

From:
To:
Subject: Boggle Hole Youth Hostel
Date: 18 April 2021 08:11:42

Dear Mr Hill,

Planning reference NYM\2021\0220\FL

Thank you for your time when I spoke to you last week.

As promised, I am asking the following questions to aid clarity and avoid any future misunderstanding with what the youth Hostel is proposing to do with their rubbish store.

To help put this into context, I, amongst others objected to the proposed structure and at the time of the Planning committee was assured the application would be allowed only under certain conditions from Planning.

It was clear from the start of the work these conditions were being ignored, eg the hedge was not retained, the required height of the fencing was not adhered to, the rear retaining wall was over height, the Tarmac apron was not completed, the boarding was vertical, not horizontal, along with no allowance for the climbing plants which were supposed to help hide 'the in your view structure'.

Alongside this the passing place/turning area which the Planning committee stated should be retained for its intended use, was roped off and identified as a staff car park and is still being used for that purpose.

It is for the above reasons and my difficulty in interpreting the drawings that I would like clarification of the latest proposed plans.

Can you confirm if my following understanding and interpretation the latest proposed plans are correct?

The A-A cross section shows a maximum height of 1.9m, which I believe, means the back retaining wall will be removed down to a height of 1.85m.

Please can you confirm this is correct?

The front elevation shows the fencing as almost parallel in height, showing the South side, right-hand end as 1.90m and the North side on the left-hand end as 1.8m.

Does this mean the existing 2.4m height at the North end is to be reduced down from the top to achieve the proposed height of 1.8m, or am I correct in assuming the existing top height point of the palings will not change, but the ground will be raised towards the North end to reduce the length of the palings?

The Plan view shows the Gates in the existing position with the climbing plants in front of them! yet the front elevation shows the gates in a proposed more central position. Would you explain which drawing is correct please?

The Apron identified as tarmac, is concrete at the moment, even though the original Planning Permission stated the Apron should be Tarmac.

Can you confirm, that this time the Apron will be Tarmacked as the Plan states?

The screening plants, identified at the Planning committee meeting as climbing plants due to the small amount of space to grow anything was to be planted where there is now concrete. Am I correct in thinking the concrete will have holes made in it to enable plants to be planted?

I apologise for needing to ask these questions, but you will see from my comments, past history shows some Planning Applicants ignore the agreed Planning Permission and with such woolly and contradictory information, I have no option but to ask these questions.

Kind regards

Ray Clifford
Kettlewell Cottage,
Fylingdales
Whitby
North Yorkshire
YO224QQ