

North York Moors National Park Authority

13 October 2022 Planning Committee members update sheet

Item 3, Public minutes of the site visit held on Friday 07 October 2022

Public site visit minutes of the meeting held at Rear of Roxby Hill Farm, Pickering Road, Thornton le Dale on Friday 07 October 2022, 2.30pm

Present: David Hugill, Janet Frank, Heather Moorhouse, Clive Pearson

Apologies: Malcolm Bowes, Sarah Oswald

National Park Authority Officers: Mark Hill (Head of Development Management), Jill Bastow (Senior Planning Officer), Emily Jackson (Development Management Graduate Trainee)

Others: None

NYM/2022/0325: variation of condition 2 (material amendment) of planning approval NYM/2019/0261/FL to allow revised dwelling design

The Chair opened the meeting by noting there were no members of the public present and then reminded Members that the purpose was a site inspection not a meeting and no decision would be taken.

The Officers introduced Members to the site and summarised both: the differences between the approved plans and the dwelling as built (the application under consideration) and the impact of the as built dwelling on neighbours. Members were reminded that the decision to visit the site was to consider the impact of the proposed dwelling on the neighbouring properties, in particular The Poplars to the east. Members attention was drawn to the blue spray paint on the ground and blue painted stakes which marked out the position of the dwelling as originally approved.

Officers then led Members around the site so that they could see its position relative to the neighbouring properties. It was noted that the dwelling as built sits further back (south) in the site and as such is closer to the properties on Castle Close although there are no first-floor windows to habitable rooms in the rear elevation overlooking those properties. Members moved around to the west side and noted that the dwelling as built did not extend as far to the west as approved, but that first-floor bedroom windows had been introduced which did afford some overlooking of the garden to 1 Thornton View although there was no direct overlooking of windows. Members noted that the boundary hedge along the western boundary provided some privacy for both properties and requested this be retained.

Moving to the front of the property Officers explained how the applicant had been sold a smaller site than shown on the approved plans and as such the garage was smaller and sited further south than as approved. Officers noted that the dwelling did not adversely impact on those properties to the north.

Members update sheet October 2022

Members and Officers then moved onto the neighbouring property to the east, The Poplars to assess the impact on light to habitable rooms and amenity space. Officers explained to Members how the approved dwelling would have been set further forward and that the dwelling as built avoided any potential for overlooking from the rear elevation of the proposed dwelling and despite being two-storey was less overbearing than the approved scheme.

The Chair closed the meeting after Members and Officers had returned to the site and thanked everyone for their attendance.

Item 8, Plans list

Plans list item 1, NYM/2022/0515

Parish - Hinderwell Parish Council strongly objects to this application. There is not the need for extra parking in Runswick Bay as since COVID the number of vehicles requiring parking as greatly reduced. The applicants already provide 28 days of temporary parking over the busiest days of the summer which is sufficient.

Third parties - The following additional objections have been received from the following people:

Matthew Sewell & Catherine Endean, 7 Bank Top Lane, Runswick Bay

Terry and Louise Russell, 1 Bank Top Lane, Runswick Bay

M Cheall, 58 Ellerby Lane, Runswick Bay

Object for some or all of the following reasons:

- As living directly opposite the site in Bank Top Lane, we have first-hand knowledge of how seasonal traffic effects the village. This summer has shown traffic volume return to pre pandemic levels and the public car park adjacent to the land in question has been perfectly adequate, as I believe have the lower village car parks. In fact, the pop-up car park run by Mulgrave Estate has been virtually empty on many of the days they opened it.
- The surrounding infrastructure, particularly Bank Top Lane lacks the capacity to sustain increased traffic volumes. The application states this new car park will relieve traffic in the village. This might have been so during the last two years but does not apply now or in the future.
- The proposed entry and exit to the carpark are in a narrow residential lane that is already used as access to the public car park adjacent to the land in question. The residents in Bank Top Lane all have driveways onto the lane and need clear access at all times. This would be impossible to achieve with additional traffic entering and exiting the proposed car park.
- Local Plan Section CO3-parks it clearly states, "New parking facilities will only be permitted where it is the only way to solve existing identified parking problems" As we do not have any identified parking problems in the village then this should apply,

Members update sheet October 2022

and the application be rejected. this development is not to the benefit of the community. It is clearly just a money-making scheme to benefit Mulgrave Estates and is of no benefit to local residents.

- The creation of a car park will also have a tangible negative impact on the local ecology including the destruction of existing habitat and change of use from historic grazing land to a car park will have a negative effect on the ecological value of the area and the statement "the proposed work will have a positive impact on the conservation area" is without merit and lacks evidence.
- The newly proposed informal seating area is of concern and will undoubtedly attract anti-social behaviour if left unsupervised and therefore be a local public health issue with fly-tipping of waste: surplus food, soiled babies nappies along with drug litter and dog waste.
- Runswick Bay is a beautiful village, and any loss of green space and pollution should be deterred especially when it is completely unnecessary.
- Taking into account the overwhelming response to the initial application and the number of residents expressing their strong objection, it is once again obvious to ourselves and should be to the planning officers, that this application
- Loss of privacy – live directly opposite the site. There will be an abundance of people and cars in and out of the car park and the car park looks directly into our property and several other residents' properties.
- I wish to invite the planning officer to our property to assess the level to which this will affect us as residents. This will enable them to be able to see this from our property and appreciate the implications this will have on ourselves and local residents.
- Noise and disturbance - During the summer months there is an increase in noise levels and disturbance. This proposal would significantly increase this due to the level people it would attract. I permanently work from home and feel that the increase in noise and disruption would have a huge detriment to my working life and ability to work from home. The noise from visitors has been known to wake us up during the night on several occasions.
- What is the purpose of informal seating area – it appears that the original café plan has been replaced with the seating area. Is this to attract mobile food outlets instead in the future? Or a secondary planning application for a café? I feel this could also attract unsociable behaviour late in the evenings, as the current Scarborough Borough Council car park frequently does.
- Precedent for future development –I feel that this planning application is just the tip of the iceberg. I would encourage North York Moors National Park to consider this issue carefully as we have had several surveyors in the adjacent field opposite the Runswick Bay Hotel, which would indicate further plans to develop this land.
- Loss of green space – this is one of the only remaining green spaces in the village.

- Unstable ground – no evidence of checks for ground stability
- No toilet facilities – this has been an ongoing issue since the Scarborough Borough Council toilets in the car park on Bank Top Lane were closed several years ago. There are no other facilities other than in the bottom of the bay, and residents have had to endure visitors relieving themselves behind bushes and in any areas they can find. I feel by increasing the level of parking, but with no facilities, we will only see an increase in this.
- Scarborough Borough Council plans for electric vehicle (EV) chargers. The updated plans show EV chargers to be situated in the middle of the proposed car park. Scarborough Borough Council have recently released information that they have secured/are providing funding to install EV chargers in several villages around Whitby and Scarborough, one being Runswick Bay. They have advised that they will be installing two EV charges which are capable of accommodating two vehicles each at any time, which would mean there are effectively four charging points, and these will be installed in the Scarborough Borough Council car park on Bank Top Lane by the end of 2022.
- We are concerned with the amount of light and noise the proposed chargers on this planning application will omit with the ones on this plan being situated much closer to residential dwellings (dark skies). The ones to be installed in the existing car park will provide sufficient access to charging points for visitors to the village.
- Runswick Bay is currently a pretty village with some green areas remaining. Other than at peak times, it is peaceful and tranquil, and I feel that would be spoilt by the proposal.
- The proposed site is completely separate from the main existing built-up areas of the village and therefore, will be completely out of place, and detract from the beauty of the village.

Lyn Pollard, 5 Bank Top Lane, Runswick Bay has submitted further objections as follows:

- As bats frequent the field and sheds, a focussed, thorough and specific bat survey should also be undertaken.
- I attach a photograph of the Scarborough Borough Council Bank Top Lane car park to substantiate the questioning of the need for further parking:

Photograph showing Scarborough Borough Council Bank Top Lane car park



It was taken mid-afternoon on Saturday 20th August and illustrates that fewer than 25% of the 100 spaces are occupied despite it being the peak of the holiday season. (It also shows the potential for some of the grassed areas to be marked out to increase parking capacity or used for seating/picnic areas in the unlikely event that such needs ever arise, and to install EV charging points).

The attached photograph shows the view of the site from my property on Bank Top Lane (a similar view is shared by the other properties on Bank Top Lane). The site is in full view despite the hedges being allowed to grow unfettered this year.

Photograph showing the view of the site from 5 Bank Top Lane, Runswick Bay



Furthermore, any lighting beyond daylight hours, irrespective of it being low-level and of a style and luminance which minimises glare and light pollution with all bulbs shielded to prevent upward and minimise horizontal light spill' (Condition 3 GASC00) will inevitably impact the enjoyment of properties overlooking the site as well as polluting the Dark Sky zone cherished by all.

I understand that Cliffemount Hotel also sited on Bank Top Lane has recently change Members update sheet October 2022

hands and plans for its redevelopment are in progress. It remains to be seen what impact this will have but inevitably there will be some disruption and this should be considered particularly if developments on both sides of the road are allowed to proceed simultaneously.

Item 3, NYM/2022/0622

Amended recommendation:

1. The Local Planning Authority considers that the proposed single storey extensions, by virtue of their size, scale, form, fenestration and design detailing, encompassing the rear and side elevation of the host building and more than doubling the existing footprint, would not be subservient to the host property and would cumulatively erode the simple form and functional character of the original building. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy CO12 and Policy CO17 of the North York Moors Local Plan and the Authority's Design Guide Parts 2 (Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings) and Part 4 (The Re-use of Traditional Rural Buildings) which seek to ensure development is of a high standard of design detailing which complements the architectural form and character of the original building.
2. The proposed extensions would result in a significant increase in the habitable floorspace of the original dwelling and extend what was a small, converted farm building significantly beyond its original size. The proposed extensions considerably exceed the specified limit of 30% of new habitable floorspace as stated in Policy CO17 of the North York Moors Local Plan. The increase in the overall habitable floorspace would consequently have a detrimental impact on the mix of dwelling types needed to sustain balanced communities within the National Park and result in the loss of a smaller more affordable dwelling.

Ward member - Cllr Jane Mortimer, Fylingdales Ward supports the application for the following reasons:

The property is a two-up two-down cottage, and the proposed extensions are considered modest that will enhance the cottage and give more convenient and necessary living space. The design fits in with the vernacular of other local buildings and the cottage is not visible from any roads, being up a track from a back road in Hawsker.

Third Party comments

David McCandless, Operational Support Manager, North Eastern Inshore Fisheries & Conservation Authority, Town Hall, Bridlington supports the application for the following reasons:

- The proposal is considered to be very modest and in keeping with other buildings and structures on the site;
- The applicant is required to undertake a significant proportion of his work from home, and he needs to work both effectively and efficiently from his home without the need to move from what has been his long term residence.

Members update sheet October 2022

Additional Information

Amended plans received which have omitted the wraparound element of the original proposal and instead two separate extensions are proposed, one each to the rear (west) and gable (south) elevation. The rear extension is permitted development and the applicant could proceed with that extension without further consent from the Authority.

The agent refers to a former wheelhouse to the north elevation and an outbuilding to the south elevation as justification for the proposed extensions and comments that these former structures did not form part of the original conversion scheme due to their state of repair. At the time of the original application in 2003 neither the outbuilding nor the wheelhouse was in existence; in fact, there was no evidence of the outbuilding referred to and all that remained of the wheelhouse was a pile of stone, as can be seen in the following photographs from 2003.

Photographs showing building in 2003



With regard to the size, scale, and form of the amended proposals, it is acknowledged that the omission of the wraparound represents an improvement. However, the extensions would still encompass the rear and side elevation of the host building, and more than double the existing footprint such that they could not reasonably be argued as subservient to the host property.

The agent also comments that the rear extension maintains a course of stone between the roof of proposed extension and that of the main building thereby respecting the original structure. Unfortunately, this gives very shallow pitched roof (17.5 degrees) which looks out of keeping with the host building and will require the use of an interlocking clay pantile. Furthermore, the agent cites that the proposed openings are traditional in scale and form, but the scheme includes large, glazed sliding doors which account for 43% of the rear elevation to the extension. These are very domestic in scale and appearance and are out of character with the host building which has a high solid to void ratio and a predominantly blank rear elevation, further eroding the simple form and functional character of the original building.

The agent has also confirmed the existing and proposed floorspace calculations which were missing from the application as originally submitted. Accordingly, the existing dwelling provides a gross internal floor space of 82.34 sq.m and the revised extensions

will provide an additional 36.8 sq.m which still represents a 44.7% increase in habitable floorspace. It is acknowledged that what potentially could be built under permitted development would provide 34.04sq.m which equates to a 41.3% increase in habitable floorspace, not significantly different to that proposed. However, what is proposed requires planning permission and as such must be assessed against the relevant policies of the Local Plan; it is for the applicant to decide whether to implement his permitted development rights.

In conclusion whilst the amended plans represent a small improvement it is not considered that they outweigh the concerns expressed previously with regard to the size, scale, form, fenestration, and design detailing of the extension nor do they adequately address the 30% threshold under Policy CO17 and as such the recommendation remains one of refusal.