

**From:** lanthincheyba@aol.com  
**Sent:** 28 September 2011 08:22  
**To:** programmeofficer  
**Subject:** Issues unable to be presented by an ignoramus in the Matters 4 Meeting

**Attachments:** Barlby\_Bridge local plan map.pdf

Mr M Mike - Independent Government Inspector

**Please forgive me if this is not done, but I had great difficulty as one not used to such a procedure, in attempting to find the right place to speak, but subsequently losing the opportunity by matters moving on.**

**I cannot not attempt to recover the situation if I am to do my best to help defend my family and my friends and neighbours families.**

**How and when, for example, might I have raised the topic of the 800 protests that came out of the so called consultation, and how they would be costed and attended to etc?**

**May I please beg your indulgence.**

Sir,

1.] Environmental Agency engineers, on considering a defence wall from Ousebank Cottages to the railway bridge upon which a heavy-duty fence was eventually built on the inner edge, and which has the evident height difference, would have had to work from the 2005 to 2008 Local Plan which consisted of an open recreation area where the allotments are at present.

The engineers working off the Selby & District official Local Plan would have been little need for the extra security of the pile driven interlocking steel sheeting deemed as necessary for protection of Ousebank.

2.] The Regional Development fund remit for the Second tranche of £1 billion of the £3.4 billion fund now that £1.4 billion has been allotted, is for innovative industry with consequent inbuilt sustainability.

A copy is attached of the 2005/2008 Local plan for what has since become a housing build that the Environmental Agency could not possibly have been aware of, especially as no one ever knew about it inasmuch as it was kept well under the radar after the defeat of the Bellway Homes attempt to get BOCMPauls Ltd to build 600 houses.

The promoters, Spawforths Ltd, admitted to an almost cosmetic purpose for the funds, even though their 'UMaDD' consultant protected his reputation by stating that 'amendments' to the finalised Option 7a might require need to look to public funds.

Is it likely that cosmetic purpose will gain a share of the highly competed for the second tranche of the Fund?

3.] The District Valuer put the S.106 considerations at £30 million if the £4 million costs that BOCMPauls Lt would place against the 'core strategic site' for cladding their Mill to prevent smell and noise is NOT taken up.

The £35 million S.106 payment proposal would follow if BOCMPauls Ltd did in fact manage to take up the £4 million given the reservations of the District Valuer.

[ To local residents, who saw the Mill cladded and to actually stop the noise and sweet aroma of animal oil cake food cooking, and who know, a charge against the site build for work successfully completed several years ago, is a puzzle that seems to equate to creative accounting.

4] the 'unadopted' and unadoptable roads surrounding Ousebank cottages deteriorate rapidly after repair paid for communally, and the 'occupier liability' that could ensue from mass trespass that

must therefore be prevented (and that means the dangers of mass confrontation) and stemming from unadopted road accidents with little case law established (and threatening onerous costs to those having such forced on them to threaten livelihood) makes for a nightmare future scenario for Ousebank residents.

Sincerely

Ian T Hinchey      Ousebank      where 40 families live in continual dread of  
permanent threat to life and limb and livelihood