

## Charlotte Bogg

---

**From:** Pat Sutor  
**Sent:** 11 December 2015 17:01  
**To:** Rachael Balmer  
**Cc:** Brian Newcombe; Charlotte Bogg  
**Subject:** Sites Consultation 2015: Site 125, Rillington  
**Attachments:** Amended comments on stage 1 Sift.doc

Dear Mrs Balmer,

I write on behalf of Mr B Newcombe. He regrets that the site is regarded as being too small to be considered for housing in this Service Village. It could have allowed a neglected site in a visually important location viewed from the village to be improved.

We also have some additional comments. We presume that the text in red in the full SSM for Site 125 would count very strongly against it. Mr Newcombe has some comments which are attached.

I add to these below.

Q7: The site is well below the rising ground to the south and so the claimed adverse impact on the landscape is over-stated.

Page 6, C: For the same reason the claimed 'significant impact' on the landscape has also been over-stated.

Q31: The site is significantly higher than the adjacent beck so would not flood easily.

Q41: The lack of possible provision for affordable housing should not be seen as a reason for rejecting housing development as an off-site commuted sum, as mentioned, could be used,

Q48: There are 2 PROWs adjacent. The footpath to the west is across the beck would not be adversely affected. Neither would the RUPP to the east (the access to Ellis),

We ask that these comments be taken into account.

Regards,

Pat Sutor

In general, in relation to points Q5, Q6, Q7 and Q10 there does seem to be a misunderstanding. Much of the reasoning for rejection seems to revolve around the trees on the site and the need to significantly reduce/alter/fell them. There are no actual trees of any significance on our plot, which extends to the west only as far as the beck. There are lots of trees on the other side of the beck (the western boundary of our site), some of which are overhanging our plot, but it may well not be clear from the Google Maps view that they are not on our property. We understand that, quite reasonably, in order to keep costs down, authorities sometimes utilise Google Maps for assessing plots. We wonder whether this may be the case here? The site is, in fact, bounded on the south and west sides by a well tended hedge with no trees, on the north side by a rather more unkempt hedge with one small tree, and on the west side by the beck. Indeed, far from requesting tree removal, etc., we would be very much in favour of retaining any existing tree structure in order to preserve the essential rustic charm of our site. Perhaps we should have made this point in the original submission of the site but were unaware that further amplification was possible. Will address these issues in more detail in each of Q5, Q6, Q7 and Q10 below.

More specifically-

Q1A. Remains grey, suggesting no assessment? The site is in the '*Up to 5 mins walking time*' category.

Q5. "*Established trees important to retain*". We assume this refers to the trees on the other side of the beck? As indicated earlier we would want to retain the existing trees anyway.

Q6. "*The site contains a number of trees . . .*". Again we think this probably refers to the trees on the playing field site, not on our site. Also, we would very much wish to retain the trees and hedgerows.

Q7. ". . . *This is a small, but prominent site which is heavily treed . . .*". and ". . . *There is an existing timber building, which the site submitter proposes to replace with a new dwelling. It is unlikely to cause wider landscape impacts by virtue of its size, but an adverse localised impact would be present.*"

This seems somewhat of an exaggeration – a replacement dwelling of similar size (a bungalow?) would have no significant impact in this respect. Once again we are not proposing to tamper with any of the trees on the site, let alone the trees referred to, which are not on our site.

Q10. "The area is well treed, and a new dwellings (sic) likely to necessitate removal of such trees, which would be to the detriment of this site" . Again, we think, probably refers to trees which are not ours. We would not deem it necessary to remove any trees, rather wishing to retain them. All that would be necessary (for access) would be a drive-width gap in the northern boundary hedge.

Q11, 'C'. Disagree with this – suggest '*neutral impact*' would be more appropriate; proposal would have minimal adverse impact on . . . etc.

Q13. "*intrusive development in streetscene*" - how? Surely, if anything, the trees referred to would help minimise any visual intrusion, helping to cloak the development? Being on the periphery of the village, it would help to define the boundary. Also, there have indeed been significant archaeological discoveries in and around the Wolds area but we cannot recall anything of that nature in the immediate vicinity of Rillington. However, we accept that this is a requirement that, as with all sites, must be legally addressed.

Q13, 'D'. We would respectfully suggest that '*Development would not adversely affect etc.*' would be more appropriate.

Q16 'E'. '*Site capable of incorporating low carbon, etc.*' We would be quite happy to follow this route, voltaic panels, etc.

Q46. This seems seems to contradict the assessment for Q3. " . . . and conflicts anticipated with playing pitch access". One small dwelling access teed off the adequately wide playing field access road; it's not really likely to cause any conflicts.

Q48. The report is correct in stating that the site is adjacent to the PROW. Cannot see how there would be any need to transect the PROW. Proposal would not therefore affect the PROW.

Q52, 'M'. We would respectfully suggest, given the responses we have made above, that '*Site has no adverse impact, etc.*' or at the very least, '*Site does not have significant adverse impact, etc.*' would be more appropriate here.