



Rudby Parish Neighbourhood Plan Event – Site Presentation by Developers

24th September 2017, Q&A Session

Chair – Allan Mortimer (AM) Chair of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Tim-Keeping – Rosie Danjoux, Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Minutes taken by Katie Atkinson, KVA Planning Consultancy

Attendance: Approx 60.

AM introduced the meeting and welcomed the community to the Village Hall on behalf of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.

The aim of this specific event was to enable people with an interest in particular sites that were put forward through the Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plan (developer's/ land owners/ agents) to become involved in the process, address the community regarding their particular land interest, and facilitate an organised question and answer session between members of the community and the interested parties.

It is important to note that having invited several developers to the event, for a variety of reasons, these were the only representatives willing and available to present to the community today. This does not give them more weight in the site selection process over those representatives unable to attend the event.

Two initial questions were put to the Chair prior to the start of the presentations:

Q: Why are there two sites being discussed today when they are not a Preferred Option in the emerging HDC Local Plan?

A: This is covered in my introductory presentation (see website) however, the NP can allocate different sites or above and beyond housing allocations put forward in the plan, therefore it is important for us to look and assess all options for the community as part of the NP process.

Q: What is a mixed housing development?

A: A combination of affordable/market priced homes and sizes including number of beds etc to suit particular housing needs.

The following sections highlight the Q&A sessions held after each presentation



1. Andrew Moss, Planner from Ward Hadaway, representing Sarah Webster. Sites between Langbaugh Road and Paddocks End

Introduced the site as effectively blank canvas – happy to develop all or part of the site(s) and would offer whatever the community wanted in terms of a site to the south and / or a site to the north or a comprehensive development of the whole site over time.

Q: Have traffic surveys on Langbaugh Rd been done, if so, what do these show – what about during school travel times?

A: Yes, and were found to be acceptable in principle to NYCC Highways Department, meaning that there would be sufficient capacity for an increased number of cars.

Q: If the site was linked to the Broadacres development at Paddocks End – would there be a footpath/cycleway available for children to utilise on way to/from school etc.?

A: Not looked at this yet, but don't see why not. Access to school should certainly be a consideration – it was looked at during Garbutts Rd site preparation application. Client is landowner of all sites so should be feasible.

Q: At a meeting with NYCC some time ago, the community were told that any development of that site could not come through Langbaugh Road – would only be allowed via Broadacres.

A: No response.

Q: Looking at the gradient of the site – if you were to use top end of field this would result in an insult to the eye. There has been a range of housing built to date within the village and all development has maintained character of village and been hidden through landscaping etc. even though there are larger developments etc. so it still feels like a village. This site would not allow this due to the gradient – how do you propose to manage this and how will council view this?

A: Agree that approaching Garbutt's Lane from the west is limited screening and view is the urban edge. A development would be seen against this urban backdrop, the skyline would not be breached. We would need to take in to account design and materials would need to be considered to ensure it fits in sympathetically. Not necessarily looking at use of whole site - potentially just the southern (flat) and northern areas of the site may be developed –which would be hidden by Broadacres development.

Q: Historic hedging is 2m and has been chopped down so is not constant – screening will not hide development.

A: Accept that there will be a visual impact associated with every development anywhere.

Q: Maximum site size the community has requested is looking at approx. 25 houses – have you considered phasing at all?



A: Land put forward as a blank canvas – can be developed in any way. If a site was put forward for 25 dwellings it would take up to 2 years to develop – if bigger could be phased via condition. No constraint at this stage if village wants to build out slowly.

Q: In developing NP thus far we have identified issues of concern for the community – have you looked at flooding/ wildlife studies etc.?

A: number of studies have been undertaken – looking at traffic and flooding in the area – looked at site to north of Garbutts Rd at time of (2010) Allocation Doc. At planning application stage there will be a plethora of reports to be submitted which will be addressed at that stage and subsequent relevant conditions.

Q: You are the representative of the landowner – are there any agreements with developers at this stage or purely a land promotion?

A: Solely land promotion at this stage. There has been discussion with Broadacres regarding access to site and they have confirmed that they would allow access to the site.

Q: Am I correct in thinking that you could develop one site with say 20-40 houses, however, there could potentially then be other applications for houses submitted and developed around that site within the larger area owned by same land owner – taking it well above 70 houses?

A: Yes, but by creating the NP you are doing the right thing. It will set out parameters for plan period which would constrain development during that time period. Once beyond that period there may be more housing but plan could be renewed before then preventing this if that is the decision taken.

Q: Once land is agreed to be developed – will we have say who the developer is?

A: My client has had approach from a certain developer and she has refused them, there is however developer interest.

AM – the NP can have influence over some things but not others. We can choose a site with a developer attached which may deliver some certainty. However, if we chose a site being promoted with no developer attached we cannot guarantee who the developer will be – we can say how it should be developed i.e. design styles etc.

Q: 70 houses in NP but for what period?

AM – up to 2035.



2. Mark Barlow, Logic Architects on behalf of Armstrong Richardson. 'Gardenstones Site' only presenting on plot 009

Mark introduced himself stating he was the architect behind Broadacres Paddocks End development and was asked to get involved again at this site [by Armstrong Richardson].

Q: Is 2/3 bed housing affordable?

A: Whatever housing need is we would respond to that and provide what is needed. Not a typical developer but local landowner so driven to deliver the best scheme for the area

Q: The site floods at the moment so what would happen if it rains?

A: The site is not in an official Floodzone – but runoff would go to rest of field away from housing.

Q: What are the access arrangements for the site?

A: When we spoke to NYCC, the Highways engineer preferred access to be via Belbrough Lane although we have shown 2 possibilities on the sketch (*see website*) but we would favour one that highways preferred.

Q: You mentioned the possibility of traffic calming measures in your presentation - what do you mean by traffic calming?

A: Anything that would work best for the community – speed bumps / chicane etc.

Q: When we have spoken to NYCC, they do not want to do anything re calming – the Officer at NYCC does not want to do anything as they have to maintain it and implement it etc.

A: NYCC Highways Officer told us he would support calming – therefore the owner can support it

Q: But you only have control of what happens inside the site rather than the linking road?

A: Yes but boundary would be including the road so could put calming in at our expense (via condition / s106 etc).

Q: Explain bungalows – could they be extended?

A: They would be single storey - if an owner wanted to extend upwards and they wanted to put a dormer in this would be a separate planning application for a later stage and would be up to the owner.

Q: Who is in charge of site – who will determine what goes in to planning application?

A: Armstrong Richardson (AR) owns site, architect and builders are also involved – AR would obtain permission with a design – a developer/builder would then develop it – would need to find someone – no one, as yet, been in serious discussions – brief discussion with Broadacres.



Q: With NP one possibility is that sites come with a site design brief which address the site design.

A: *Yes I would agree a design brief in policy of NP on your preferred sites would give you more control.*

Q: why has area not been ploughed this year?

A: *No idea!*

Q: Disabled person would need own transport to get to the shop it would be too far to walk.

A: *All we can do with this fact is position bungalows as close as possible to the top of the hill so people can walk along path to village if they want to.*

Q: You said there was no discussion today regarding site number 010 – are AR withdrawing site from development?

A: *Draft neighbourhood plan brief was to allocate a site for 20 units – no sense to submit anything further.*

POST MEETING NOTE: Clarification on this point was requested after the meeting by AM. The response was:

“Armstrong Richardson wish both sites to continue to be considered as potential housing sites in the Neighbourhood Plan.

I concentrated my presentation on site S/073/009 in response to the reference in the site selection criteria to identify a variety of sites that could provide circa 20 units. Obviously if this site was supported but it was stipulated that the density must be low (to maintain views between units for example) then it is possible that more land would be required beyond the boundary of site S/073/009.”

Q: Use of bungalows to lessen visual impact, they'll be half size?

A: *Yes, a bungalow would be single storey plus roof (2 storey plus roof is what I meant by a house). There will be no 3 storey town houses*

Q: Access to school is important. I would find it difficult to walk this distance from this site to the new SPAR and I can't drive. Don't think it falls into good criteria for disabled/old people housing.

A: *AR own this land so will propose both housing for disabled and elderly as you purport to need both but you could accept site without having old peoples housing on it.*



3. Aiden Hamilton, Duchy Homes and Dominic Smith, Lichfields - land west of Rudby Bank

Community consultation took place last summer and this site was allocated as a Preferred Option for the emerging HDC Local Plan. To clarify, the site in question is the land north of existing hedgerow – not area to the south – option to improve ecological benefits/footpaths and connections etc. The proposal is for 24 bungalows – mix of 1 storey and dormer. Accessed from Rudby Bank – near the existing bus stop and the access meets NYCC design standards in terms of suitable widths/gradients.

Assessed scheme against NP preferences believe it fits to all 5 criteria. Happy to provide affordable housing on site. A benefit of this site is that it is a developer-led scheme which ensures clarity of what will be delivered.

Q: Have you increased the public access on land to the south of the site? I believe it is already open

A: There are defined routes across site – people should not be deviating from those as it is private land. However, if selected the site could be for informal play space for kick-a-bouts etc.

Q: How will the access fit between the 2 existing houses?

A: We have created an engineering option layout drawing which shows it is possible to fit between the two dwellings, the owner of site will live in one of the existing dwellings.

Q: My garage fits into the splay – will you need to reduce my garage?

A: This is not necessary – access will be created as a double width road and footpaths. There is a design solution so can share this with you.

Q: Where will bus stop move to?

A: To the south of the existing stop. NYCC have already agreed some of this – will send items regarding this for public viewing.

Q: Have any other access options been discussed for site access?

A: There is some flexibility there to move along the frontage but as the design solution works we haven't had to do that.

Q: Would there be definitely be dormer bungalows on your site? Views from existing dwellings would be restricted.

A: We will be required to incorporate official stand-off distances into the scheme – meaning all new dwellings will have to be at least 21m from existing elevations – however, we would be providing generous plots so would be well over distance needed to help prevent this.

Q: People wanted this to be green space in the NP – why have you ignored it?

A: The Council rejected the site as a designated green space therefore we believe it is the best fit for new housings for the village and company.



Q: Existing traffic is a nightmare along the site. Will take too long for families to walk into town or to school. My neighbour took 1.5hrs to walk from there to new SPAR and back etc. Survey equipment was put up in advance but only undertaken when school not in operation.

A: *Can assure you that surveys were undertaken at the correct time and would be verified by NYCC.*

[This response was challenged by several members of the audience]

Q: Would you put traffic calming measures in place?

A: *Council will only let you put in place what they want on the road as they own it and maintain it – but happy to put in place whatever was needed providing that they would accept it.*

Q: Local Green Space Designation. What is your view on land to the south side of site – would it be supported on that site?

A: *We are not promoting land at that side, therefore, if you want something written into NP from day one to make this happen we would be happy to sign up to the anything to say it will be never be developed.*

Q: What is a bungalow, who are the 2 beds aimed at?

A: *Perception is that they will be for the elderly but anyone can have them.*

Q: I am appalled with your presentation – 2 years ago we said that access/egress was unsafe, no additional work has been done, the access you propose will cut across my garage – no attempt has been made to show a different option. Little thought to alternatives. Barn Owls have been lost from the site – the owner of the site only cuts grass now and sheep grazing land lost.

A: *We have done a substantial amount of work in the past – this is still the same site which has not changed, therefore, we believe it will work which is why we have brought the same presentation. The Council have worked with us and believe we will have a viable site.*

Q: How long will development take?

A: *Between 18-20 months. Would be a construction management plan – would manage traffic the same as any other development.*

Q: How can you go ahead with this proposal when Secretary Of State says nothing should be developed on this site?

A: *The political arena has changed and HDC needs housing to go somewhere.*

Q: Topography and land has not changed.

A: *We can only collate information and submit it with collaboration of the LPA – if it works we get Planning permission, if not then we don't*

Q: NP are looking at 70 houses over 20 years – don't believe what you are doing is matching timescale of NP.



A: Likely that a site would be developed out in 24 months due to size of site – could phase sites over period of plan within the NP.



4. James Crickmore – Cleveland Hillview Park – allow mobile homes to be used for permanent residential use.

People want to live here on a full-time basis. Site is used all year round by visitors, but limited by planning condition stating holiday use only. Could be an option here instead to allow a change of use to residential lodges (Mobile homes are delivered to site and bricked around. Similar to modular homes which has government backing in housing which are manufactured in factories, and also delivered to site and put together on concrete bases).

Q: Is there a covenant on land restricting use to over 55years?

A: *No it's just what we cater for.*

Q: What is the current constraint?

A: *Can only be used for holiday homes –people must have another permanent address. Open 365 days of the year.*

Q: Has this been rejected by HDC?

A: *Not yet. It's been a live planning application since April.*

Q: Does this offer a route to partner with Housing Association?

A: *If council want to use some housing as local needs they could but we have never been asked. If a footpath was requested – we would put one in so no expense to village or council. No path coming in from Swainby either.*

Q: Community may have concern re distance from site to village?

A: *Yes, but all sites are remote and everyone has access to cars to access shops etc. If remains as holiday homes will still be same number of cars.*

Q: If this was permitted would it come out of the need for 70 homes to be allocated within the NP?

KVA: *No, this would be considered windfall as it is a live planning application. If it was withdrawn and resubmitted only as a site option then it might be.*

AM: Closed the meeting at 4pm offering thanks to all site agents and guests from individual sites stating if no landowner put their sites into the pot we would find it difficult to deliver 70 homes in the area and then we would have something forced upon us by HDC.