

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/U2750/W/25/3377009

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference

Appeal By

Site Address

SENDER DETAILS

Name

Address

Company/Group/Organisation Name

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground

Interested Party/Person Correspondence

Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

Escrick Parish Council (EPC) received access to the 215 page appeal on North Yorkshire Public access planning portal 2nd February 2026, there is too much technical data to be evaluated in the time permitted before closure and submission to the Secretary of State on the 23rd February deadline, which is before our next Parish Council meeting. The report is dated December 2025 and the release of the appeal background data in our view demonstrates the lack of respect shown to residents during the whole consultation process.

We trust the views and objections by the Conservation Officer, Campaign for the Protection of Rural England, Environment Agency, North Yorkshire Council (NYC) Highways and EPC will be studied and upheld under this appeal. There are substantial resident objections to the planning application and these too should be studied.

Specifically we ask for close examination of any proposed changes made to the original application that do not address the following issues :-

- The significance and lessons learnt elsewhere in the region of building in a Flood Zone 3 area
- Applicant attempts to overcome Flood Zone 3 that cause proposed dwelling appearance and loss of privacy issues for existing residents
- Full Zone 3 proof of lack of alternative sites and the need to build when the directly adjacent former Slaughterhouse site has recently been approved for development. The detrimental impact on those houses that have been approved for building must also be taken into account
- NYC Highways concerns expressed in the initial application, we do not feel these have been addressed
- Failure to completely comply with the Escrick Neighbourhood Plan Design Code
- Proximity and distances given of properties from the roadway – they appear to have measured from the house rather than the garage which seems curious. Residents query the design layout and the size of front gardens with regard to loss of privacy, the applicant also refers to the fact that Carrs Meadows has smaller gardens ranging from 4.1m to 8.1 m, but it should be noted that their measurements on the proposed development show gardens as small as 2.5m, and the 8.1m upper limit of the existing gardens is seemingly due to only the smallest subset of properties being selected for measurement.
- Finally in this section, NYC REFUSED the original planning application for sound technical reasons. The applicant has cherry picked elements of the various reports to present an appeal, we ask for the full technical reasons that the consulted bodies objected to and why NYC Planning REFUSED the application to be taken into account in the Secretary of States appeal judgement.

Appeal - EPC general comments:

The applicants opening statement says the development delivers material planning, economic and social benefits that significantly outweigh alleged harm. EPC would say they don't actually provide any evidence for any economic or social benefits in their information and we agree with the original comments by the Conservation Officer, in particular her final summary points made via email 15th May 2025 to NYC Planning, as incorporated into the Delegated Planning Report document published by NYC.

Later in the appeal the applicant refers to the draft Selby District Council (SDC) conservation plan to try and add legitimacy to their appeal – but within that document it states "The village buildings are set back behind relatively large front gardens" a point they choose to ignore. They also make an inaccurate

comparison stating the houses on Main Street Escrick have smaller front gardens. This is true, but they are a different style of house, built in a completely different era. Only if the new planning proposal was to build small semi detached or terraced housing would this comparison apply.

Local Impact of scheme and Conservation area:

The applicant claims the scheme would not affect the experience of the conservation area – which we feel is factually incorrect.

They make a number of comments re sightlines of historic buildings not being impeded and again refer to the SDC conservation plan to back this up. What they fail to mention is that the plan talks about views not being static and that “views include how open space is experienced and viewed from within the Conservation area.” The same report states “Views make an important contribution to our ability to appreciate the character of the conservation area”.

The report mentions the area could be questioned as an area for development but states “ as long as the character and appearance of conservation area is respected” – we don’t feel that is the case with this development design. We feel the applicant stating in their appeal that the proposal would not affect the core of the conservation area is inaccurate, we would argue it affects the area when looked at in its entirety.

Page 115 of the report “the Council has a duty to pay special attention to the desirability or enhancing the character or appearance of the area, including an assessment of the contribution made by open space within the conservation area.” This design development proposal is in direct contradiction of this statement.

Highway access, parking issues highlighted by NYC Highways and residents:

EPC states once more that these issues have not been resolved in the appeal.

Visibility Splays & Parking – The applicant has based part of their appeal on not needing to change the splays on the fact that, due to speed bumps, speed limit of the road is more like 20mph rather than the actual limit of 30mph. As the speed limit of the road is 30mph, any planning should be based on this, not what someone thinks it should be.

In the initial objection it stated that Plot 8 needed 3 parking spaces – according to appeal, the applicant states Plot 8 does have 3 spaces (see p136). However, we would argue that the allocated space at the front of the house would force pedestrians to have to walk into the road before accessing the alleyway towards Main Street. Further to this, it is unclear where the pavement would actually end, is it before or after the location of the two visitor parking spaces? - pedestrian safety must be paramount.

Summary:

EPC remains against the development and OBJECTS to it in its current form, we are disappointed at the timing of the publication of the appeal data as indicated in our opening statement, making it impossible to fully consult further with residents and difficult to debate in person as a Parish Council.

Contrary to the opening statement of the appeal we do not see that the proposed development brings any material planning, economic or social benefits that outweigh alleged harm, and the data in the appeal documents does not back up their contention.

The appeal does not resolve the issues of impact on the conservation area, and if the draft SDC conservation plan that they refer to is read and is used in its entirety then we would argue that views

of the conservation area are impacted.

The applicant states the development would not affect the core of the conservation area. We would state that they area should be viewed as a whole and not just the core area, and as such the development does have a negative impact on the conservation area as a whole.

On the specifics of garden size we note that even using their own data the gardens are smaller than the surrounding buildings of similar style. We would also state again that it is erroneous to compare garden sizes from buildings on Main Street Escrick which are of a significantly different style and from a much earlier era.