Members Update Sheet

Item 1 NYM/2018/0177/FL

Yorkshire Water – Revised Comments: No objections but if planning permission is to be granted, a condition should be attached in order to protect the local aquatic environment and Yorkshire Water infrastructure.

Please note an additional condition:

17. DREG00 Development shall not commence until measures designed to protect the 1800mm diameter sewer and 300mm diameter overflow pipe that are laid within the site boundary have been implemented in full accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved by the Local planning Authority. Furthermore, the protection measures shall apply to all phases of the development.

Please note additional Informatives:

5. On the Statutory Sewer Map, there is 1 no. 1800mm diameter public combined sewer and 1 no. 300mm diameter Yorkshire Water maintained overflow pipe recorded to cross the site. It is essential that the presence of this infrastructure is taken into account in the design of the scheme. If the developer cannot provide a 5 (five) metre building standoff either side of this infrastructure (i.e. a protected strip width of 10 (ten) metres), a Formal Build Over agreement will be required with Yorkshire Water as the proposal is outside the scope of Part H4 of Building Regulations. The intention of this legal agreement is to protect the public sewer network and safeguard Yorkshire Water's interests and is required before the development is allowed to commence. The developer will be responsible for all costs involved. A restricted strip will be required for future replacement of the pipeline and the building over of any access point(s) on the pipeline will not be permitted.

   In order to begin this process, Yorkshire Water require the following:

   - Seven copies of a layout drawing showing proposed works together with
   - the position of the public sewer(s)
   - The full contact details of the applicant's solicitor
   - A method statement and drawing indicating how the public sewer is to be protected at all times
   - during the works
   - A payment of £500.00 + VAT. This covers Yorkshire Water's administration costs. If other costs are incurred, (e.g. sewer pre-cleansing, monitoring of remedial works) then the applicant will have to pay a sum of money before the agreement is signed. Please note that the costs of Yorkshire Water's solicitor are not included in this. The developer will also have to pay the costs of Yorkshire Water's solicitor.

6. It is noted from the submitted planning application that surface water is proposed to be drained to watercourse. Please note further restrictions on surface water disposal from the site may be imposed by other parties. You are strongly advised to seek advice/comments from the Environment Agency/Land Drainage Authority, with regard to surface water disposal from the site. The landowners consent will be required for the construction of a new outfall structure. As surface water from the site is not proposed to discharge to the public sewer network no assessment of the capacity of the public sewers to receive surface water has been undertaken. Should the surface water disposal proposals change further consultation with Yorkshire Water will be required.

The persons listed below object to the application for the same reasons as stated in the Committee Report:

Rebecca Brennan, 14 Middlewood Lane, Fylingthorpe
Elizabeth Gray, 3 Loring Road, Ravenscar
Suzanne Brennan, Fern Lodge, Robin Hoods Bay
Chloe Purves, Willow Dene, Church Lane, Fylingthorpe
Lucy Tilbury, 95 Side Cliff Road, Roker, Sunderland
Carolyn Watkinson, Hallcliffe, Thorpe, Whitby

Additional objection points raised:

- Concerned that the plans that show the gabion basket wall at only a metre high, but having been out and measured, the heights will be well over a metre in many places due to the steep slope of the cliff so a one metre high gabion basket wall will not be high enough.
- If the services are to run over the applicants land at the side of the steps, it should be noted that the top half of that slope to the left is owned by another house

The persons listed below support the application for some or all of the following reasons:

Mr Gordon Wearmouth, 31 Norlington Close, Orlingbury, Kettering
Alistair Alderson, Stephen Fawthrop, Browside Farm, Ravenscar

- Re-creating past heritage, however, do agree that the village needs expanded parking to cope
- Demand for refreshments in Bay often appears to exceed availability and this would be a welcome addition to the many visitors whom the current local businesses rely on. The visual/environmental impact looks minimal.

Item 4 NYM/2018/0094/FL

Matthew and Jenneke Fitzgerald, 10 Low Dalby - Additional Comments - In support of our argument that Low Dalby has reached its capacity in terms of visitor numbers at peak times, this bank holiday weekend was a case in point. By 12.30pm today visitors' cars were queuing on the forest drive down the hill to Low Dalby in order to access the car parks which had reached capacity. Some visitors' cars were directed through Low Dalby village to park in the area by the workshops on Housedale. We counted 62 cars at the workshops, 58 along both sides of the forest drive/ verge parallel to the main car park and in the bus stop. Another 34 were parked on the forest drive and verge between Go Ape and the overflow car park where signs advise there is no parking on the verge, causing difficulty for vehicles to pass one another. Opposite the overflow car park there were another 25 or so parked on the

grass area. The main car park, overflow car park and Go Ape car park were full; a group of motorcyclists parked in the picnic/ seating area between the main car park and the courtyard.

Adderstone Field and the World Cup Car Park at Dixon's Hollow while much busier than I have seen before, had sufficient space to accommodate many more cars.

I would like the Committee Members to take this into consideration before approving an application aimed at increasing visitor numbers to Low Dalby village, when there is so much more forest available for developing visitor attractions more sustainably. Surely spreading the visitor pressure across a wider area would benefit tranquillity, visitor experience, and residents' amenity alike, and be more appropriate for a National Park, conserving its special qualities.

Item 5 NYM/2018/0119/FL

Please note that the development description stated on the Index to Plans List for this item is incorrect. The description as stated on the full Committee Report is correct.

Additional Background Information

Final amended plans have now been received from the agent showing revised window arrangement to the proposed dwellings which make good use of existing openings, limited the number of new openings and blocking up those openings which would otherwise overlook neighbouring properties.