access, the application should be refused in line with the Government Inspector's stipulation.
  2. The development requires a very high build density. This is totally inappropriate for the town and, when compared to the neighbouring development (the West Pasture estate) as seen on the plans, the layout is totally out of character.
  3. There is insufficient consideration for parking vehicles. Most of the housing appears to be without driveways and/or garages which will result in the significant numbers of cars being parked on the roadside causing congestion and restriction to emergency vehicles.
- Collectively, these reasons show that the reserved matters have not been adequately dealt with and permission should be refused.

Sarah Ward

4, Ripley Close, Kirkbymoorside

**Subject:**Objection to the proposed Gladman development on Westfields, Kirkbymoorside

**Date:**Sun, 7 Jan 2018 16:11:39 +0000

I am objecting to the Gladman application as Kirkbymoorside does not have the infrastructure to support it. My Daughter has recently started Kirkbymoorside school, which is a lovely school but the classes are already full. When she was in nursery last year the school were unable to offer her extra funded hours offered by the Government for working parents as the school did not have room. For my younger Daughter there is one childminder and a preschool which is already full to capacity. As a parent I am aware of the congestion at school times along Westfields and I am very fearful the proposed entrance would be dangerous.

When requesting a Doctor's appointment, it is common to wait at least a week for an appointment, which would demonstrate an already stretched service.

I am very keen to shop locally but already find it difficult to get a park in the street at Kirkbymoorside.

I am concerned about the water run off from the hills currently which causes issues on the footpaths and road near the proposed development.

There are already developments in Kirkbymoorside still waiting completion.

I hope the views of the local community are heard and this application is justifiably declined.

Debbie Bayes