North Yorkshire Council

Scarborough and Whitby Area Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 23 March 2026 commencing at 10.00 am.

Councillor Liz Colling in the Chair and Councillors David Chance, Derek Bastiman, Eric Broadbent, Janet Jefferson, Rich Maw, Tom Seston, Subash Sharma and Roberta Swiers.

Officers present: Karl Battersby, St John Harris, Joe Penny and Stewart Rowe

Other attendees: Rosalind Aldcroft (Bay View Coffee House), Adam Ashman (Yorkshire Water), Miles Cameron (Yorkshire Water), Martin Christmas (Environment Agency), Andrew Clay (Scarborough Tourism Advisory Board and SEA LIFE Scarborough), Steve Crawford (Surfers Against Sewage), Mike Dugher (Environment Agency) and Professor Darren Grocke (Durham University).

Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book

---

194 Apologies for absence

Councillors David Jeffels, Clive Pearson, Heather Phillips, John Ritchie, Neil Swannick and Phil Trumper.

195 Declarations of interest

Councillor David Chance declared an interest in his capacity of Chair of Pickering Fishery Association which was in litigation with the Environment Agency.

196 Public questions and statements

There were five public questions submitted to the committee. An additional three public questions submitted by Whitby Community Network were dealt with outside the meeting since a representative could not be present to ask them. Questions 1 and 2 were considered at Minute 201 – Environment Agency and questions 3 to 5 were considered at Minute 202 – Yorkshire Water.

1. The aim of Scarborough Sea Pool CIC is to have a new tidal sea pool in Scarborough, the preferred location has been identified as Children's Corner, slightly to the south of the main south bay beach. Having read the papers for this meeting, we think

The current monitoring period during 15th May to 30th Sept and only 20 times during this period doesn't meet the year round nature of surfing and sea swimming in Scarborough, we want this acknowledged and year round testing done across all the bays and not limited to a small number of testing locations, we also want to be involved in the future testing.

Yorkshire Water say they consult with Surfers Against Sewage and Sons of Neptune; we want to make YW aware of many other active sea swimming groups in Scarborough that

should also be involved and actively consulted in the future Bathing Water Partnership.

We can be contacted via our email scarboroughseapool@gmail.com and our website https://e-voice.org.uk/scarboroughseapool/ **(Karen Chiverall, Scarborough Sea Pool CIC)**

Reply

Defra has recently consulted on proposed reforms to the Bathing Water Regulations 2013 including extending the dates of the monitored bathing season. Should Defra permit this and the funding be made available, then the EA would gladly undertake more testing over a longer period.

In reply, Ms Chiverall sought further information about the Defra consultation: had the consultation closed? Was there an opportunity for Scarborough Sea Pool CIC to participate? The Chair advised that the Area Committee had responded to the consultation which took place in November – December 2024 seeking an extension of the monitored bathing season.

2. In the recent water quality review a list of reasons for poor water quality at South Bay, Scarborough were given: discharge of sewage via water company overflows, animal waste, misconnected drains, agricultural runoff and urban runoff. Whilst this presents a diffuse picture of culprits, what is the accurate picture? What is causing the majority of negative impact to our water? We ask you to quantify, provide percentages for each of these data points to explain the picture more accurately. **(Elisabeth Marriott)**

Reply

The EA uses microbial source tracking of potential sources of pollution and total bacterial community profiling to test samples for counts of the bacteria intestinal enterococci (IE) and Escherichia coli (E. coli), the two bacteria used to classify bathing waters under the Bathing Water Regulations 2013. These techniques do not allow to build a precise picture of contributors by percentage to poor bathing water quality, rather give strong or weak indicators.

In response, Ms Marriott sought further clarification as to how the EA's findings marry with those of Professor Grocke.

The meeting was advised that seabirds were a consistent contributor to the bacteria measured as part of the Bathing Water Regulations requirements at both Scarborough South and North bathing waters – the former site having a magnitude greater concentration of markers than the latter, but they were present in numbers at both. The presence of the markers was established through the use of Microbial Source Technique (MST) analysis of the bacteria present in the water samples collected at the sampling points at Scarborough North and Scarborough South and further confirmed through use of bacterial community profiling analysis. Seaweed samples were not obtained from the bathing water sites as seaweed does not grow at these locations, so this could not be compared with Professor Grocke's investigation findings. Seabird markers were also found in water samples taken in Scalby Beck but analysis of the bacteria in these samples showed that human and ruminant markers were in much greater concentrations here, compared with both seabirds and the water taken at the bathing water sites. The dominance of human and ruminant markers found using the EA's investigative techniques would be supportive of the findings of Professor Grocke's work in Scalby Beck.

3. We are one of many active sea swimming groups in Scarborough and we organise

regular swims, multiple times a week. We get alerts about CSO's and spillages via the SSRS (Safer Seas and Rivers) app. We are very concerned about all CSO's, but especially at times when the weather is dry, we have been told that sometimes the monitoring equipment can cause errors if there is dust, dirt or spiders' webs on the sensors. How accurate is the information about CSO's and how can Yorkshire Water improve the sensors or fix faults with them, or is the information about dust, dirt and spiders' webs just a 'web of deceit'?

We would also happily assist with more frequent water quality testing.

(Cathy Foreman, Hub Sea Swimmers)

Reply

YW uses EDM (Event Duration Monitoring) sensors in storm overflows which operate in a hostile environment buried underground and can become contaminated. This can lead to indications of an instantaneous discharge on the real time overflow map which are generally fake. YW is working to reduce these anomalies and make the equipment more reliable. YW was assessed by the EA on the availability and accuracy of these monitors so it was in YW's interests to reduce anomalies in the data.

4. Will Yorkshire Water provide or fund water quality testing kits to local sea swimming/surfing groups to enable the collection of real time data? In this way, the public can get involved thereby building trust in YW and EA. **(Alicia Black)**

Reply

YW has much confidence in the science around bathing water testing and the work undertaken by the EA and Professor Grocke, and further acknowledges the value of real time information on bathing water quality. Even though the technology is not quite there to enable this, YW would be very interested in investigating and implementing a solution involving the public through the Bathing Water Partnership. Reference was also made to a two year plan to introduce real time testing in Scalby Beck.

5. Whilst bonus payments were banned in 2025, these payments are still being made in disguised ways, for example through parent companies, or as retention payments. These are still bonuses. How can the public trust YW when massive amounts of money are paid out of the company rather than used to lower bills and clean our water? **(Elisabeth Marriott on behalf of Tim Blacklock)**

Reply

The payments referred to were not performance related payments, but payments agreed by shareholders for the Chief Executive. It would not be right for customers to meet these additional costs through their bills, and YW was working hard to ensure there is transparency around these decisions.

197 Review of bathing water quality in the North Bay and South Bay, Scarborough

Considered a report of the Corporate Director Environment which set the scene for the review by providing some historical and background information in respect of the challenges regarding bathing water quality in the North Bay and South Bay and how agencies were responding. In particular, the convening power of North Yorkshire Council was highlighted to bring different agencies together to tackle this issue.

198 Local impacts

The committee received presentations from several local stakeholders in respect of the local impacts of bathing water quality.

Steve Crawford, Surfers Against Sewage

Steve Crawford addressed the committee as a lifelong Scarborough resident and former surf business owner, explaining that he had closed his business due to persistent poor water quality and associated health concerns. He highlighted the scale and longevity of pollution affecting both North and South Bays, citing high numbers of CSO discharges, inadequate historic investment outcomes and conflicting or unclear public safety messaging on beaches. He stated that public awareness of water pollution had increased significantly, leading to fear among residents and visitors, reputational damage to Scarborough, and negative impacts on tourism and livelihoods. While welcoming further proposed investment, he expressed a lack of trust without clear accountability for previous failures, described the personal financial consequences he had suffered, and called for greater transparency, honesty and effective action to restore confidence and deliver lasting improvements in bathing water quality.

Rosalind Aldcroft, Bay View Coffee House

Rosalind Aldcroft addressed the committee as a South Bay trader and regular year-round sea swimmer, explaining that she frequently observed families and swimming groups entering the sea without necessarily being aware of water quality concerns, and cautioned that public messaging needed to strike a balance between not deterring visitors while still being clear about potential risks. She stated that water quality had improved since earlier decades but remained insufficient, and questioned whether current sampling locations and frequency provided a full and accurate picture. She asked whether testing should be extended geographically and into the winter months to allow clearer analysis of seasonal influences, including visitor numbers, weather conditions, farming runoff and storm overflow activity. She also raised concerns about the annual movement of beach sand, questioning whether pollutants could be stored in the sand and later released into the water, and whether seasonal population increases contributed to higher pollution levels. She concluded that, as a destination dependent on bathing and swimming, Scarborough owed residents and visitors the best possible water quality supported by robust testing and transparent information.

Andrew Clay, Scarborough Tourism Advisory Board and SEA LIFE Scarborough

Andrew Clay addressed the committee as General Manager of the Scarborough Sea Life Centre, outlining its 35-year presence in the town, ownership by Merlin Entertainments, and recent significant investment demonstrating a long-term commitment to Scarborough, environmental sustainability and the local economy. He explained that the centre relied directly on seawater pumped from North Bay for its exhibits and life-support systems, using large volumes of water which were filtered and tested daily, making clean bathing water critical to its operation. He emphasised that, beyond being a visitor attraction, learning and conservation lay at the heart of the Sea Life Centre’s work, including education, habitat research, breeding programmes, rescue and rehabilitation of marine animals, and monitoring of local marine ecosystems. He highlighted the unique value of being located directly on the coast, enabling engagement with local habitats and wildlife, and stressed the ecological importance of clean seas given the presence of seals, cetaceans and returning species such as bluefin tuna. He also described wider environmental activity, including beach cleans and concerns about marine litter, pollution and disturbance from events such as Bonfire Night, concluding that water quality was

essential not only to the centre's viability but to marine conservation, education and the wider environmental health and reputation of Scarborough.

Members' discussion

In response to the presentations, councillors questioned whether Steve Crawford's concerns as a council tenant and business owner had been properly addressed, including the absence of responses from Yorkshire Water on issues such as surface water runoff, sand movement, blocked drains and historic investment failures, and why he and some local division councillors had not been involved in earlier bathing water quality summits. Members expressed concern about the effectiveness and clarity of beach signage, reputational damage to Scarborough, loss of livelihoods, and the risk of continued delay while waiting through regulatory assessment cycles. Councillors supported Rosalind Aldcroft's observations regarding sand movement and seasonal factors, questioning whether pollutants could accumulate in sand and be released later, and calling for more geographically extensive and year-round water testing to better understand the influence of weather, tourism levels and other external sources. Questions to Andrew Clay focused on the Sea Life Centre's reliance on seawater pumped from North Bay, how filtered and used water was discharged, whether long-term and seasonal water quality data existed, and whether such data could be shared publicly to inform understanding of trends during peak tourism periods. Members were also interested in whether Sea Life Centre was involved in local seagrass projects and whether the seagrass was affected by pollution. Wider issues raised included accountability for past infrastructure investment, monitoring future investment outcomes, possible links between dredging, marine habitat impacts and water quality indicators, and the urgent need to improve communication, transparency and confidence for residents, visitors and the local economy.

Mr Clay undertook to provide a response to the committee on Sea Life Centre data on sea water quality including seasonal variations and to check SLC's involvement in local seagrass projects and potential data on pollution levels in seagrass.

199 North Yorkshire Council

The committee received a presentation from Stewart Rowe, Coastal Manager, Harbours and Coastal Infrastructure, North Yorkshire Council.

Stewart Rowe addressed the committee acknowledging the long-standing frustration shared by partners and residents about bathing water quality and emphasising the collective determination to resolve issues that were damaging to the town. He outlined the complexity of the problem, noting multiple potential sources of pollution including sewage, agricultural runoff, wildlife, misconnected drains, sand movement and harbour dredging, and stressed that the key challenge was understanding the relative contribution of each through robust science. He explained that North Yorkshire Council's primary role was to convene and coordinate partners through mechanisms such as the Bathing Water Partnership and summits, while clarifying that sampling regimes, standards and beach classifications were set nationally by the Environment Agency and DEFRA, limiting local discretion. He described the statutory basis for beach signage, including the tension between bathing water advice and RNLI lifeguard operations, and set out the council's wider responsibilities such as beach cleaning, dog controls, and planning. He highlighted Professor Grocke's study commissioned by the council and additional Environment Agency investigations beyond mandatory sampling, intended to examine a wider range of inputs such as sand, watercourses and seasonal pressures from visitor numbers. He concluded that resolving bathing water quality issues depended on improved scientific understanding to identify root causes, noting that sand relocation was undertaken for coastal protection reasons and was not currently subject to testing, but remained an area of interest for further investigation.

Members' discussion

Following Stewart Rowe's presentation, councillors discussed the tension between public water safety and bathing water quality, questioning whether the presence of RNLI-managed bathing zones risked implying that swimming was safe despite poor classifications. Members reflected on substantial historic investment by Yorkshire Water which had failed to deliver the expected improvement to bathing water status, expressing frustration that a former quality award had deteriorated to a "poor" classification under the four-year assessment cycle, despite infrastructure upgrades and contributions from major businesses. Councillors emphasised the need to maintain political scrutiny and public focus through continued bathing water summits, rejecting any suggestion that the issue was resolved, and calling for broader engagement with stakeholders and speakers who had contributed evidence. Further discussion focused on adopting a process-of-elimination approach to identify pollution sources, including consideration of sand movement, harbour dredging, seasonal population pressures, stormwater runoff, ageing Victorian drainage infrastructure and the potential impacts of overdevelopment on wastewater capacity. Clarification was sought on how surface water, street cleaning runoff and extreme rainfall events interacted with the combined sewer system, and whether mitigation measures such as retention tanks were operating as originally intended. Members also raised concerns about pollution from events such as Bonfire Night, discussing enforcement, byelaws and the potential for organised alternatives to reduce environmental harm, while reiterating that resolving the bathing water issues required sustained partnership working, transparency and timely action rather than accepting continued poor outcomes.

200 Professor Darren Grocke (Professor of Stable Isotope Geochemistry, University of Durham)

The committee received a presentation from Professor Darren Grocke, Professor of Stable Isotope Geochemistry, University of Durham.

Professor Darren Grocke addressed the committee to present the findings of a two-year scientific study using nitrogen stable isotope analysis of seaweed to identify sources of nutrient pollution affecting Scarborough's bathing waters. He explained that analysis of over 3,400 samples of Fucus and Ulva collected from 18 sites between September 2023 and October 2025 demonstrated that nitrogen signals recorded in the seaweed were consistent with pollution from animal manure and human sewage, rather than seabird guano or routine agricultural fertilisers. The results consistently identified Scalby Beck as a dominant source of nitrogen pollution, with ocean currents transporting this pollution from the North Bay into the South Bay, particularly during summer months when pollution levels intensified. Seasonal comparisons showed relatively cleaner conditions in winter and significant deterioration in summer, including a pronounced pollution event in July 2025 affecting much of the coastline. Professor Grocke highlighted the advantage of using seaweed as an integrative monitoring tool, capturing average pollution over several weeks rather than short-term snapshots, and noted that visible increases in seaweed growth were often indicative of nutrient enrichment rather than good environmental health. He also raised concerns that beach sand movement could remobilise stored nutrients and contaminants, potentially exacerbating pollution as material was redistributed along the bay. He concluded that the evidence strongly pointed to nutrient inputs via Scalby Beck as a priority area for targeted investment and remediation, and that improved scientific understanding was essential to inform effective long-term solutions.

Members' discussion

Following Professor Darren Grocke's presentation, councillors commended the robustness

of his scientific analysis, focusing discussion on the finding that animal manure and human sewage were the dominant contributors rather than fertiliser runoff or seabird guano. Members questioned what practical systems and regulatory changes were needed to address pollution from Scalby Beck, including stronger controls on CSOs, greater oversight of agricultural and groundwater inputs, and clearer accountability given the absence of a single authority with overall responsibility. Councillors raised concerns about historic planning decisions, overdevelopment and infrastructure capacity, and emphasised the importance of continued monitoring to assess whether remedial actions delivered real improvement, noting with concern that funding for Professor Grocke's work had ceased and advocating for further commissioning of similar studies as quality assurance alongside future Yorkshire Water investment. There was strong interest in expanding the approach beyond traditional bacterial indicators to a broader assessment of water quality, including routine testing of beach sand before relocation, consideration of nature-based solutions such as seaweed, mussel and aquatic planting to absorb excess nutrients, and complementary monitoring techniques. Members also explored how improvements at identified source areas would translate into public confidence about swimming safety, acknowledged uncertainties around wider climatic factors, and stressed the value of extending investigations further inland to understand how catchment-wide processes influencing coastal water quality, concluding that Professor Grocke's work provided a critical evidence base to guide sustained action.

201 Environment Agency

The committee received a presentation from Martin Christmas, Area Environment Manager (Yorkshire), Environment Agency. Before the presentation, Mr Christmas provided replies to two public questions (see Minute 196 above).

Martin Christmas addressed the committee on behalf of the Environment Agency to explain its statutory role in bathing water management, emphasising that while the EA was not a public health body, it was responsible for bacteriological monitoring, incident response, investigation and public reporting. He outlined how bathing water classifications were derived from weekly sampling during the bathing season and assessed using a four-year rolling average, noting that this meant single poor years could significantly influence classifications and that conditions could vary considerably year-to-year. He summarised the long-term picture for Scarborough, highlighting the persistent poor classification at South Bay and the more variable performance of North Bay, and stressed that earlier large-scale investment by Yorkshire Water had demonstrated that no single intervention could be relied upon to resolve such a complex problem. He presented findings from extensive investigations since 2014, including microbial source tracking and bacterial community profiling, which showed consistent human and seabird contributions at both bathing waters, occasional dog and ruminant inputs linked to rainfall and Scalby Beck, evidence of untreated sewage in Scalby Beck after rain, and confirmation that treated effluent from both Scarborough Wastewater Treatment Works and McCain's could be detected at both bays, demonstrating both north-to-south and south-to-north water movement. He also reported evidence that bacteria could be mobilised from beach sand, confirmed that Scarborough Harbour was not a significant contributor, and updated members on recent regulatory inspections of Yorkshire Water assets, which identified actions but no permit breaches. He concluded by outlining planned activity for 2026, including continued compliance sampling, deployment of continuous water quality monitors in local becks, increased agricultural inspections in the Scalby Beck catchment, ongoing partnership working, and delivery of storm overflow reduction schemes through the AMP8 programme by 2030.

Members' discussion

Following Martin Christmas's presentation, councillors discussed the long-standing nature

of poor bathing water quality at South Bay and the more recent decline at North Bay, questioning whether any specific changes in infrastructure, development or pressures could explain the deterioration and noting that previous investigation had not identified a single definitive cause. Members explored the role of seabirds as a constant background influence rather than a recent change, while seeking reassurance that they should not be discounted entirely, and queried the relevance of human behaviour such as urination in the sea to E. coli readings. Significant concern was raised about agricultural runoff, including slurry spreading during wet conditions, the potential use of treated sewage sludge on farmland, and the need to understand how rainfall events and time lags influenced the appearance of human and animal waste markers at the coast. Councillors also highlighted possible additional sources within the catchment, including leaching from historic and current landfill sites, private septic tanks, and complex drainage associated with old mills and culverts along Scalby Beck. Discussion focused on the limitations of current sampling regimes, the difficulty of quantifying relative source contributions, and interest in more integrated, longer-term and catchment-wide monitoring approaches to complement compliance sampling. Members questioned how surface water, street-cleaning runoff, overflow assets and sluice gates operated during heavy rainfall and flooding events, and whether asset management decisions might unintentionally exacerbate pollution. The discussion concluded with proposals for closer joint working between the council and the Environment Agency on gull management, landfill assurance, and other data sharing, and an acknowledgement that resolving bathing water quality required continued investigation, transparency and coordinated action across multiple agencies rather than reliance on any single intervention.

In response to a request by the committee, Mr Christmas undertook to provide detailed bacterial marker data for the North Bay and the South Bay and details of the pollution risk forecasting tools used by the Environment Agency in the locality.

202 Yorkshire Water

The committee received a presentation from Miles Cameron, Manager of Strategic Partnerships, and Adam Ashman, Head of Strategic Partnerships & Sustainability, Yorkshire Water. Before the presentation, Messrs Cameron and Ashman provided replies to three public questions (see Minute 196 above).

Miles Cameron and Adam Ashman addressed the committee on behalf of Yorkshire Water, acknowledging longstanding concerns about bathing water quality in Scarborough and setting their presentation in the context of historic and recent investment, partnership working and the complexity of multiple pollution sources. They outlined Yorkshire Water's infrastructure history in Scarborough, noting the transformation since the Victorian short sea outfalls, major investment between 2010 and 2015 including storage tunnels, treatment upgrades and UV disinfection, and more recent schemes at Wheatcroft and Whitby Road Bridge which had significantly reduced storm overflow frequency and duration. They reported strong asset performance in 2025, with full effluent compliance, improved UV disinfection effectiveness, and year-on-year reductions in spill events, while accepting that assets alone could not resolve all water quality pressures, particularly those linked to Scalby Beck and wider catchment inputs. They described the creation of a dedicated Bathing Waters team to provide specialist focus, greater transparency, proactive maintenance and closer collaboration with partners, including work on misconnections, investigations and rapid operational response.

Looking ahead, they highlighted a major AMP8 investment programme of around £120–150 million up to 2030 to further reduce CSO spills through a blended approach, alongside expanded education and community engagement, aerial mapping to identify drainage risks, a large-scale water-butt programme, and continued partnership work with the council and the Environment Agency. They also outlined innovation trials, including

seaweed-based “blue solutions” to absorb nutrients, new monitoring technologies aimed at near real-time water quality information for the public, and strengthened governance through a reinvigorated Bathing Water Partnership with independent leadership and wider stakeholder representation, emphasising that rebuilding trust would depend on openness, sustained investment and coordinated action over time.

Members’ discussion

Following the presentation by Miles Cameron and Adam Ashman, councillors focused on issues of trust, accountability and delivery timescales, welcoming the scale of proposed investment but expressing frustration that South Bay remained classified as poor and concern that promised improvements had not yet translated into visible results. Members questioned how the new stakeholder group would be constituted to ensure genuine representation of residents and water users, sought clarity on the extent of Victorian and combined sewer infrastructure, and explored how future solutions might prioritise surface water separation, sustainable urban drainage and misconnection remediation rather than further reliance on combined systems. Significant concern was raised about the impact of continued housing growth on already constrained infrastructure, the status of Yorkshire Water as a non-statutory consultee in planning, and whether capacity issues were being adequately addressed.

Councillors pressed Yorkshire Water on why earlier investment programmes had fallen short of expectations, how the new £120–150m AMP8 programme would differ, and whether improvements could realistically be accelerated ahead of the 2030 deadline, stressing that continued delays posed reputational, environmental and public health risks for the town. There was strong interest in extending monitoring beyond the bathing season, improving transparency of data, supporting citizen-science initiatives to rebuild confidence, and exploring longer-term solutions such as grey-water recycling alongside simpler measures like water butts. Members also highlighted ongoing concerns around flash flooding, operational controls such as valves and overflows, agricultural and non-Yorkshire Water sources of pollution, and the need for clearer explanations of responsibilities between agencies. The discussion concluded with requests for continued engagement with the Area Committee, involvement of members in stakeholder nominations, closer alignment with local plan policy on drainage and water management, and a shared expectation that Yorkshire Water work with partners to deliver faster, demonstrable improvements while maintaining open communication and scrutiny.

In response to requests made by the committee, Messrs Cameron and Ashman agreed:

i. To provide details of the scheme for giving sewage sludge to farms
ii. To provide data on the number of spills from Scarborough’s five CSOs
iii. To provide details of the operation of the sluice valves at Aquarium Top and Peasholm Park in relation to pollution prevention
iv. To provide further details of the process for the adoption of wastewater assets such as sewer pipes in new housing developments, with particular reference to West Garth, Cayton, the sewer assets of which had not yet been adopted.

203 Conclusions and recommendations

The Chair thanked all the contributors and summarised a list of recommendations which had arisen during the meeting for consideration by the committee. These were agreed and subsequently finalised as follows:

Resolved that the committee:

1. Makes the following recommendations to North Yorkshire Council

That the council:

(i) routinely arranges testing of the sand on the South Bay before moving it from the West Pier to the Spa;
(ii) gives consideration to commissioning Professor Darren Grocke to undertake further studies;
(iii) investigates the impact of cleaning the streets of guano - where does the water go? Does it go into treatment works or does it go into run-off and straight into the sea?
(iv) involves the Environment Agency in ongoing work on the new Gull Strategy so the EA can assess any possible impact on bathing water quality;
(v) writes to the Minister of State for Housing and Planning to request that relevant water companies be statutory consultees on planning applications;
(vi) ensures that landfill sites, both used and closed, close to waterways are checked for leach;
(vii) ensures that the emerging Local Plan has policies that (a) develop SUDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems) strategies and (b) require grey water recycling on all new builds;

2. sets a date for Yorkshire Water to attend to update the committee on their plans and work programme; and

3. seeks involvement in the creation of Yorkshire Water's new Stakeholder Group to ensure the Stakeholder Group is representative and all interest groups are consulted.

The meeting ended with Councillor Rich Maw outlining a new multi-agency citizen science pilot study which used rapid testing technology to give a real time indicator of endotoxin levels in bathing water. Local volunteers, for example surfers and swimmers would be invited to assist in taking 90 samples over 90 days to help assess the quality of the bathing water on each day. The longer term plan was to develop the study into a funded research project.

204 Date of next meeting

5 June 2026 at Scarborough Town Hall

The meeting concluded at 1.47 pm.