
From: Graham Forster
Sent: 13 July 2020 09:40
To: Hilary Saunders
Cc: 'Gill Forster'
Subject: Council for British Archaeology- Letter dated 8th July 2020

Good Morning Hilary.

I have spent some time digesting the letter from the Council for British Archaeology and conclude that it contains a number of inaccuracies.

Gill and I offer the following which may be of assistance to you.

Unfortunately it appears that there has been little or no proper research into the subject, that it based upon information available on the NYMNPA website and information provided by "concerned member of the public". There is no evidence of site visit.

I propose only to address matters under the heading of "Significance".

1. We know that Brookfield was once a farm and that by the time that it came into the ownership of the Yeoman family, about 150 years ago, it had considerably reduced in size.
2. The Yeoman family first used it as a pig farm and then market gardens before becoming a domestic property partly used as a builders yard in connection with the business of Mr D R Yeoman. This ceased in October 2012.

3. During the Yeoman family period of ownership land has been sold off including:
 - i. The land on the south side up to Roxby Terrace.
 - ii. The former orchard upon which the three 1970's house fronting Roxby Road are built.
 - iii. The land, now 1 Brookfield Gardens.

The size and rectangular shape of subject piece of land is therefore a result of past land sales and development and is purely accidental.

- a. It follows that the land has no special historic significance in its own right. It is a residual piece of land that was once part of a much larger field.
- b. Brookfield was the farmhouse. Historically the pinfold belonged to the Lords Farmanby.
- c. The pinfold came into the possession of the Yeoman family by the route of adverse possession – unchallenged continuous usage over a long period of time. In January 2004 an application by the Yeoman family to register the title of the pinfold was granted by the Land Registry with Possessory Title. In May 2018 this was upgraded to Absolute Title.
Given these circumstances, it seems very unlikely that Brookfield was occupied by the Pinder (unless the Pinder and the farmer were for a period one and the same person) and the chance of this being so is no more than the likelihood that he was resident in any of the older properties in the immediate locality.
- d. We must also look at the use of the pinfold. The report correctly states that it would have been used to collect stray animals. These would of course have belonged to many different people. We know that access was by way of an opening on the north side with no opening onto the Brookfield land. Ed Freedman when Conservation officer researched this and discussed the matter with me in some depth in 2017 when we sought to carry out a limited restoration scheme with the support of NYMNP and Parish Council.
- e. The location of the pinfold adjacent to Brookfield is a historic accident and there is historically no connection between it and Brookfield other than physical proximity.

The comments made in the section "Comments" appear to mirror the submissions by the Cheryl Ward Consultancy. The arguments are already well rehearsed.

Regards

Graham

Briggate Barn
Briggate

Nesfield
Ilkley
LS29 0BS
UK

Tel:

Mobile: