

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: FAO Hilary Sanders NYM/2018/0094/FL
Date: 13 May 2018 07:45:04
Attachments: [9.5.2018 planning letter.odt](#)

Dear Hilary

Our research has uncovered some more evidence relating to our objection to NYM/2018/0094/FL. Unfortunately our internet has not been working for a week so we could'nt send it to you earlier. Would you be kind enough to consider it.

Regards

Victoria Allan

Dear Hilary

Further to our objection relating to planning application NYM/2018/0094/FL, we are contacting you to let you know that further research has uncovered additional evidence reinforcing our contention that the Nissen huts referred to by the applicant as justification for the choice of location for the development were not, in fact, a WW2 prison of war camp as stated on the first page of the planning application. This error is also repeated in the Forestry Commission amendment dated 17th April.

Page 18 of the "History of Allerston Forest" on the Forestry Commission's own online archive, [https://www.forestry.gov.uk/PDF/FCFH002.pdf/\\$FILE/FCFH002.pdf](https://www.forestry.gov.uk/PDF/FCFH002.pdf/$FILE/FCFH002.pdf) which was written in 1951 within 6 years of WW2 ending, and so is likely to be an accurate description of the situation, states

as Snainton and Ebberston. Small numbers also came from Scarborough.

During the war years the labour position was relieved to a great extent by the provision of prisoners of war, at first Italian and later German, billeted in Thornton Dale and transported by lorry. With their repatriation soon after the war, and the expansion of the forest programmes, labour shortages were apparent for some time, but the Forest Workers'

This clearly states that the prisoners of war working in the forest stayed in Thornton Dale.

The first statement on the planning application that the Nissen huts housed prisoners in the 1st and 2nd World Wars is, therefore, untrue. Despite having the opportunity to do so, the Forestry Commission have not corrected this error. They repeat the claim about WW2 in their amendment dated 17th April and only address the claim about WW1 obliquely by conceding that the Nissen huts were built in the 1930's without directly correcting the initial statement. In our view, this error, combined with other inaccuracies in the planning application, means that the planning application should be considered invalid, and not considered until the errors in the application are corrected in full.

Regards John and Victoria Allan