

Herewith my statement. It is deliberately concise. It restates points made to the LPA over the last 14 years in its consultation on the Local Plan.

1) The site is in the middle of Allerston. It is occupied by mid-20th century redundant farm buildings which in my opinion are most unsightly.

2) 3 June 2004. Site proposed for Local Plan review by Peter Rayment as agent for Martin Green, and given reference as 7. Development was seen as an opportunity to amend an ambiguity in 2002 Ryedale Local Plan and redevelop eyesore of dilapidated mid-20C farm buildings with housing appropriate to conservation area.

3) I later took over as agent for Mr Green. The objection was given a new number, 539.

4) What we consider (in 2) to be an ambiguity relates to Inset 7 (Allerston) in the 2002 Local Plan. Paragraph 2.2 of the text explains why certain areas have been excluded. *'...the open spaces between the buildings north of Allerston Mill on the west side of Main Street are an important element of the character of this part of the Conservation Area. In order to prevent their loss through infill development this area is excluded from the Development Limits of the settlement'*.

5) I support this objective. However in fact the site is occupied by the unsightly buildings and therefore is not itself part of the *'open spaces'*. I regard the mismatch between the notation on the Inset map and the written text as ambiguous.

6) In 2005 a planning application for three houses in a terrace and a fourth detached house (LPA ref 05/00937/FUL) on the site was refused, mainly because of its location outside the development limits.

7) It is worth noting that the Council's Conservation Officer commented on the planning application that their removal would be acceptable. It was stated that the buildings do not contribute to the character of the conservation area. Conservation Area Consent was given for their demolition.

8) An appeal was made in 2006 (PINS reference ...2015146). It was dismissed. In her decision the inspector said *'Alterations to the defined Development Limits should be proposed through the development plan process'*.

9) I know that the Council's search for sites to meet its housing needs is concentrating on larger sites and is restricted to the towns and larger 'service' villages. I understand this strategy.

10) However I regret that the opportunity has not been taken to reexamine and where appropriate amend existing Development Limits from the 2002 Local Plan, in particular in the light of the 2006 inspector's comment in 8 above. The Development Limits remain as part of the LPA's planning policy. Policy SP2 of the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy (5 September 2013) refers specifically to them in the context of the 'smaller villages'.

11) My objection for consideration at the EIP is that the LPA has not addressed our request for the Allerston Development Limits to be reexamined.

12) I am not aware of any intentions by the LPA for a comprehensive reexamination of Development Limits across Ryedale despite having made enquiries.

13) I hope and trust that these representations will be taken into account.

Patrick Sutor
BA, Dip TP, MRTPI
for Mr M Green