23

ACK

8905

RICHMONDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

RICHMONDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL
REC'D 13 SEP 2012

Richmondshire District Council
Local Plan Core Strategy
Proposed Submission
August 2012

Representations Form

Please read the guidance notes before completing this form

This form comprises two parts:
Part A - Personal details
Part B - Your representation(s)

Both Part A and Part B of this form need to be completed in order for your representation(s) to be valid. Please complete a separate sheet (Part B) for each representation you wish to make. Further copies of this form can be downloaded from www.richmondshire.gov.uk/localplan.aspx
You do not need to fill out Part A for each representation, provided that all representations made are securely attached.

Your completed form must be returned to the following address to reach us no later than 4pm on Friday 14 September 2012:

Planning Policy
Richmondshire District Council
Swale House
Frenchgate
Richmond
DL10 4JE

HAMBLETON D.C
REC'D 13 SEP 2012
PES | KES | CX | ACK

Alternatively, you can email localplan@richmondshire.gov.uk and submit this form as an attachment.

Please note, all representations will be made available for public inspection on our website www.richmondshire.gov.uk/localplan.aspx with personal details (i.e. email address, telephone number and signature) removed.

PART A - Personal details

	YOUR DETAILS	AGENT'S DETAILS
Title	THE HON.	NO AGENT
First name	BERNARD DERFLK	
Last name	BORMAN-SCHREIBER GRAF V. ULLERSDORF	
Job title (if applicable)	RET. CO. DIRECTOR	
Work/Organisation (if applicable)	—	
Address	"GREENWAYS" BRENTWOOD LEYBURN N. YORKS.	
Postcode	DL8 5FP	
Telephone no.	EX DIR.	
Email address		

PART B - Your representation(s)
Please use a separate form for each representation

8905

Name/Organisation: NONE

Q1 To which part of the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document does this representation relate? (Spatial Principle, Sub Area Strategy or Core Policy)

Policy number (e.g. SP2, CRSS or CP8) VARIOUS ALL CONCERNING LEYBURN

Page/paragraph number(s) PRESENT ISNORING IMPORTANT ISSUES

Please Note: Your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to fully support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations. After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

Q2 Do you consider the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document is ...?

	Yes	*No*	*Don't know*	
(a) Legally compliant	☐	☒	☐	
(b) Sound	☐	☒	☐	NOT ENOUGH DETAILS FOR LEYBURN

If you answered '*No*' to (a) or (b) above, please continue to Q3, otherwise continue to Q5

Q3 Do you consider the Core Strategy unsound because it is NOT...? ***(please refer to guidance notes)***

- ☒ *Justified*
- ☒ *Effective*
- ☒ *Consistent with national policy*
- ☒ *Positively prepared*

Please give details of why you consider the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible:

SEE ENCLOSED LETTERS 11/9/2012
9/11/2011

NO NEED SHOWN FOR FURTHER DEVELOPMENT NORTH OF LEYBURN SUBSTANTIAL CHANGE OF TYPICAL YORKS. MARKET TOWN NO EMPLOYMENT AVAILABLE IN LEYBURN INFRASTRUCTURE WILL NOT COPE. AS THERE ARE UNRESOLVED PROBLEMS ALREADY

IMPORTANT DETAILS NOT CONSIDERED INDUSTRY, MISUSE OF RESIDENTIAL AREAS ENTITLEMENT TO BE SAFE ROAD SUBST. CHANGE & FIXED POLICY & PLAN. ROAD SYSTEM NOT FIT FOR PURPOSE & COUNTY PLAN. NOT APPLIED BASED ON GOT RECOMMENDATIONS

continue on a separate sheet if necessary

Q4 Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at Q3 where this relates to soundness. You need to say why this change will make the Core Strategy legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible:

8905

MORE DETAILS & CONSIDERATION OF IMPORTANT ISSUES INDUSTRIAL AREA & BRENTWOOD MAINTAINING GOOD RESIDENTIAL QUALITIES

SEE ENCL. SUBMISSIONS OF FACTUAL SERIOUS ISSUES NOT DEALT WITH

EXHIBIT (1) 11/4/2012

-"- (2) 9/11/2011

I CALLED AT LEYBURN COMMUNITY OFFICE ON TUESDAY 4th SEPT. 2012 AND ASK FOR A MORE DETAILED INFORMATION ON LEYBURN BUT REC'D NO REPLY

continue on a separate sheet if necessary

Q5 If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document, please use the space below to set out your comments:

8905

continue on a separate sheet if necessary

If your representation is seeking a change to the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

☐ *No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination*

☒ *Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination*

If you have selected '*No*', your representation(s) will still be considered by the independent Planning Inspector by way of written representations.

If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

THIS IS BETTER EXPLAINED BY ORAL EXAMINATION BASED ON FACTUAL EXPERIENCE

If you wish to be notified of future stages of plan preparation, please tick the appropriate box(es) below:

☒ *Submission for Examination*

☒ *Inspector's Report Publication*

☒ *Adoption*

Please notify me by:

☒ *Post*

☐ *Email*

BORMAN

Please Note: The Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature:

Date: 14th SEPT. 2012

Ex H. (1)

8905

The Hon Bernard Borman-Schreiber von Ullersdorf

"Greenways", Brentwood, Leyburn
North Yorkshire DL8 5EP

Richmondshire Local Plan Core Strategy Proposed Submission
Public Representation by Bernard Borman-Schreiber Esq, Graf von Ullersdorf

Having looked at the submissions to the public of the Local Plan I would wish to observe the following and make it subject to a further Enquiry. My comments relate both to "legal compliance" and "soundness".

1 Brentwood

In the past there has been controversy about Brentwood being linked to Maythorne Estate which has caused a number of problems, ie speeding and parking, and although at a Public Enquiry conducted by H M Inspector Turner, and the Council agreeing in full to his report, his recommendations were not implemented. It raises the question "why hold Enquiries and produce a Local Plan when no-one takes any notice of it?" I therefore ask for the issue of Brentwood to be re-investigated.

2 Leyburn industrial area

The same argument applies to the industrial area to the southeast of Leyburn which borders residential areas, especially Leyburn Station Yard. It has been everybody's understanding that this area is for light engineering and storage only, yet we have heavy engineering there and even in the Conservation Area of the Station Building itself, we have strange goings-on in planning terms. The tree planting scheme which should have been completed some twelve years ago has not even been started.

3 Safeguarding Market Town image for the benefit of tourism

Given that the Planning Authority accepts that Leyburn plays an important part in the tourist industry and is adjacent to the National Park, there is an abundance of plastic banners and advertising clutter even in designated Conservation Areas. The Local Plan as presented for Leyburn is minimalistic and requires detailed clarification with regards to Brentwood, protection of Conservation Areas and the development of land for industrial and commercial use to the southeast of Leyburn. There are also parking issues which affect the well-being of the town and Leyburn Town Council has made it known that they are not engaging with the population about it; in fact they are going to do nothing at all. That is unacceptable because this unelected Town Council represents nobody except themselves.

4 Unneighbourly industry

The issue of HGVs coming through the town centre also needs to be looked at for there is no reason why this practice should continue. Traffic from the quarries can use the Tank Road and there is, in any event, no effective control over the pollution which the quarry in Leyburn causes and a wheelwash should be installed.

5 Leyburn Medical Practice

I would also wish to enquire about the impact of the, what I would call, illegal planning activities in relation to Leyburn Medical Practice. I would like to see it established that this must remain a

Medical Centre and must not be changed to retail or office use. In fact, whilst there is no planning permission for office use, we find that the Primary Care Trust operates an office from there. We also have retailing in terms of a chemist there. Whilst these facilities are welcomed, they have nonetheless been poorly thought out for the sake of the profit of a strange company, namely Trinity Medical Properties Ltd, without taking adequate account of the neighbourhood in terms of speeding, parking and general nuisance. It has recently been said by those "in the know" that Leyburn Medical Practice, because it is on a severely restricted site, would be better situated somewhere else, ie towards Bellerby.

6 Leyburn expansion

It would also be helpful, in the interests of the environment and the neighbourhood, if no more increase in cheap housing takes place around the railway station. Again, a hotel was changed into affordable housing, contrary to the Local Plan and low-quality housing was built at the petrol station. In any event the proposed addition of 365 houses in Leyburn is in the wrong place and would seriously change the nature of Leyburn as a typical Yorkshire market town, and the tourist industry. It would bring more traffic to the school in Wensleydale Avenue and to the Medical Centre and cause problems with an already problematic sewage system. In short, Leyburn requires an additional main sewer. We have been subject to blockage and flooding and there have been problems with the Brentwood pumping station.

7 Environmental issues

The Wensleydale Railway, whilst it might be an interesting arrangement for tourists, also creates a substantial nuisance. They should be asked to work in accordance with the railway regulations as far as whistle boards are concerned so that they do not blow the whistle when they feel like it, to the distress of some, and that they do not discharge their burnable rubbish through the steam train which causes a lot of black smoke and soot. Their diesel trains are equally not properly maintained. In addition there is provision given for the railway to be allowed to burn thousands of tons within the confines of Leyburn Town centre. Clearly this is a major industrial undertaking and there must be rules. There is also a substantial nuisance from the constant burning of industrial waste and bonfires (dioxins), slurry spreading to the south of Leyburn and the practice of sheep dipping with noxious fumes on the southern borders of the town.

8 Conclusion

Whilst I have raised these issues within the framework of public consultation, as per enclosed copy of my letter, I would like the Enquiry to take further account of my comments in that letter, as well as in this document. I would be willing to appear before H M Inspector for examination. I am equally concerned that delegated powers given to officers are being abused. These should not be used, in my view, for substantive matters but for minor planning issues only and I hope that the Council's policy can be examined and that the Council is given proper advice on this, and also that the legal standing of the Local Plan is properly explained as there is a general belief that the consultation's outcome and the Local Plan can be changed at will. Some wording is designed to produce flexible interpretation and better legal definitions are required as it will otherwise make the whole exercise of a Local Plan meaningless and subject to abuse.

Leyburn, 11 September 2012

Bernard Borman-Schreiber Esq, Graf von Ullersdorf

PS. I DID ASK FOR SPECIFIC DETAILS BUT RECEIVED NO REPLY (COMMUNITY OFFICE 4th SEPT 2012

8905

BDBSVU

Exh. 2

From: "LDF" <ldf@hambleton.gov.uk>
To: "'Bernard Borman'"
Sent: 09 November 2011 12:32
Subject: RE: Richmondshire Local Development Framework consultation Sept 2011

Dear Consultee,

Thank you for your comments on the **Richmondshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy Proposed Changes**.

All representations submitted will be considered during the production of the next version of the Plan, the Proposed Submission Core Strategy, which is due to be published for formal representations early next year. A Consultation Statement summarising comments received and our response will be presented to the Council and published alongside the Proposed Submission document.

It is not our intention to reply to individual respondents, but you will be notified when the Plan is next published.

Yours faithfully,

Planning Policy Team
Richmondshire District Council
Swale House
Frenchgate
Richmond
North Yorkshire
DL10 4JE
Tel: 01748 828760
Fax: 01748 825071
Email: ldf@richmondshire.gov.uk
Website: www.richmondshire.gov.uk
Please consider the environment – only print this email if absolutely necessary

working in partnership HAMBLETON DISTRICT COUNCIL RICHMONDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

From: Bernard Borman
Sent: 09 November 2011 10:33
To: ldf@richmondshire.gov.uk
Cc:
Leyburn Town Council
Subject: Richmondshire Local Development Framework consultation Sept 2011

B D Borman-Schreiber, Graf von Ullersdorf
"Greenways"
Brentwood
Leyburn
North Yorkshire DL8 5EP

Attn: Mr Graham Banks, Planning Policy Manager, Richmondshire DC

Dear Mr Banks

I refer to your letter 16 Sept 2011 and have studied your Consultation Paper and the Leyburn Paper. Please find below my observations on both.

Consultation Paper

General

Whilst I think that the documents you have produced are obviously very professional, I would like you to consider

1) that this Local Plan [LP] has legal consequences and must be a guide in the future planning process. I personally took part in the Public Enquiry under Inspector Turner in about 1997 at which the Inspector had clearly agreed with my argument and his findings were accepted by the Council and incorporated into the LP. When I discovered that the aspects of that LP were ignored I made representation again to the following Public Enquiry, about 2000, in Thornborough Hall, Leyburn. I wanted to express the evidence that the LP was not being followed. In conjunction with Harry Tabiner and the Planning Inspector, I was not allowed to make such representation, the reason for which is still unknown to me. I believe that the costly production of a LP should not just be an exercise to demonstrate that there had been a consultation but that the outcome should truly result in a planning system and policy which gives particular attention to the views of the consultees, ie, existing residents. I would like to draw specific attention to the words of Inspector Turner when he said that existing residents should not be in constant fear of arbitrary changes to their environment. He also paid attention to the danger of allowing exceptions as this could cause "leapfrogging". The main concern at the time was the development in Leyburn Station Yard where B2 was allowed because "one could still hear the birds sing in Brentwood". This was followed by two B2 enterprises and the construction of low cost housing (flats). One has to bear in mind that the area was designated around a Listed Building and next to a Conservation Area in a completely residential area. Further, the planning stipulation of landscaping, made some 20 years ago, has still not been either started or completed. All this happened under the planning chairmanship of Cllr Scott and Cllr Pat Middlemass who both had no understanding of the planning process and lacked the common courtesy to deal with representations by local residents. The new Local Development Framework must therefore be meaningful, especially since it is a legal document. I would draw attention to the excellent paper which Mr Brian Hodges wrote some years ago on the importance of the Local Plan in planning terms. The whole planning process is a quasi-judicial process and needs to take into account highway policies of NYCC such as no major access roads through residential areas. It has to considered that therefore the final document must be unambiguous, in plain English and not woolly. Whilst obviously the present document has been professionally put together, it also needs to be legally watertight as it will otherwise give rise to arguments about interpretation and misunderstandings. I would like to quote the following sentence as an example: Page 5 of the document, under 3c: "Do you agree with the rejection of no need for Core Strategy guidance to facilitate development? If not, why not?". If I am correct in what I think this may mean, I would respond that a Local Development Plan, ie, Core Strategy, is important to the existing inhabitants in order to protect their way of life and their substantial financial investment. This view was also expressed, as already quoted, by Inspector Turner. When one looks at Leyburn, one has to realise that the main economic element is tourism. Substantial monies are spent in food establishments, bed and breakfasts, Tennants Auction House and shops in general who would not thrive without tourism. The national advertising which Tennants are getting puts Leyburn firmly on the map. If one considers the tourism importance of Richmond and Hawes, Leyburn is clearly an important link in that concept. Its main attraction lies in the fact that it is a traditional Yorkshire Market Town which has most facilities and is not boring. There are road issues in Leyburn and a safety audit would be desirable, as well as adequate signposting on the motorway. The general appearance of the town round the Market Square is very important and should be substantially enhanced to reflect the importance of Leyburn in the promotion of tourism in the Yorkshire Dales. The constant straem of traffic, which appears to exceed 500 vehicles a day, from the quarries right through Leyburn town centre is undesirable. There should be no right turn arrangement from the quarry and a wheelwash is also long overdue. Railway Street has become a race track and the use of Brentwood as an inner ring road, ie, major access road, is undesirable and contrary to modern highway thinking. Again, Insp Turner said that there should be no more traffic loading onto Brentwood, yet we have seen the contrary taking place due to an expansion of the primary school, additional housing and the Medical Centre, as well as another Dental Surgery. Again, this needs to be brought up to date. We now have proposals which are mentioned for the site next to the Surgery to be used for residential development and the intentions are to put that traffic also into Brentwood whilst it could equally be directed across the railway crossing onto Harmby Road. There are further suggestions that additional housing around Maythorne Farm will also find its connection into Brentwood over the small beck at the bottom of Wensleydale Avenue. That too had been previously considered at a Public Enquiry but was rejected. If they want to develop that part of Leyburn, they have to build new roads which follow the principle of no major access roads through residential areas. There are speeding, parking and noise issues on Brentwood. Many of these problems arise when some joyriders find bumping over the humps, which are incidentally completely ineffective, fun. Mothers taking children to and from the primary school and preventing buses from turning in the space provided in front of the school because their "darlings" can't walk 50 feet to the main entrance, and to shift the problems of Maythorne council estate and the school on to the residents of Brentwood is clearly not fair or desirable. I have previously submitted to the Public Enquiry the views of a well-known and well-established Barrister on planning law, and a well-respected firm of solicitors view also on planning law, confirming that my view on

this subject conforms to the current national policy and the County policy of no major access roads through residential areas. We now find that coaches, buses and lorries also travel through Brentwood because there are no restrictions and because of the inadequate signposting people use Brentwood as a car park rather than using RDC's car park. This causes annoyance to the residents and loses income for the Council.

I will now comment on specific items within your document.

Brentwood

The whole issue of traffic requires some serious re-thinking, particularly since the existing speed limits are frequently severely broken in an area where there are young children, two nursing homes, one surgery and elderly residents.

1.1 It would not be in anybody's interests to put affordable housing into existing developments as this has already caused problems in Brentwood. There is a large site at the back of Leyburn Mart which is not used by the Mart which could be better used and would not have substantial impact on existing neighbourhoods.

1.2 There is a maxim in English law which says that if you make an agreement you cannot in that agreement agree to agree at a later stage. This paragraph seems to confront that very issue. What is the need for any development, who identifies what needs there are, and on what basis? The so-called ability to meet immediate needs should not be frustrated and is totally ambiguous and unlawful. It gives certain interested parties the opportunity to claim needs which are by definition subjective and if they can lobby sufficient Councillors to be on their side, the plans get approval contrary to the interests of the local people. That makes the effective control of local development framework meaningless. We already have an example of the steelwork activities in Leyburn Station Yard which is clearly B2, a classic case in point where Local Plans were overridden by Councillors who took into account issues which they should not have taken into account and ignored issues which they should have taken into account.

1.3 We need no encouragement in Leyburn for development as the success of this Market Town depends on it remaining so. There is plenty of space allocated for industrial and commercial development in Catterick and Colburn and there is not exactly a housing shortage in Leyburn either.

1.4 Again, who decides what is most appropriate? The Local Development Plan needs to be more specific.

1.5 This again is woolly and allows a weakening of the whole concept of a Local Development Framework.

1.6 This is important to Leyburn because the environmental impact has already been ignored for too long and no existing development is required other than by those who want to sell their land. This would support the idea that any new development should not cause disadvantage to existing residents and if need be infrastructure may require renewal and new roads need to be built to serve these areas.

2.1 This is a paragraph to agree to agree (see 1.2). The reference to an enhancement of the infrastructure has been ignored in the past, in particular foul drainage. We, at "Greenways", Brentwood, and "Willowside", and St Matthew's Terrace, have had substantial drainage problems over the years. On one occasion we at "Greenways" were flooded because some developments channelled their surface water into the foul drains which causes problems at the narrowing of the drain where the 9 inch drain is channelled down the railway embankment through an iron pipe with 90 degree bends, of half the capacity. There is clearly a need to have a new major drain going through parts of Leyburn before any more housing is constructed. We have had flooding problems of the foul sewer off the Bellerby Road, also at Dale Grove and at the bottom of Brentwood where there is a pump directing sewage into an already problematic sewer.

a. v. You are not likely to get much response on this one because the people of Leyburn are very apathetic and not known for their literary prowess.

b. i. This is an open cheque and needs to be more closely defined. It is important that Hipswell, Scotton, Colburn and Catterick are not linked to Leyburn. I cannot foresee that Leyburn ever will have the need to share provisions, services and facilities with those areas. Leyburn has a unique and separate identity. Special consideration should be given to the idea that developments in other areas does not have an adverse impact on Leyburn, such as supermarkets and similar market facilities as exist in Leyburn.

5.1 The "Leyburn area" needs to be more clearly defined as at the moment it is not clear to the uninitiated.

Since we are paying specific attention to town centres, I believe that the bus stops in Market Square, Leyburn, should be moved to a more convenient location. If need be, pedestrianise the area from High Street to Brentwood entirely and perhaps have bus stops there or in Commercial Square. There are inadequate facilities in Commercial Square for disabled people to do their shopping. The entrance to the Council car park next to the Golden Lion is dangerous because people come from a road traffic area right across a pedestrian foothpath, and meet more pedestrians coming back from the car park. Road humps would be appropriate. Better signposting of the dangers would also be helpful. I also believe that the parking in Market Square should be limited to one hour, and since Richmondshire are employing a ticket warden in thier car park, perhaps an arrangement could be made with Leyburn Town Council to include the Market Square. The lights in the Market Square may be effective but they are visually quite awful. It would be desirable if they had Victorian lantern types (as in Crakehall) right the way from the High Street to Brentwood. The ginnels in Leyburn town centre are of unacceptable standards and require professional resurfacing, and indeed better lighting. Whilst the trees planted in the Market Square have improved the environment of that area, there is still a need to improve the visual impact and the existing pump could be made into a more interesting feature in the Square. Tables and chairs outside some premises have become popular. That should be encouraged with appropriate and fitting furniture. There is no understanding and no facts are known about what is owned by the Town Council, the District or the Highways Authority and that requires urgent clarification. Since the Town's Squares are an important part of the district's commercial life, the funding of repairs to those road surfaces should be reconsidered because whilst the owners may be the Town Council, the areas are in fact used as a highway. The appearance of gaudy shop signs and gaudy plastic advertising banners should not be allowed as it is contrary to the interests of good town planning. A re-alignment of Moor Road and the junction with the High Street could create a safer environment as the current alignment prevents a clear view to the right and to the left. It could be considered that the mouth of Moor Road should be next to the Kings Head public house. If need be, this could be improved by traffic lights, taking into account Moor Road, Bellerby Road, the car park exit and the High Street.

Leyburn Paper

The increase of housing by 380 dwellings is far too high and would substantially change the nature of this traditional Market Town (Leyburn). The density is also too high. Leyburn is not short of employment opportunities and to seek an increase of the employment areas by ten hectares is far too ambitious and unnecessary. The land adjacent to Leybun Station has not been classified as industrial in the past and this should not be done now. See the report by Insp Turner. Access to the Primary School and Wensleydale School could be better achieved by upgrading Ford's Lane as both properties are adjacent to it. Some more pleasant footpaths to the east of Leyburn would be desirable. Whilst there is a footpath across Maythorne Farm, this area is invariably sprayed with slurry and that farm is an environmental nuisance because of this activity. There is no possibility of enlarging Leyburn based on the current infrastructure. When one compares the road safety arrangements in Richmond, one can safely say that the arrangements in Leyburn are minimal and inadequate. Since we have lost the services of many police officers and staff, it is essential to engineer problems out of the Highway arrangement. There desperately need to be some restrictions on Railway St and Harmby Road because hardly anyone observes the speed limit. Could we please have a weight restriction also on Brentwood? It is also important that any additional use adjacent to the Leyburn Business Park, and local people have specifically insisted on the use of the words business park rather than industrial park, good architecture should be used as this is effectively the entrance to the Dales. Tennants is one of the most important enterprises in the Town, if not the District. Tree planting and tree conservation are important to the visual impact on the town. The woods behind Thornborough Hall are an important inner town park area and maybe the Listed Folly there could be suitably repaired and could be used as an open air theatre, or some other tourist attraction such as a medieval market or other theme.

Conclusion

I have done by best to consider the wellbeing of Leyburn Town as a community and to safeguard the environment for local residents. I hope that my contribution will not follow the usual route into the filing system, confirming that "htank you for your communicatin which we will take into account". Consultations have to be meaningful and most positively be reflected in the final Plan. I am giving a copy of this document to my County Councillor, District Councillors and Leyburn Town Council in the hope that they too will engage with you. I would urge you to consider using clearer English so that it is unambiguous in this quasi-judicial process and readily understood by all concerned. You have a particularly good Councillor in Cllr Harris, who is English perfect. Perhaps he might be invited to look at the phraseology. Also, some legal advice could be obtained so that a conflict of law is avoided. Such safety precautions would prevent unnecessary arguments, work and correspondence, and complaints to the Ombudsman. I speak from experience.

Yours sincerely
B D Borman-Schreiber, Graf von Ullersdorf, F. Inst. D.

The information contained in this email is confidential. It is intended only for the stated addressee(s) and access to it by any other person is unauthorised. If you are not an addressee, you must not disclose, copy, circulate or in any other way use or rely on the information contained in this email. Such unauthorised use may be unlawful. If you have received this email in error, please inform the sender immediately and delete it and all copies from your system. Any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Hambleton District Council.

All e-mail traffic may be subject to recording and / or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Hambleton District Council, Civic Centre, Stone Cross, Northallerton, DL6 2UU.