



Spring Farm,
Bickley,
Langdale End,
Scarborough.
N. YORKS YO13 OLL
December 17th 2016

Dear Mrs.Saunders,

Once again I write to express my concern over the proposed airfield at Southmoor Farm, NYM/2016/0817/FL. I am at a loss to understand why , having been turned down six times, by the National Park, Forestry and almost the whole of the local community , Mr.Walker and his backers persist. Once again I state that I have no personal feelings against Mr.Walker, but his application contains a number of inconsistencies which continue to make me very suspicious about the whole development. Also I would like to make it clear that he has not provided us here with fast broadband.

The last appeal was turned down due to the Sandford Principle, on the grounds that the goshawk and nightjar nest in the area. Nothing has changed – those birds will be nesting and raising young during the spring and summer, the time when flying would be most likely to occur. A number of supporters of the application present airfields as havens for wildlife. So they might be in urban areas. But on the National Parks website one of the North York Moors National Parks's designated "special qualities" is it's "abundance of forest ancient trees and woodland that's rich in wildlife", no need to dodge the aircraft on the applicants airfield! Our wildlife is well catered for and the proposed development can only be detrimental. The Environment Act 1995 states that one statutory purpose of a National Park is to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage. The staff of NYMNP understand this and have repeatedly tried to uphold this aim. Why are they not supported in this? Should this application succeed I believe it would be the thin end of the wedge for almost any activity/business in any National Park.

Mr.Walker states that the airfield will be for his own aircraft and other aircraft privately owned by local residents! As it had to be patronisingly explained to us at the Appeal Meeting that "some people use aircraft like you use cars", I don't know who these 'locals' might be. If Mr.Walker wants an airstrip for his own plane alone, I would not object. But the letters of support come from around the country, from flyers who obviously expect this to be a commercial venture they will be able to take advantage of. Mr.Walker states that he will have to give permission for use of the airstrip, but gives no numbers, so it does not reassure.

The application states that previous Inspectors 'accepted' that there would be no noise issues. I'm sure they genuinely believed this but they have not experienced living and working here

and I beg to differ. The geography of this immediate area means that sound is amplified and I repeat that I am regularly able to hear cyclists talking on the opposite side of the valley and rutting deer can sound like dinosaurs calling. There is no possibility that noise from the airfield and flights would go unnoticed. Another of the NYMNP's stated "special qualities" states that ... "remoteness and tranquillity is also part and parcel of the park – it's a place for spiritual refreshment...and clear unpolluted air." (my underlining). The application cannot meet this aim. How can the concerns of those living here be of no consequence? Once again the NYMNP, knowing the area, have valiantly upheld this principle. Why is that not sufficient? Yes, we do have noisy car and motorcycle rallies once or twice a year, but their dates and routes are controlled and they are open for the general public to enjoy. The applicant's report also mentions the military aircraft which flies in the area – but this hardly supports the application and rather implies that we shouldn't be expected to endure more. Military aircraft are our defence, so are a completely different matter.

The applicant and supporters repeatedly state the benefit to tourism and the local economy. In fact the tourist industry in this area is already thriving and the forest busy with walkers and cyclists. Mr. Walker's B&B is the only place likely to benefit. The proposed business is naturally elitist due to the expense and will not benefit the local area, unless there are plans to seriously develop the site in the future. Do the flyers around the country realise that there is no public transport for miles around the proposed site? Is Mr. Walker also planning a private taxi service? The National Parks have a duty to "seek to foster the economic and social well being of the local communities within the national Park". The proposed site will not benefit the former and can only be detrimental to the latter.

I would also like to briefly remind that this is an area where many horse riders are about during the day. Despite supporters stories of horses who don't bat an eyelid at full throttle take-offs I'm afraid we don't have such 'bomb-proof' steeds and there is a risk to riders in the nearby forest and bridle path, especially with unscheduled movements.

Finally, having read some of the letters of objection it is clear that some members of the local community are suffering real distress over this unsuitable application. I wish Mr. Walker well with his private hobby, but if he really cares about the community he professes to belong to he will review his ideas and withdraw his application. Whatever happens, it has no place in a National Park.

Yours sincerely

Glynis & Kerry Ludkin

