

## PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

At a meeting held on Thursday 10/11/2022

Present:-

Councillor J.E. Mortimer, Chair;

Councillors P.H. Trumper, C. Pearson, R. Swiers, P. Riley, G.W.L. Smith,  
W. Forbes, W. Chatt, R. Maw, S. Cross, J. Nock and M.J. Cockerill

### 1. **DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Paul Riley declared that agenda item four (22/01604/FL) had been discussed by Reighton & Speeton Parish Council (of which he is also a member) but that he had taken no part in those discussions.

### 2. **MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 06/10/2022 be **APPROVED** and signed by the Vice-Chair.

### 3. **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

There were no public questions.

### 4. **PLANNING APPLICATION - (22/01604/FL) CHURCH FARM, SPEETON 22/228**

The Committee considered:-

- i. a planning application for the erection of nine dwellings with associated access and infrastructure following the demolition of existing agricultural buildings at Church Farm, Main Street, Speeton, YO14 9TD for T., J. and P. Coleman.
- ii. a report of the Head of Planning (reference 22/228).

Updating the report, the Planning Officer explained that agricultural operations at the site would cease if planning permission was to be granted. The Planning Officer went on to confirm that spare capacity for carrying out such work was available locally at an alternative site.

Following the Planning Officer's report, the Chair invited the agent, Carl Stott, to speak on behalf of the application.

Members welcomed the proposal and were of the opinion that the plans were amongst the best seen for a small development for some time. Members also praised the retention of existing buildings on site as part of the overall development. However, the Committee did request a condition to set out how trees adjacent to the site could be preserved during the construction phase.

**RESOLVED** that planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out in the report and with the additional condition detailing the projection of the trees.

### 5. **PLANNING APPLICATION - (22/01701/FL) 12 CARLTON ROAD, FILEY 22/227**

The Committee considered:-

- i. a planning application for the demolition of commercial properties (B1) and the erection of six dwellings (C3).
- ii. a report of the Head of Planning (reference 22/227).

Members felt that the site was amongst the worst locations in Filey for a development of this sort. The Committee also wanted to abandon the idea of using the access track altogether, however the Planning Officer explained that the Council encourages pre-application discussions, which had not happened in this case, but suggested that they would return to the applicant and suggest this before the resubmission of another application in the future.

**RESOLVED** that planning permission be **REFUSED** due to concerns relating to design and residential amenity.

**6. PLANNING APPLICATION - (18/00470/FL) LAND NORTH OF BOTANY WAY & DISCOVERY WAY, WHITBY 18/140**

The Committee considered:-

- i. a planning application for fifteen industrial/warehouse units with associated roads, parking and landscaping.
- ii. a report of the Head of Planning (reference 18/140).

Updating the report the Planning Officer confirmed that comments had now been received by the LLFA who had raised no objections. The Planning Officer also relayed to the Committee that a comment had been received from a member of the public in Whitby claiming that the site did not lend itself to cycling and suggesting that the plan be reconfigured to allow for better cycling while also reducing speed limits in the area to 20mph. The Planning Officer added that these suggestions were not being recommended by the Highways Authority. The Planning Officer acknowledged that a condition could be added to facilitate bicycle parking. The Planning Officer went on to add that some final, minor, revisions to the layout plan were still being awaited which would rearrange some of the parking to the front of the units, include electric vehicle charging points and amend the curvature of the bend in the approach road to better accommodate HGVs. The Planning Officer stated that the agent had already signalled approval of these amendments and that delegated authority was sought to confirm the finalised plans.

The Committee questioned the potential impact of development at the site in relation to the beck adjoining the site and the saltmarsh further downstream. The Planning Officer confirmed that the site had been looked at by an ecologist but went on to confirm that they would double-check and potentially impose a condition to install petrol interceptors on site to address the issue. The Committee also sought to understand if the plan area was the last remaining site in that semi-industrial part of Whitby that could accommodate a development of this sort. The Planning Officer confirmed that essentially this was the case in the area outside the National Park, minus some small parcels of land.

**RESOLVED** that planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out at the report and the additional conditions of cycle storage details, compliance with the flood risk assessment, the inclusion of petrol interceptors and Officers being granted delegated authority to confirm the final plans for the site.

**7. PLANNING APPLICATION - (21/02303/RG3) NORTH BAY, SCARBOROUGH 22/8**

The Committee considered:-

- i. a planning application for the demolition of a footbridge over the North Bay miniature railway for Scarborough Borough Council.
- ii. a report of the Head of Planning (reference 22/8).

Following the presentation by the Planning Officer the Head of Planning added that any improvements to the level-crossing would require separate authority from the Office of Rail & Road (ORR; a non-ministerial department that governs mainline railways as well as heritage and miniature lines). The Head of Planning went on to explain that if Members saw the improvements to the level-crossing as fundamental to the proposal, and wanted assurances that the improvements would take place, it would strengthen the requirement for making those improvements prior to the demolition of the bridge. The Head of Planning further stated that if the ORR were resistant to the level-crossing changes it may necessitate a rethink of the project by the applicant.

Updating the report the Planning Officer provided comments that had been received by Councillor John Atkinson (ward member for Northstead) who felt that the loss of the bridge would make the area dangerous for young children and would result in decreased trade for neighbouring businesses that have come to rely on footfall that the bridge enabled.

Following the Planning Officer's report the Vice-Chair invited John Sissens to speak against the application.

Overall there was considerable support from the Committee for maintaining the bridge with a preference for repair over demolition. Members queried the omission from the report of the impact of demolition of the bridge on ponds in the local area which were reputedly home to newts. While Members understood that the bridge did not form part of a designated right-of-way they questioned whether any attempt had been made to register the route as such and went on to ask if any such registration attempt was made whether that would secure the future of the bridge. Members sought to know the reasoning for building the bridge in the first place and the routes it was intended to carry. The Committee were of the opinion that the amount required to repair the bridge was not substantial.

**RESOLVED** that planning permission be **REFUSED** due to concerns that the loss of the route across the footbridge would increase use of the level crossing, adversely affecting the safety of children, animals and pedestrians.

**Chairman**