

Charlotte Bogg

From: Alan Collinson
Sent: 10 December 2015 17:22
To: Charlotte Bogg
Subject: Sites Consultation- Local Plan Sites Document

Dear Sir or Madam,

Re Pickering Sites 203, 150 and 139

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above referenced document.

I note from the plan of Pickering that there are three particular sites shown as residential; viz 203, 150 and 139. It may be that the plots in question find their way into the residential category because plans have been submitted in the past for residential development. But I do not believe this adequately reflects their planning history.

These sites were the subject of a Public Inquiry held by the Planning Inspectorate at Ryedale House in 2012 and it was during the course of the Inquiry that the development history of this land was reviewed (at some length) by both Council and Development counsels.

I summarise this history as follows. The land along with other plots was assigned the status as suitable for residential development (Category 1) in a review exercise carried out by a contractor on behalf of Ryedale District Council. In the case of these three plots this classification was incorrect because the land adjacent was an industrial estate without any constraints. However, understandably in such a large exercise, this error was not picked up by the council. It seems to me this current review provides an opportunity to correct this earlier error.

In the fullness of time given its status, applications for residential development were made. These applications were rejected by the Pickering Town Council and refused by Ryedale District Council and, on appeal, refused by the Planning Inspectorate. The whole of the Planning Inspectorate report is available to the council but I offer the following excerpt from the Inspector's report which summarises the situation very well.

"I am firmly of the view that this is simply the wrong place for residential development in land use planning terms."

The Inspector's view leaves no ambiguity. And if the land were to be the subject of another planning application (which it already has) then it is certain that this quote will be raised again.

Given this likelihood there is a real prospect that any application would be refused and, once again be the subject of another Public Inquiry. Such Inquiries are very expensive to contest and hardly represent a good use of Ryedale District Council funds, not to mention the funds of prospective developers which would be better used elsewhere.

May I suggest therefore, that continuing to list the land as possible residential use is, simply put, an accident waiting to happen. Possibly a very expensive accident.

Although my own personal preference would be to leave the land as a buffer between existing residential property and the industrial estate, I must recognise that there is pressure to develop. Moreover, there is a real need for development within Ryedale. It seems to me it would be much less risk to the council if this was to be categorised as "Not Specified". This would then open up the possibility of allocating the land to industrial use in the future. Such development would need to be done sympathetically but overall this is a risk averse suggestion and not one which exposes the Council to potentially very expensive outcome in the future.

Furthermore, if Ryedale is to house a great many more people then they will have to work somewhere. Therefore, I further suggest that making the land usage more flexible is not only lower risk to the Council but it would also be seen as a more responsible and sustainable position to take.

Your Sincerely,

Alan Collinson

—
— d
—

Alan Collinson

—
—