



EAST RIDING

OF YORKSHIRE COUNCIL

County Hall Beverley East Riding of Yorkshire HU17 9BA Telephone 01482 887700
www.eastriding.gov.uk

Alan Menzies Director of Planning and Economic Regeneration

CARMEL EDWARDS

Your Ref:

Our Ref:

Enquiries to: John Lister
E-Mail: john.lister@eastriding.gov.uk

Telephone: 01482 395040

Date: 7 July 2011

Dear Carmel,

Examination of Bridlington Town Centre Area Action Plan PHM and Hearing dates

The Council has made a serious commitment to the regeneration of Bridlington, and a substantial amount of time and public money has been spent preparing and working towards submission of the AAP. As you will understand from the exploratory meeting, the regeneration issues are complex, and in order to ensure the most efficient use of examination time, and clear presentation of the rationale behind the AAP, the Council has considered it appropriate to retain Leading Counsel of some seniority.

Whilst I appreciate that Leading Counsel's attendance may not be required at the procedural Pre-Hearing Meeting, it is imperative to the Council that Leading Counsel attends the examination in public to represent the Authority. As I have previously advised, Mr Elvin is not available until after 28th November, as he has a three week case in Belfast in November. When Mr Elvin was first instructed, you had indicated that the examination may take place in September. It is considered unhelpful to insist upon the earlier date in November, when Mr Elvin has read into the matter and has already provided advice to the Council.

A delay of two weeks in the timetable in order to accommodate retained Counsel does not seem unacceptable, bearing in mind that the pre-hearing meeting is proposed to be moved back a further two weeks due to the Inspector's vacation in August in any event. If this were a s. 78 inquiry, we would have been allowed to refuse the first offer of a date and we are able to accommodate the inquiry only a short period of time after the revised dates suggested by the Inspector. Unless a date can be agreed to accommodate retained Counsel, then further public money will have to be expended in briefing alternative Counsel simply in order to advance a hearing by two weeks. We suggest that to refuse a later date for the Examination would be disproportionate in the circumstances and we ask the Inspector to accept the date we suggest for the examination.

Yours sincerely,

John Lister
Head of Bridlington Renaissance

