

Rachael Balmer

From: Charlotte Bogg
Sent: 02 November 2015 11:47
To: Rachael Balmer
Subject: FW: Sites Consultation- Local Plan Sites Document sent on behalf of Mrs Rachael Balmer

From: James Cook |
Sent: 02 November 2015 10:34
To: Charlotte Bogg
Cc: Gary Housden
Subject: RE: Sites Consultation- Local Plan Sites Document sent on behalf of Mrs Rachael Balmer

Hi Charlotte,

I'll give you some feedback on the process for future improvements as it was a complete waste of time on technicalities for me.

Here's how it happened

- 1) We met and discussed with Daniel Wheelwright who confirmed our Keldholme was considered in Kirkbymoorside.
- 2) We spent hours preparing and presenting then years waiting, much longer than advertised and in which Gladman stole in.
- 3) Shaun Robson and Gary Housden suddenly said Keldholme wasn't in Kirkbymoorside, so the site wasn't considered despite being on the map and labelled Kirkbymoorside site 132 and accepted.
- 4) Gladman managed to bypass the whole process by being more of a big bully than you are, or try to be. Most bullies are cowards and you failed to fight it.
- 5) Shaun Ronson said this is revealed in the plan because Malton says "including Old Malton" but none of the others were so highlighted, like Middleton or Keldhome
- 6) This was proved a false contrivance when you continued to include Kirby Mills in the assessment - a separate hamlet also. When questioned Mr Daniel Wheelwright said "but Kirby Mills" has other problems like flooding. No sites were acceptable (though it continues to be preferred for new employment in Kirkbymoorside. This shows that you allowed it because you knew the sites wouldn't get through - trying to manage the disappointment of the landowners. This shows your approach is not reactionary but you are engaging in master planning without consultation - which is not how the UK system is supposed to operate. It seems like a ploy to be able to maintain at the Gladman appeal their stance "there are no other sites in Kirkbymoorside" which later turned out not to be true - as micro metals cannot be fully used.
- 7) A planning consultant said within 2km for walking or 5km of services should be considered sustainable which my site is - it is only a little further from the centre than parts of Gladman (10-30%). Once this consultant knew Shaun Robson was involved who they once were a colleague of, they said "you can't rely on that because the planners will make up what they want on that".
- 8) There is strong evidence that Keldholme is nearer to Kirkbymoorside than Kirby Mills at its extremity. The houses north of the road have names, not numbers like Kirby Mills does, and most of the residents feel they live in Keldholme e.g. Mr Glensor recently deceased, grandfather of my friend. The white house next to the sports field was marketed as being in Keldholme, and as I grew up there my friend lived south of the road and I thought he lived in Kirby Mills, but the houses north were Keldholme.

I think in other regards many of the Keldholme sites are suitable or prime for "small scale developments" the local people wanted because they knew it would nourish and compliment the town and its economy. The commitment to never build next to the sports field to allow its expansion and the sports field, means they could never coalesce more than they actually do. They do more so in function than built form due to the sports field. So it's a false premise anyway, but the wicked always have an excuse as the old fable goes (like affordable housing or local needs).

It's really poor handling and more incompetence to run a sweet shop from your overly stubborn and sadistic leadership who only bow to bigger bullies - which makes their plans to get the major share fail anyway and does a disservice to the real living community, who are only ever an afterthought in overly corporate style manoeuvres of self-interest.

Regards

James Cook

From: charlotte.bogg@ryedale.gov.uk

To: charlotte.bogg@ryedale.gov.uk

Subject: Sites Consultation- Local Plan Sites Document sent on behalf of Mrs Rachael Balmer

Date: Mon, 2 Nov 2015 08:00:40 +0000

Dear Sir/Madam,

Sites Consultation- Local Plan Sites Document

Ryedale District Council is now consulting on the site assessment work, undertaken to date, to progress the Local Plan Sites Document. This is the second part of Ryedale District's Development Plan and will contain site allocations and other site-specific policies.

This email is sent to you to invite you to make representations for the following reasons:

- You have submitted land for consideration through this process either as landowner or agent for land owner;
- You are a representative of a Town or Parish Council within the District (outside of the National Park), or a parish adjacent to the District;
- You have asked to be updated on planning policy matters;
- You are a representative of an organisation who have an interest in the District;

This consultation is seeking your views on the work undertaken to date on site assessment, and the assumptions and judgments used to inform how sites have been assessed. Our findings have led to identifying:

preferred sites for the Service Villages; and
potential options for sites at the Market Towns.

It should be noted that the level and amount of development to be distributed to the Market Towns and Service Villages is already established in the adopted Local Plan Strategy, so we are not seeking views on this. This consultation is about the sites which will be needed to meet these established development requirements. In addition, the Council is not considering further sites which are not within, at or around the Market Towns, or the ten Service Villages. These villages are Amotherby and Swinton, Ampleforth, Hovingham, Nawton and Beadlam, Rillington, Slingsby, Sherburn, Sheriff Hutton, Staxton and Willerby and Thornton le Dale.

If you are a landowner, or an agent, you may wish to provide further information to help us understand whether the site you have submitted is both deliverable and developable, or whether to help understand whether any impacts associated with the development of your site can be mitigated.

If you are a resident or business in Ryedale you may wish to provide comments on some of the preferred sites or potential site options that have been suggested in this document, in the place where you live or operate your business from.

Alternatively, you may suggest that other sites would be preferable. If you are particularly concerned about a site, which is near where you live or work, which is listed in this document and shown on the map, even it is not listed as a preferred site or a potential option site, you should still let us know your concerns.