

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Planning Application NYM/2021/0290/FL
Date: 12 August 2021 16:02:29

Dear Sir / Madam

I am writing to object to this planning application on the grounds that The Wheatsheaf Inn is a premium quality Public House, unique, a Community facility and should not be lost to residential development.

National and Local Planning Policy sets out to protect Community facilities from proposals that would result in their loss. This application potentially means the loss of a service facility which is outstanding, delivering exceptional quality food and drink.

The Wheatsheaf Inn has always been successful, always vibrant and as such surely must be a viable business at the premium end of the spectrum. It is a destination for people seeking fine food and drink locally and regionally, with many people travelling significant distances to enjoy good food and drink in this area of the National Park. It is without question exceptional.

Given its reputation, vibrance and premium quality, the fact that other pubs exist in Egton and Egton Bridge, is not a reason for the North York Moors National Park Authority to grant this planning application. The Authority must support key community services (and in this case, an exceptional one) as stated in the Local Plan.

The Wheatsheaf Inn is a destination of excellence and it should continue as such. This application must be refused.

Best Wishes

Oliver C Foster MRICS

Egton Estate
Egton Bridge
Whitby
YO21 1UY

www.egtonestate.co.uk
www.egtonevents.co.uk

From: planning@northyorkmoors.org.uk
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Comments on NYM/2021/0290/FL - Case Officer Mrs Hilary Saunders - Received from Mr Mulgrave Estate at Mulgrave Estate, Estate Office, Lythe, Whitby, YO21 3RJ
Date: 12 August 2021 13:50:19

Objection to NYM/2021/0290/FL

Alterations to and change of use of public house to form 2 no. principal residence dwellings with associated parking and amenity space

An objection is made to the above application on the grounds that The Wheatsheaf is a much valued and very popular local facility and should not be lost to residential development. The proposal is contrary to national and adopted local planning policy and should be refused.

1. National and Local Planning Policy seeks to protect community facilities from proposals that would result in their loss. This proposal results in the loss of the public house.

2. NYMNP Local Plan Policy - Strategic Policy L - indicates that development will not be permitted that would result in the loss of a community facility unless that facility is no longer suitable or viable and no longer needed. The Wheatsheaf is popular locally - it has been almost fully booked for the summer and has a reputation of never serving a bad meal. The information supporting the application places great weight on the fact that the loss of the Wheatsheaf is bearable because there are other public houses in the vicinity. However, this argument fails to address the viability and need arguments of the Wheatsheaf itself in comparison to the other facilities. Given its reputation it is likely that The Wheatsheaf is the most lucrative of the public houses in the village. The fact that other public houses exist is not a robust reason for the National Park to allow this facility to be lost.

3. A key objective of the adopted Local Plan - Objective 19 (which precedes Strategic Policy L) supports the provision and retention of key community facilities. This proposal is contrary to that key objective which goes to the heart of the plan.

4. Para 7.2 of the Local Plan which follows Strategic Policy L, includes pubs in its definition of Community Facilities

5. Para 7.3 of the Local Plan states:

"Once lost, such facilities are seldom regained. The conversion of community facilities to non-community uses such as residential can reduce the social cohesion and economic vitality of local communities, as well as causing additional disruption and inconvenience in terms of access to services. The Authority will therefore carry out its statutory duty to foster the economic and social well-being of local communities by setting out a clear policy that the loss of community facilities through change to an alternative planning use will, as a matter of principle, be resisted"

The proposal should therefore be refused on this basis.

3. The information supporting the application does not demonstrate that it is no longer suitable, no longer viable nor no longer needed. The Appendix contains marketing material only and does not provide robust justification around the viability or need tests at all. There is no detail on when the marketing took place, what enquiries came forward and how they were treated. This is not a facility that is no longer viable nor can it be demonstrated that it is no longer needed. The application fails to meet the tests set out by this policy. Whilst there is sympathy that the current owners would like to retire after a busy and successful career, the proposal is founded more on their desire to remain in their property rather than for the business to be sold on as a going concern. The proposal does not meet the policy tests as it has not been robustly demonstrated that the business is no longer viable or needed and therefore the proposal is contrary to policy and should be refused.

4. The supporting information refers to the 'public benefits' of the proposal which it argues come from the conservation led approach to the sympathetic conversion of the building to residential use. A public benefit using this argument is clearly a red herring and the supporting statement completely fails to address the 'loss of public benefit' that the loss of a public house through the conversion to private residential dwelling would cause, which is clearly greater than any benefit to conservation gained through residential conversion. The proposal should therefore be refused.

This proposal is contrary to Objective 19, Strategic Policy L, paragraph 7.2 and 7.3 of the Local Plan and fails the 'public benefit' test for the reasons outlined above. It does not constitute sustainable development as required by the NPPF and therefore should be refused.

Comments made by Mr Mulgrave Estate of Mulgrave Estate, Estate Office, Lythe, Whitby, YO21 3RJ

Comment Type is Strongly Object

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Cc:
Subject: COMMENT ON CURRENT PLANNING APPRICATION: NYM/2021/0290/FL
Date: 21 July 2021 16:13:23

David & Cathy Ward. Old Maltongate Farm, Maltongate, Thornton Dale, YO18 7SD

North York Moors National Park Authority, Planning Department The Old Vicarage,
Helmsley. For the Attention: Hillary Saunders

20 July 2021

Dear Madam

CURRENT PLANNING APPLICATION.

REF: NYM/2021/0290/FL : Alterations & change of use of public house to from 2 dwellings

At: The Wheatsheaf, Egton for Mr N. & Mrs E. Pulling

We note that the above application has been registered and we wish to add our strong support for the application. The supporting documentation prepared by Cheryl Ward (no relation!) for the application for the change of use of the Wheatsheaf Public House to become 2 dwellings is very comprehensive, dealing as it does with the planning policy aspects of the proposal with arguments which all seem very compelling – there are, after all, 3 other pubs in this small village.

Our additional supporting comments are based on the impact the running of the pub has had and is still having on the lives of the applicants and their family. The Pullings have been at the Wheatsheaf for over 20 years and during this time have developed and grown the business. Whilst, we are sure, there are many ways to run a country pub, the way the Pullings have done it has been totally immersive, wife in the kitchen, husband front of house – no respite, no holidays. This has been central to their reputation for friendly hospitality and good food – essential for the all-important repeat business which a country pub needs for year-round trade.

Nearing retirement age, worn out and with health issues becoming more a feature of the daily grind they put the business on the market in 2015 in an honest attempt to get their financial investment back from the business to enable them to fund their well-earned retirement. This plan to exit from the business as a thriving going concern has been active for over 5 years but has not been successful, despite employing several specialist agents and being prepared to take any realistic offer. There has been no interest in the sale of the business.

With options closing down they have reluctantly arrived at the current situation. Seeking a viable exit from the unenviable position they find themselves the sale of the premises as dwellings is there last hope. It may be that, with a planning approval for change of use to hand, the attraction of the sale of the Wheatsheaf as a going concern may be a more

appealing, lower risk, prospect for a prospective purchaser, but in any event the current situation the Pullings find themselves in has to change.

Please be sympathetic to this application.

Yours sincerely

David & Cathy Ward (brother-in-law and sister of Elaine Pulling)