

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: NYM/2020/0948/FL - Meadowcroft
Date: 31 March 2021 11:23:57

Hi Planning

I was look at the additional information for this application, and there is a 23 March email which refers to a map showing the location of a sewage treatment plant, but the plan at the bottom of that document doesn't include that nor can I find any info from a later date. Can you please check if this has been uploaded and I just haven't found it please?!

Thanks very much

Elsbeth

Elsbeth Ingleby MA_{Cantab} ACIEEM

Ecologist

North York Moors National Park Authority

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

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: applications
Date: 19 March 2021 09:43:53

Hello,

Below are our comments on the plans circulated by yourselves.

Planning – NYM/2021/0105/FL – Croftlands, demolition of stable & construction of garden room with office above.

No objections

NYM/2021/0104/FL – Croftlands, construction of replacement porch, extension with balcony above to south elevation together with a link extension.

No objections

NYM/2021/0115/NH – non material amendment to NYM/2020/0038 – to allow enlargement of roof canopy at Charity, Whitby Road, Robin Hood's Bay

No objections

NYM/2021/0118/LB – 5 replacement roof lights to the rear of Hillside, Fisherhead, RHB.

No objections

NYM/2021/0055/LB – replacement meter box at 9 Bloomswell, RHB

No objections

NYM/2020/0948?FL for Meadow Croft, Dark Lane, demolition of house and garage and replacement house and double garage.

Objections - overdevelopment, not in keeping with the surrounding area, too modern.

Concerns over the double garage and parking having a large impact on the Green Lane and Monks Trod.

Regards,

Jane Mortimer,

Chairman and Acting Clerk,

Fylingdales Parish Council

Fylingdales Parish Council

From:
To:
Cc: [Planning](#)
Subject: NYM/2020/0948/FL - Meadowcroft, Dark Lane, Raw
Date: 15 March 2021 11:34:26

Dear Jill

The updated bat report includes the records from local bat groups and DNA evidence of the species of bat utilising the small roost identified. This information indicates that there are no records in close proximity to the application site, with the nearest roost recorded 16 years ago and some 470m away. The bat roost identified is of a whiskered bat. As the potential in the building is low and the number of droppings found small, it is believed that the roost comprises a day roost although mitigation of a scale proportional with a maternity roost is proposed. The surveying ecologist has proposed to seek a bat licence under Licencing Policy 4, under which activity surveys are not required.

I am satisfied that the proposed scale of compensation is proportionate to the level of impact and therefore that the Favourable Conservation Status of the local bat population is unlikely to be detrimentally affected by the development. A European Protected Species licence or Bat Mitigation Class licence will be required for the development to proceed. A copy of the licence, once obtained, including any conditions or annexes appended to it including method statements and required mitigation, must be provided to the Authority and acknowledged in writing prior to any actions permitted under the licence taking place.

In addition, we should condition that any tree and shrub removal works should not commence within the bird breeding season (March to September inclusive) unless preceded by a nesting bird check undertaken by a suitably qualified ecologist.

I note that there is no further information regarding glazing and light spill, and so will await further consultation regarding any amendments proposed to design etc in due course.

Best wishes

Elsbeth

Elsbeth Ingleby MA_{Cantab} ACIEEM

Ecologist

North York Moors National Park Authority
The Old Vicarage, Bondgate, Helmsley, York YO62 5BP
Main office: 01439 772700

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: FW: RE: NYM/2020/0948/FL Trod/archaeology
Date: 05 March 2021 08:30:52

-----Original Message-----

From:
Sent: 04 March 2021 17:02
To:
Subject: RE: RE: NYM/2020/0948/FL Trod/archaeology

Hi Jill, thanks for checking. At a minimum the trod can't be removed, so a condition for retention would be great. If lifting the trod is essential, then yes a methodology and watching brief should be applied, condition ARCH02 should suffice for that, as there is always the potential for relevant archaeology to be present beneath the slabs, and they should be relayed as close as possible to the original position.

Thanks!

Nick Mason
Archaeology Officer