

North Yorkshire Council

Scarborough and Whitby Area Planning Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 8 May 2025 commencing at 2.00 pm.

Councillor Phil Trumper in the Chair plus Councillors Subash Sharma, Derek Bastiman, Eric Broadbent, Janet Jefferson, Rich Maw and Clive Pearson.

Officers present: Charlotte Cornforth (Principal Planning Officer – Development), Amy Harrap (Senior Planning Officer), St John Harris (Principal Democratic Services Officer), Nick Read (Development Management Team Leader), David Walker (Development Service Manager), and Laura Zielinski (Solicitor Planning and Environmental)

Apologies: None

Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book

114 Apologies for Absence

No apologies.

115 Minutes for the Meeting held on 13 March 2025

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 March 2025 were confirmed and signed as an accurate record.

116 Declarations of Interests

Both Councillors Subash Sharma and Derek Bastiman declared an interest in respect of planning application ZF24/00625/FL - Installation of replacement windows in uPVC window frames with double glazed units at St Laurence Church Hall , Church Hill, Scalby, Scarborough, North Yorkshire, YO13 0SA, since they had been in communication with the application in respect of the application. This did not affect their judgement of the application at the meeting.

Planning Applications

The Committee considered reports of the Head of Development Management – Community Development Services relating to applications for planning permission. During the meeting, Officers referred to additional information and representations which had been received.

In considering the reports of the Head of Development Management – Community Development Services, regard had been paid to the policies of the relevant development plan, the National Planning Policy Framework and all other material planning considerations.

Where the Committee granted planning permission in accordance with the recommendation in a report this was because the proposal is in accordance with the development plan, the National Planning Policy Framework or other material planning considerations. Where the Committee

granted planning permission contrary to the recommendation in the report the reasons for doing so are set out below.

117 ZF25/00143/FL - Installation of a new sheet piled wall approximately 1.5m seaward side of the existing sheet piled wall together with the construction of a new reinforced concrete capping beam with replacement mooring bollards at Eskside Wharf , Church Street, Whitby, North Yorkshire, YO22 4AE

The Head of Development Management – Community Development Services sought determination of a planning application for installation of a new sheet piled wall approximately 1.5m seaward side of the existing sheet piled wall together with the construction of a new reinforced concrete capping beam with replacement mooring bollards at Eskside Wharf, Church Street, Whitby, North Yorkshire, YO22 4AE on behalf of Mr Nick Franks.

Updating their report, the planning officer drew members' attention to a typographical error in the report: at paragraphs 10.10 and 10.12 under the 'Heritage' sub-title, the paragraph within the NPPF referred to should read paragraph 215 and not 115 as stated. Since the Environment Agency had not yet submitted comments on the application, the officer advice was that should the committee be minded to approve the scheme, it would be subject to receipt of a positive recommendation from the EA.

Lastly, following discussions between officers, ecologists and the council's Principal Engineer who was project managing the scheme, it had been confirmed that Biodiversity Net Gain should be secured by way of biodiversity units purchased through a local bio bank. A S106 agreement was not required as reported at paragraph 11.4 of the report, as this approach would be secured by a pre-commencement condition to provide written confirmation to demonstrate the units had been purchased. Should the committee be minded to approve the scheme this condition would be added accordingly.

During consideration of the application, the Committee discussed the following issues:

- The importance of maintaining flood defences
- The risk that the proposed concrete capping beam could constitute a trip hazard (the case officer would raise this with the project manager)

The decision:

That members be minded to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions detailed in the committee report, the receipt of a positive recommendation from the Environment Agency, and a pre-commencement condition providing confirmation that the Biodiversity Net Gain had been secured by way of biodiversity units purchased through a local bio bank with the decision delegated to the Head of Development Management and to impose any further planning condition(s) recommended by the Environment Agency that they deem appropriate.

Voting record:

A vote was taken and the motion was declared carried unanimously.

118 ZF24/00625/FL - Installation of replacement windows in uPVC window frames with double glazed units at St Laurence Church Hall , Church Hill, Scalby, Scarborough, North Yorkshire, YO13 0SA

The Head of Development Management – Community Development Services sought

determination of a planning application for installation of replacement windows in uPVC window frames with double glazed units at St Laurence Church Hall, Church Hill, Scalby, Scarborough, North Yorkshire, YO13 0SA on behalf of St Laurence's Church Rooms (Mrs Susan Truefitt).

The applicant, Susan Truefitt then spoke in support of the application.

During consideration of the application, the Committee discussed the following points in favour of the planning application:

- The minor aesthetic value of the Church Hall and its extension which was not regarded as a building of Townscape Merit – the planning application would improve the building's appearance
- The application site's distance from the carriageway which made the detailing of the windows less visible to passersby
- The widespread use of uPVC window frames with double glazed units on other buildings in the Scalby Conservation Area
- The importance of the building to the local community and that the planning application would make the building more sustainable, energy efficient and pleasant to use

And against the planning application:

- The use of uPVC window frames would detract from the character and appearance of this historic building

It was moved but not seconded that the officer recommendation in the report to refuse permission be adopted.

It was moved and seconded that the officer recommendation in the report to refuse permission be rejected on the following grounds:

- The application site's distance from the carriageway which made the detailing of the windows less visible to passersby and considered that there would be no adverse impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in this case
- The planning application would improve the amenity of the building making it more sustainable, energy efficient and pleasant to use

Voting record:

A vote was taken and the motion was declared carried with 6 for and 1 against.

The Legal Officer advised that since there were no conditions proposed in the report, the members could be minded to grant with the decision delegated.

It was then moved and seconded that the Committee be minded to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions with the decision delegated and the conditions to be determined by the Head of Development Management in consultation with the Chair of the Committee.

The decision:

That, notwithstanding the recommendation in the officer report, the Committee be minded to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions with the decision delegated and the conditions to be determined, by the Head of Development Management in consultation with the Chair of the Committee.

Voting record:

A vote was taken and the motion was declared carried with 6 for and 1 against.

119 Any other items

There were no urgent items of business.

120 Date of Next Meeting

Thursday, 12 June 2025 – Town Hall, Scarborough

The meeting concluded at 2.42 pm.