

Kildare
Swineherd Lane
Kirkbymoorside
York
YO62 6LR
4/10/2018

Caroline Mulloy

Matter 3 Housing

Issue – Whether the proposed site allocations are justified, effective and consistent with national policy and the local plan strategy (LPS)?

Matter 8 Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Issue – Whether the VIUAs are justified, effective and consistent with national policy and the Local Plan Strategy

Re SD7 Site 156 Kirkbymoorside

Dear Ms Mulloy,

May I thank you again for giving me the opportunity to speak at the examination of the Ryedale Plan_ Local Plan Sites Document.

In yesterday's exchanges the disregard of the Local Plan Strategy (LPS) by the RDC was again a feature of their evidence. They did not address at any stage two of the policies of the LPS with which development of site 156 would conflict, namely:

1. 'In accommodating new development of the town (Kirbymoorside) the town retains its North/South axis and form in the landscape'
2. 'Safeguarding long distance views towards and across the town and into the moors.'

They did refer to the third policy, namely 'Avoiding coalescence between Kirkbymoorside and Keldholme/Kirkby Mills', and agreeing that developing site 156 contributed to coalescence, *'but not very much'*. Instead they focused on the issue of the hazards of the A170, and accessibility to the amenities of Kirkbymoorside neither of which issues are policies of the LPS.

They argue that despite these issues site 156 is suitable for development.

In justifying this position they say that they did not consider sites to the south of the A170, because access was too difficult. This is untrue as a quick look at Helmsley Pickering (and Kirbymoorside) would show that all of these towns have development either side of the A170.

They also use the issue of accessibility to the amenities of Kirkbymoorside as a further justification of the merits of site 156 for development. And yet they proposed site 201 (on the Northern edge of the town) for development, and have already approved site 102 on the Western edge of Kirkbymoorside for development. Accessibility does not seem to have been an issue in these decisions.

Their justification for proposing site 156 appears to depend on their view that *'its only a small field'* which *'won't make much of a contribution to the coalescence of Keldholme and Kirkbymoorside'* and its removal from the protection of VIUA status *'won't have much impact on the large VIUA'* from which they propose to remove it. In addition they apparently claim that *'the benefits of the development of site 156 significantly outweigh the loss or damage to the character of the settlement'*. There is no evidence to back up their claim, and I do not think that there would be any difference between site 156 and any other site put forward for development regarding benefits. How one chooses to measure 'the loss or damage to the character of the settlement' I am not sure. But site 156 is a highly visible site, especially from the sports field and the A170. As such I would have thought that the impact on the character of the settlement would be significant

The proposed allocation of site 156 is not consistent with the policies of the LPS.

The proposed removal of the VIUA status of site 156 is not consistent with the LPS.

Alternative sites have been put forward for development which would be more consistent with the policies of the LPS than site156.

I would therefore ask you to instruct the removal of site 156 from the development plan. I believe that as soon as the landowners and developers whose sites have been excluded become aware of the deletion, other proposals would quickly come forward.

Yours sincerely,

A W M Purser