



The Planning  
Inspectorate

Room: 3N  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Bristol  
BS1 6PN

[www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate](http://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate)

Mrs Wendy Strangeway  
North York Moors National Park Authority  
Development Control Support Officer  
The Old Vicarage  
Bondgate  
Helmsley  
York  
YO62 5BP

Your Ref: NYM/2016/0349/FL  
Our Ref: APP/W9500/W/16/3166289

06 March 2017



Dear Mrs Strangeway,

**Town and Country Planning Act 1990**  
**Appeal by Malcolm & Pauline Armstrong**  
**Site Address: Rock Haven, Newlands Road, CLOUGHTON, Scarborough, North**  
**Yorkshire, YO13 0AR**

I enclose for your information a copy of the appellant's final comments on the above appeal(s). Normally, no further comments, from any party, will now be taken into consideration.

Yours sincerely,

*Charm McFarlane*  
Charm McFarlane

*Where applicable, you can use the internet to submit documents, to see information and to check the progress of cases through the Planning Portal. The address of our search page is - [www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/appeals/online/search](http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/appeals/online/search)*



Our Ref: 1446

21<sup>st</sup> February '17

Planning Inspectorate  
Room 3N  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
BRISTOL  
BS1 6BN



Dear Sirs

**Appeal by Malcolm and Pauline Armstrong against North York Moors National Park  
Decision ref: NYM/2016/0349/FL to refuse permission for the Proposed Change of Use of  
Existing Stables plus Alterations to form 2 No. Holiday Units, Rock Haven, Newlands  
Road, Cloughton, Scarborough YO13 0AR**

In response to the statement from the North York Moors Park Authority regarding the above appeal, I would like to make the following observation.

The conclusions outlined by the Planning Authority in part 6 of their statement state that the proposal has an adverse impact on the character of the area and that it is contrary to policy.

On two separate occasions, the planning department concluded that the proposal did meet the criteria that they are now saying that it doesn't and their recommendations for approval were overturned by the planning committee. Our contention is that the planning officers were correct in their original interpretation and that the committee were mistaken and that the decision should be overturned and the application approved.

Yours faithfully

ALAN CAMPBELL