

Mrs Caroline Lacey  
Chief Executive Officer  
East Riding of Yorkshire Council  
County Hall  
Beverley HU17 9BA

Dear Mrs Lacey

**17/00106/STPLF | Pocklington Flood Alleviation Scheme (PFAS). Land East Of Fairview The Mile Pocklington**

**17/00723/STPLF | Erection of 207 dwellings Land North and East Of 34 The Mile Pocklington East Riding Of Yorkshire YO42 2HG**

I write to you as CEO of East Riding Council as an official about the above apparently flawed and suspicious nature of approval of planning applications for the Pocklington Flood Alleviation Scheme (PFAS) and associated Housing Application for 207 Houses to the North of Pocklington and to the East of the mile.

I wish to make an official complaint and also raise grave concerns in respect of apparent actions by some Councillors and council staff and possible external influences, under your Whistle Blowing Policy.

I also feel these grave concerns should be referred to the Standards and Audit Committees and bring them in to the public domain.

Within the above, Applications seem to have been approved in complete disregard of all of the many evidence based objections made on the majority of aspects not least on scientific, Health and Safety, inappropriate location of development, not fitting in with existing housing stock adjacent and in Pocklington, socio economic factors, scientifically flawed (e.g. ecological assessment) and on other evidence based grounds.

The granting of approval for housing I understand is contrary to EA (Environment Agency) National Planning Policy Framework where development is to be located away from flood risk wherever possible

Up to and all through the Allocations period (staring some 6 or 7 years ago, there was an unrelenting eagerness and push for the development North and East of The Mile with some apparently unusual decisions made (e.g. down grading of the quality of POC C land, ERYC

Planning Department almost doubling the size of POC C (without consultation) and other suspicious activities.

After concern was raised over the run off from a development upstream of the town, a woefully inadequate pond was proposed. In the end through a large and I believe flawed identification of Critical Control Points through a HACCP (Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points) type scheme. the so called Pocklington Flood Alleviation Scheme (PFAS) was conceived.

The PFAS has been described as a “White Elephant “ and a poor use of Direct Costs (not including administration, overheads etc,) approaching £2.1m of public money plus an inducement of nearly £4m from the developer towards this and in “mitigation” of high density housing, not meeting ERYC own Planning Strategy and lack of on-site recreational area.

The PFAS does not do away with the need for a culvert system through Pocklington both above and under the town. No upgrading or maintenance work is planned for the culvert and it is said that maintenance is the responsibility of Riparian Owners even when it runs under a property such as commercial premises in Pocklington.

The nearly £2.1m of Direct public money could go a long way in improving the culvert system to take the Beck safely through the town. At present it is said in its present state to be able to withstand a 1 in 70 year event (the same as the PFAS) but with extra funding that could have been much improved upon rather than have a dangerous “white Elephant” upstream also claimed to be able to withstand a 1 in 70 year event

The unexplained drive for the new housing north of Pocklington, where residents will have to drive through town to reach the major travel routes, has resulted in a White Elephant in the PFAS. The tail has wagged the dog!

The PFAS scheme was approved first which then appears to have now reversed the process and pressure to approve the housing development (The tail has wagged the dog again but the other way round) as I will explain below with some instances of an apparently suspicious nature.

In August 2017 well before the Planning Application meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> October 2017, Persimmons Homes were advertising on their website houses for sale in POCC.

At that Planning Meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> October 2017, the so called PFAS was passed but the Housing Application for 197 houses (which initially was 160) was refused. Usually in such circumstances the developer would have later put in an appeal if they wanted to contest the decision or make a revised application.

Councillor Phyllis Pollard was the Chair of this meeting (please note for later) and instead of the application being refused, she deferred it. This seems to be **very significant** and to some

may seem suspicious as it is apparently easier for the developer to work with ERYC to ease a revision through this way rather than by an appeal.

For example, in a similar case not long before the said Persimmons Homes Planning Meeting, a Planning Application made for development opposite the Linden Homes development on the Balk was refused and the developer needed to appeal which as it happens, was dismissed.

The deferral of the Persimmons Homes planning application deferred on 5<sup>th</sup> October 2017 initially had until 21<sup>st</sup> November 2017 to address the reasons why it was refused but it was deferred many more times with new deadlines (almost monthly) after being approved at the Planning Application Meeting on Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> November 2017.

This meeting on 16<sup>th</sup> November seems to have been called in haste to meet the 21<sup>st</sup> November 2017 deadline. However, the process was no where near complete at this stage as there were numerous subsequent deferrals and it was not finally approved until 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2018. By this time, the number of houses had risen to 207 where it had first been 160 in the allocations document, then 197 and now 207,

The morning of the Planning meeting on Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> November 2017 where the application was approved, there was a full front page spread in the Pocklington Post published in the morning saying that it was highly likely the Persimmon Homes' Planning Application would be approved in the meeting which was on the same day but in the afternoon.

How did that information reach the Pocklington Post in time for Copy to be ready for publication on the day of the Planning Meeting? Was there any collusion to get the application passed?

Why were the Pocklington Ward Councillors (Councillors Mole and West) not having voting rights in the committee that day?

Comments were invited for the application meeting on Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> November 2017 but there was a very short dead line of perhaps only about a week. I know of some comments that were submitted before the deadline that was very close to the meeting (perhaps only a day) were not on the website and it was clear councillors and others on the committee had not read them all (physical impossibility). In addition, the summary / interpretation of the comments at the meeting that hastily, often incoherently read / mumbled out by the clerk was not complete.

In the Planning Application documents, it is incorrect when it states that only one property (34 The Mile) is said to be associated with the application. There are about 14 houses in Mile End

Park directly backing on to the proposed development site (approaching 50 in the whole of Mile End Park) and also many more in Dennison Road that are potentially affected along with properties in Algarth.

Councillor Phyllis Pollard was the Chair of the Persimmons Homes meeting (as mentioned above) and she appears to be implicated in 3 other allegedly similar dubious decisions which seems to be a coincidence. This is claimed by Peter Robinson in a letter to the Mrs Caroline Lacey Chief Executive Officer dated 29<sup>th</sup> March 2018 that *“Councillor Phyllis Pollard who provided the answer, you will remember how hurt and upset Councillor Parnaby was during his Standards Committee hearing because I had linked her to his dodgy planning schemes by pointing out that whenever she used her Chairman`s vote to swing a planning decision it was for one of Parnaby`s friends”*

When Councillor Pollard deferred the Persimmons Homes application rather than allowing it to be refused, in one of my submissions I objected to that on the grounds that it removed the application from complete public scrutiny but these comments were ignored as they were not put on the website prior to (and I still do not see them) meeting, they were not read out in the Planning meeting of Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> November 2017 and I did not receive a reply to the comments.

In addition to the above concerns, the final approval decision flies in the face of ERYC own planning strategy and their appraisal in response to the last Persimmon application. Please see “Consultation response” to Development Manager from Housing Strategy and Development from Anthony Devey and Shane Gilmer, dated 6<sup>th</sup> November 2017. In addition there were also objections from Pocklington Town Council

All through the Allocations period and application stage, objections were raised but they were completely disregarded, unusual decision made (e.g. down grading of he POC land) and ERYC Planning Department almost doubling the size of POC C).

It is not good enough that there should be such apparently suspicious circumstances. It is not enough for our Council to just behave correctly, if that is the case, but they must also be seen to be and I have raised this point before in correspondence with ERYC.

At this stage I also think it would be appropriate for all Councillors and staff involved in these planning applications to be asked if they have registered / received hospitality (e.g. the celebrated garden parties) from the landowner.

**There appears to be grounds of doubt and concern about the whole process. There appears to be a list of unusual and suspicious events not least the perception (rightly or wrongly) amongst many of an unhealthy relationship between public and private interests.**

**It is for this reason that the planning process and decisions made appear to be in doubt and not safe.**

**I urgently request this is investigated, along the apparently parallel concerns that Peter Robinson raised (in a letter to the Mrs Caroline Lacey Chief Executive Officer dated 29<sup>th</sup> March 2018) with the utmost urgency.**

**During this time until a safe conclusion is reached, development of the POC C and PFAS sites should be halted.**

Yours sincerely

John Banks

Signed copy in the post

Cc Sir Greg Knight, Open, Councillor Strangeway by email

---

**BELOW IS A COPY OF PETER ROBINSON'S LETTER FOR EASE OF REFERENCE**

Peter Robinson  
16 Hornbeam Drive  
Cottingham  
HU16 4RU  
peter@snuffmill2.karoo.co.uk  
Tel 01482 848281  
Thursday 29th March 2018

Mrs Caroline Lacey  
Chief Executive Officer  
East Riding of Yorkshire Council  
County Hall  
Beverley

Dear Mrs Lacey

Earlier this week I wrote about the Bridlington Belvedere Golf Club scandal involving the Leader of the Council Councillor Stephen Parnaby and his friend and your deputy Alan Menzies.

At that time of writing some of the parts of the puzzle had not been in position and gaps were still missing from the picture. Like all good puzzles we had all the pieces but didn't yet know it,

fortunately it was that "Nice Lady" Councillor Phyllis Pollard who provided the answer, you will remember how hurt and upset Councillor Parnaby was during his Standards Committee hearing because I had linked her to his dodgy planning schemes by pointing out that whenever she used her Chairman's vote to swing a planning decision it was for one of Parnaby's friends. With Angus Young's recent comment in the Hull Daily Mail stating that Phyllis had used her casting vote again at the Belvedere planning meeting alarm bells started ringing.

On the last two occasions when I have written to you about Phyllis Pollard using her casting vote to push through Parnaby's dodgy planning deals it involved the supermarket site in Cottingham and the Kilnwick Percy Golf Club, both for the same applicants and friends of Councillor

Parnaby. On further checking the records at Companies House I was surprised to find that the other directors at Kilnwick Percy Golf Club are none other than Kurt James Nicholas Bousfield and Robert James Nelson Bousfield both of the company Ashcourt.

Ashcourt as you will be aware is the preferred developer and the only bidder for the hugely valuable site at the council owned Belvedere Golf Club at a bargain basement price as proposed by Councillor Parnaby. Apart from the Bousfield Ashcourt Parnaby link another can be found with the Bridlington address of a Bousfield company and the Belvedere Golf Club's accountant David Dowson.

In conclusion I feel you now have no choice but to follow the advice and request of others including Councillor Strangeway and report this matter to the Police.

Yours sincerely  
Peter