

Ms Thompson

Thank you for your email.

I would definitely like my site application to be considered by a Planning Inspector and would be glad if you could arrange for this.

I disagree with your view this development would be detrimental to landscape and visual image of area, it is the natural progression of the village should any houses need to be built in Beadlam in the future. In view of successive Government's building policies for more affordable houses to be available in rural areas I would ask that my site be retained or at the least included in any future village plan.

Judy Barker for T. M. BARKER & SON

On Thursday, 30 November 2017, 11:16:32 GMT, Local Plan <localplan@ryedale.gov.uk> wrote:

Mrs Barker

Apologies for not getting back to you sooner. You will be aware that as part of the plan process we have had many sites put forward by landowners to be considered for development. We have had many more sites put forward than we actually need. This is especially the case at the Service Villages as we are only looking to distribute a small proportion of housing to these areas and we do take into account recent completions and planning permissions. (Relative to other service villages, Nawton and Beadlam have had some recent development although I appreciate that this has been at Nawton.) Against this context, we have not proposed any further sites at these settlements. In looking at sites individually, it was felt that the development of your site, in part a function of its scale and location, would have a significant landscape and visual impact and would have an adverse effect on the form and character of the settlement.

I appreciate that you are disappointed that your site is not proposed to be allocated for development in the plan. We have tried to make it clear throughout the process that we will not need all of the sites that landowners have put forward. The purpose of the current consultation is for everyone to make their views known on whether they believe the proposals (eg the sites chosen) in the plan to be appropriate or to say that alternative sites should have been chosen because they are better for specific reasons. If, as a landowner you believe that your site should have been included (and that the plan is 'unsound') then you can make a representation to that effect. This will then be considered by a Planning Inspector who will be appointed to scrutinise the plan/decisions that the Council has made. If you could confirm that that is your position, I will ensure that your views are passed to the Inspector.

The Council has a responsibility to keep its development plan up to date and to regularly review it and to ensure that sufficient land is needed to meet a range of requirements. In this respect it is always helpful for us to know which sites landowners would make available for development but again, I would emphasise that in a rural areas such as Ryedale we are likely to always have more sites put forward than we will need.

I hope that this has clarified the position for you. Please get in touch if you require any further clarification or information.

Jill Thompson

From: Judy Barker
Sent: 29 November 2017 15:25
To: Local Plan <localplan@ryedale.gov.uk>
Subject: Local Plan Sites

Dear Sir

I have received your Publication of Ryedale Plan: Local Plan Sites Document and Policies Map.

As I did not understand it I rang your office and was very disappointed to learn my land has been taken off the 'land put forward for building' schedule. The land has been on this list for about 10 years and I understood it would remain available for building for the foreseeable future.

Can you tell me why this land has been dropped from the list, and if it is possible to get it reinstated or at the very least forwarded on to the next period of planning applications?

Yours Faithfully

Judy Barker for T M Barker & Son. Ladywood Farm. Beadlam. York. YO62 7SP