

North York Moors National Park Authority

26 March 2026 Planning Committee members update sheet

Item 1, NYM/2025/0743

Additional comments have been received from the applicant's agent: -

In connection with the above application due to be heard at this week's planning committee there are a couple of points of clarification we wish to point out to Members, if possible, please:

- page 9 – the business had been operating under permitted development for the previous two seasons.
- page 10 – the current application is 'part retrospective' – the additional silo is not yet in situ. It is noted throughout the Committee report that it states 'retrospective' when it is not entirely retrospective.
- page 13 – the application was submitted on 21 Nov 2025 (shortly after the end of the closed season) – any delay on submission was entirely down to the workload of the applicants' agents (Yorkshire Planning Consultants) and through no fault of the applicant.

Item 2, NYM/2024/0877

The following additional comments have been received from the planning agent regarding the application:

I have just been reading the committee report and would like to highlight one or two matters:

- Through our negotiations the proposal under consideration by the committee is markedly smaller than the original proposal submitted with the application.
- It is 650mm (2' 1.5") lower to the ridge than the original proposal submitted with the application.
- It is also 3.1m (10' 2") shorter than the original proposal.
- Also, the main section is 50mm (2") narrower, while the projection to the west is 1.06m (3' 5") shorter, although it is 1.5 stories in height compared to a single storey.
- The outline of the original proposal is indicated on the drawings in a pale blue broken line.

The following additional third-party comments from Ms Flinton of Brook Cottage regarding the application have been received:

As the adjoining owner, I am writing to request my following comments are raised at the up-and-coming planning committee meeting. I am unwell at the moment, so request

these comments are brought to the attention of the Committee as these have not been covered and given due consideration in the Committee Report.

Having read through the Officer's Report recommending approval of this application: -

The significant impact on my property of the introduction of the new garage, drive, parking, and manoeuvring area, for the benefit of Thorpe Cottage (not the new dwelling), has not been given due consideration and is not covered in the Report.

The new garage, parking and turning area is being introduced into an area of quiet, green back land space, surrounded on all sides by residential amenity space and situated in close proximity and adjacent to the low stone boundary wall on the eastern side of my property.

This introduces vehicle movements to the rear of my house causing significant harm to and loss of my residential amenity and privacy as my living and sleeping accommodation is situated at the rear of my house close to this boundary.

This harm will be caused by virtue of new vehicle noise from engines, locking/unlocking systems, vehicle noise created by cars having to shunt around the parking area due to lack of space, and the direct shining of vehicle headlights affecting my main living and sleeping accommodation.

I have submitted photos to demonstrate the proximity but cannot see where this specific impact has been covered – there is no mention of this harmful impact in the Residential Impact section in the Report.

There is no context presented to the Committee to the fact the new garage, parking and manoeuvring area is located in quiet green space.

The current bushes and vegetation along the boundary wall forming a barrier is to be, in the main, removed and there are no requirements to replace with landscape screening of adequate size and density to mitigate any detrimental impact on my residential amenity.

I proposed an alternative parking solution could reduce the impact on my rear living space, but the Report does not cover whether this was assessed and why it was not thought to be acceptable. It was proposed to remove the garage and provide Thorpe Cottage with space for two cars (to replace their current facility) in a tandem parking arrangement, similar to that confirmed by Highways to be acceptable for the new dwelling. The storage space could then be satisfied by a garden shed located to the rear of the new dwelling adjacent the new parking spaces for Thorpe Cottage.

This revised arrangement could reduce the loss of current green space, provide for the introduction of additional landscaping, and mitigate the impact on my privacy and residential amenity. It could also further reduce impact on the Grade II listed Almshouses.

I have suggested a site meeting to demonstrate the harmful impact of this element of the application, but this has not been acted upon.

I thank you for taking these further comments into consideration before making a decision.