



Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting #19

3rd April 2018, Chapel Schoolroom, Hutton Rudby

1. Attendance & Apologies

Attending: Allan Mortimer (Chair), Karen Consterdine, Adrian Davey, Liam Percy, Richard Readman, Derek Simpson
Katie Atkinson (KVA)

11 members of the public

Apologies: Mike Fenwick, Emma Foden, Bridget Fortune, Tom Pickering

2. Procedural Issues

The Chairman advised that the order of items would be varied from the published Agenda so that all other business would be dealt with before discussing the results of the recent consultation events.

1. Minutes Of 5th March 2018

The draft minutes of 5th March had stated that a resident had read out an email. The resident said that he had not read out his email, and that the minutes were incorrect to say that he had done so. The same resident expressed an opinion the minutes had lots of errors, and said he would have fired his secretary if she had produced them.

The Chairman responded that the resident had sent an email raising the same points, in the same order using virtually identical language as he used in the meeting, and as the resident had appeared to be referring to a sheet of paper while doing so, the Chairman had assumed that he was reading out his email. Derek Simpson said that he recalled the email being mentioned and had also been under the impression that it had been read out.

Another member of the public asked if the objector to the minutes had any other specific points. The only specific issue that the resident identified was that he said he had not read out his email.

The Chairman asked if anyone agreed with the resident's opinion of the minutes. No-one did. The minutes were accepted, but it was agreed to make note of the resident's objection.

2. Actions from Previous Meetings

i) Website Bio / Photo

Photographs and personal statements for some SG members are needed for the website.

Action: Emma, Mike, Tom – provide statements & photographs

Action: Allan – update website.

Actions outstanding.

ii) Questionnaire Schedule of Responses

The schedule of responses to the 2016 questionnaire should be reviewed to identify any outstanding actions. To be progressed in parallel with consultation responses.

Action ongoing.

iii) TOR Drafting of Proposed Changes

Draft has been submitted to RPC, and it has been forwarded to YLCA for review. Comments from RPC/YLCA are still awaited.

iv) Road Safety Audit

The suggestion made at the last Steering Group meeting had been discussed at the subsequent RPC meeting. It had been agreed that as any such audit would involve issues outside the NP scope it was more appropriate for the Parish Council to take the lead.

A resident asked whether an audit would take place. The Chairman advised that there had been some discussion on the issue at the meeting with HDC, and Derek Simpson confirmed that HDC had contacted NYCC. The Chairman said it would be for the Parish Council to decide whether and how to take this forward.

3. Meeting With HDC Officers (21st March 2018)

The Chairman reported on the meeting between HDC Planning Policy Team and representatives of the Parish Council and Steering Group.

Attendees were:

- James Campbell HDC Planning Policy Manager (appointed approx. 1 month ago)
- Hannah Langler HDC Planning Policy officer
- Bridget Fortune HDC Councillor & SG Member
- Mark Jones RPC Chairman
- Steve Cosgrove RPC Vice Chairman
- Ann Pyle RPC Clerk
- Allan Mortimer SG Chairman
- Derek Simpson SG Member
- Katie Atkinson KVA Planning Consultancy

The meeting was requested by HDC who had proposed the following agenda:

1. Discuss conformity of the Neighbourhood Plan with the Local Plan / LDF
2. To provide an update on the Local Plan timetable
3. Update on Neighbourhood Plan and its timetable, timing of any draft and check of draft for basic conditions.
4. Understanding of site selection process.

At the meeting it was confirmed that the intention was to achieve conformity with the emerging Local Plan, and information was exchanged on respective timetables. The "Publication Version" of the Local Plan is expected to be submitted for HDC cabinet approval in early June. There may be changes (reductions?) in district wide housing numbers, but HDC were not able to give any specific guidance on district numbers or how they might flow through to the Parish.

The major issue arising out of the meeting was that the SG and RPC representatives were given the impression that HDC intended to allocate sites for the Parish through the Local Plan rather than leave this for the community to decide through the Neighbourhood Plan. Consequently there was no discussion on the site selection process. Concern was expressed by the parish representatives that this was not what the community envisaged or wanted. HDC did not identify the site(s) that they were considering allocating.

Subsequent to the meeting with HDC, a joint meeting of RPC and the SG was called to brief all other RPC councillors and SG members on the meeting with HDC. It was agreed to send a letter setting out our concerns to HDC's chief executive requesting an urgent response (Appendix 1). An acknowledgement had been received from HDC with a full reply promised within 7 days.

Post Meeting Note: HDC's full reply was received the day after the Steering Group meeting (Attached as Appendix 2 for information).

A resident asked if HDC's reason for wanting to choose sites was because of complaints about the NP site selection process.

The Chairman advised that HDC did not give any reasons, and other than on timetable did not give specific answers to most questions. KVA said that site selection was not discussed at all.

A resident asked how the SG could progress the Neighbourhood Plan without having firm housing numbers.

The Chairman responded that we are working to the target of 70 homes previously agreed with HDC. If/when this changes we will make adjustments as appropriate. It would be speculative to make any assumption on whether, or by how much the number might increase or decrease.

A resident said that he had attended the public meeting at which John Howell M.P. and Rishi Sunak M.P. had spoken. There was a clear message from that meeting that HDC should decide how many homes there should be, but the NP should decide where they go. He asked whether we should we get these politicians involved again?

The Chairman said that this had been discussed at the RPC/SG meeting, where the view was taken that HDC should be given a chance to respond before escalating, but that residents could make their own choices.

A resident asked if HDC were taking a similar stance with other Neighbourhood Plan Groups.

The Chairman replied that as far as he was aware we were the only Neighbourhood Plan Group in Hambleton actively progressing at the moment. Some have abandoned entirely, and the others seemed to have put their work on hold for some time.

A resident asked if HDC are wanting to choose sites because some people have questioned the SG and are pouring fire on the NP and are trying to sway HDC.

The Chairman said he did not want to speculate as HDC did not give their reasons. HDC did say that they cannot comment at this stage on these challenges, but ultimately we have to satisfy them (and an Independent Examiner) that all issues have been addressed appropriately through the Basic Conditions tests. Any issues about the Neighbourhood Plan raised with HDC are put on file, but are sent back for the attention of RPC and the Steering Group.

A resident said she was worried that everything will come back to deliverability as opposed to specific desires of the community.

The Chairman said all sites have to be deliverable. Some people apply this test early in the site selection process and then determine whether it is viable and available. We decided to do this the other way around. Putting the community's desires first and then seeing if the sites are deliverable to those requirements. There are pros and cons of doing it either way, but we can't get away from the 'deliverability' test.

Liam Percy said that is why we have always stated that sites are not set in stone. Sites can drop in and out all the way through the process.

A resident asked what implications HDC's decision to choose sites would have on the work planned by the SG?

The Chairman said we have recently done a consultation exercise which we are still working through. Site Design Briefs can be progressed as we have been given a mandate for this by the community and RPC. Some areas of work which need a significant financial spend can be put on hold until we get clarification. There are no significant cash commitments in the very short term, and we will wait for the response from HDC prior to commissioning the Heritage Impact Assessment (which has in principle been approved).

The Chairman said it would be dangerous to assume at this stage that any site is 'in or out' if HDC were to make the site choices – it cannot be assumed that their choices would be limited to their preferred sites. HDC keep stating that 'nothing is firm at this stage' which is the same response as we have been giving on our sites to date (for the same reasons).

Liam Percy stated we don't even know the number of sites which HDC would put forward – it could just be one site which we know is not what the community have asked for.

Cllr Collingwood said he had attended the meeting between the SG and RPC following the HDC meeting. He had been pleased to see everyone acting in concert to try to persuade HDC to leave the site decision with the community. He said it is important that RPC and the SG continue to go forward in the same direction with this.

The Chairman said there was a clear mandate from the community that the NP should own the site selection decision so that is what we will try to deliver until we are told not to.

4. Costs / Budget / Grants

Expenditure to 31st March 2018

Cost to Precept	£116.00
Cost recovered against HDC grant	£1,355.95
Cost recovered against Locality	<u>£5,792.50</u>
Total Cost to date	<u>£7,264.45</u>

Unspent balance of HDC grant £1,644.05

Unspent Locality Grant to return £3,064.50

Locality Reporting Requirements

An end of grant report has to be submitted to Locality and any unspent funds returned before we can access further funding. A draft end of Grant report had been circulated to SG members and it was agreed to recommend it to RPC for approval at their 9th April meeting.

Locality 2018 Grant Program

Details of the program have now been published. We are eligible for a maximum of £17,000 (less expenditure under the 2015-18 program) from Locality if our scope includes site selection, and a maximum of £9,000 if our scope excludes it. The total grant funding (HDC + Locality) potentially still available is £12,851.55 (with site selection) or £4,851.55 (without).

Clarification from HDC on the site selection issue is required before we prepare our new application, but it is hoped to submit an application by mid-April and have funds in place by mid-May. The HDC grant will be used to “bridge” the gap between the two Locality Grants.

Cost to Completion

Cost to completion is being reviewed but it is anticipated that further expenditure in the region of £10,000¹ will be needed with site selection in scope or £8,400 without. (The only explicit cost associated with including site selection in our scope is the £1,600 Heritage Impact Assessment.)

Due to the higher grant ceiling we would anticipate being able to almost fully cover the costs of the Neighbourhood Plan from grants if the scope includes site selection, but on the current estimate would have to fund ca. £3,600 from the precept if site selection is removed from scope.

1. This completion cost estimate had been prepared assuming a November 2018 referendum, and needs to be updated (increased) to account for schedule adjustments arising out of the meeting with HDC. The referendum date is now estimated as Feb 2019.

5. Issues To Refer To Rudby Parish Council

Submit End of Grant report for approval.

6. Feedback from Consultation Events (Sun 4th & Wed 14th March)

The Chairman gave a Powerpoint presentation of the results of the consultation (quantitative data and participant comments). The main discussion points are recorded below and should be read in conjunction with the presentation which can be found on the website at:

http://plan.rudbyparishcouncil.org.uk/wp/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/NP-March-Consultation-Results-V1-2018_04_03-1.pdf

The Chairman outlined the rationale for the consultation. It had been organised as a response to the reaction to site selection meeting, and feedback from the community to both the Steering Group and Parish Council. The main objectives were to review what had been done so far and check we were heading in direction of what community wanted.

The consultation involved two sessions (one on Sunday afternoon and one on Wednesday evening) just over a week apart. 127 participants signed the register. The typical visit time lasted between 30 and 60 minutes. This was the highest number of participants for any of the workshops/consultation events. There is no sign of consultation fatigue setting in as yet.

The consultation covered 6 topics: Strategy and decision making in site selection; free format commentary on Preferred Sites, Green Space and Settlement Character; Scoping for policies dealing with specific issues raised through earlier consultation work; housing; and, design.

When it comes to Site Design Briefs, we need to develop a view on if a site is developed – what would the community like to see developed (what would it look like). Some feedback suggested that people thought this meant those sites were definitely coming forward, but this is not the case. None of the preferred sites are fully proven, any of them could be eliminated, and alternatives may need to be brought forward.

The Chairman reminded the meeting that participants were only prompted for comments if their views differed from the interpretation of the evidence by the Steering Group. Around 350 comments submitted – individual responses to these will be prepared and published.

Before going through each question, the Chairman gave the rationale for the questions and their sequencing. The Chairman outlined possible reasons for the number of "No responses" which increased with the later questions.

Section 1

Q1. The work to date has assumed that we should aim at supplying sites which deliver no more than the amount of housing set by HDC. While this seemed widely accepted, we had never explicitly asked the community to confirm this was what they wanted.

There was a very clear response: match HDC targets but don't exceed.

The Chairman observed that there were quite a few 'no responses'. This happens in all consultations – some people skip sections, some people answer as a couple, etc.

Q2. This linked back to questionnaire evidence on distribution which had showed that people didn't want development all in one area, but wanted it spread around Parish. SG took this forward through workshop activities and feedback from this consultation came back the same.

However, there are two distinct groups: the majority saying distribute development over a few sites, and a smaller group favouring a single site solution.

Q3. Site size limit of ca. 25 homes arise from the questionnaire responses set. Consultation response was not as strongly skewed as the response that development should be spread out, but the majority view is to respect a 25 homes limit. Again there is evidence of a smaller group favouring a single site solution. This may be a good technical solution, but it is not what most of community is saying they want.

A resident asked if larger sites would provide more affordable housing.

The Chairman responded that provided all sites are larger than 10 homes they would all have to contribute the same percentage of affordable housing, so the total would stay the same.

The resident observed that larger sites would make delivering affordable housing more viable.

The Chairman said that this was not necessarily correct since viability always depends on site specific issues, but is typically the case.

Q4. Almost all responses were supportive of keeping sites above 10 homes to ensure delivery of affordable homes. So generally sites should be between 11-25 homes.

Q5 & Q6. The previous questions focused on the interpretation of evidence used to guide the number of sites and their distribution. Participants were now (in effect) asked to set aside the evidence and just asked 'what would you like to see?'

Split was approx. 70:30 with the minority group wanting fewer but larger sites than the solution proposed by the Steering Group.

There was very little support for having a more widely distributed solution than proposed by the Steering Group.

The broad message is that something structurally similar to what has been proposed is supported (not necessarily the specific sites), just the pattern and number of sites.

This point about process rather than outcome is important to remember for the next two questions. We specifically put these questions forward to the community about the process as we were getting questions/challenges on how we had structured the decision.

Q7. There was clear support for a criteria based approach to generate a short-list.

Some people commented that they didn't like how we handled 'centre of village' issue. This was a decision generated from earlier consultation. It was noted that the Steering Group try as far as possible to avoid making decision themselves, but aim to pose questions which generate evidence that will determine issue. In this case the evidence generated clearly pointed to using a location on the Green as the village centre.

A resident asked if the SPAR location used in that consultation was the old or new location. It was confirmed that the new location was used (and clearly marked on the map).

Someone left a comment that this was a “leading question not a consultation”. We contacted the individual for more feedback, and he explained that he was concerned that if people signed off on the process, that it would be interpreted as justification that the site selection decision was also correct. This is a reasonable concern, but was not the intent of the question. The evidence base has to be correct, and the process has to be correct for the right answer to emerge. This question only tests the community view on the process, and no inferences will be drawn from the responses on whether the correct sites have been selected.

Q8. This question looked at how we moved from a short list to the preferred sites i.e. by bringing in people’s preferences from earlier consultation work. Most people responded yes it was a correct process.

The Chairman said that it is very important that you do not read into the results of Q7 and Q8 that the site choices were correct as that was not asked here. The questions are just checking whether the community agree that the process is structurally sound.

A resident said that he felt that other criteria were brought into the decision-making process in October (making reference to discussion of the planning application on the Stokesley Rd site).

The Chairman said that this was discussed as part of the context of the site. Another member of the Steering Group confirmed that the application had been discussed but had not been a criteria within the site selection process. The KVA planning consultant confirmed that in her opinion no new criteria had been introduced during the site selection meeting.

The Chairman summarised the results of section 1 as supporting the Steering Groups recommendations with respect to housing targets, number and distribution of sites, affordable housing, and the structure (not the outcome) of the site selection decision process. The Chairman asked the meeting for any comments on this summary. There were no comments.

Section 2: Preferred Sites

In this section some information on each site was provided but there were no “guiding questions”. Participants were given a free format opportunity to express their opinions on the preferred sites.

With respect to the preferred sites, there were 25 comments concerning Stokesley Road, 40 concerning Enterpen and 36 concerning Langbaugh/Paddocks End. In the presentation comments were colour coded (Green for positive, Red for negative, and Black for neutral).

The comments on Stokesley Road were a balanced mix of positive and negative with a slight majority negative. The comments on Enterpen were largely negative - approximately three quarters. Comments on the Langbaugh/Paddocks End site were predominantly positive.

- **Q9. Stokesley Rd.**

The negative comments on this site seemed to be mainly related to specific concerns rather than objections in principle to the site being selected.

Issues raised include: traffic, flooding, distances from services.

Some liked that it was on the edge of settlement which is a negative for others.

- **Q10. Enterpen**

Focus issues of concern were: access, parking, views across the flagpole field, and precedent for potential future expansion of site.

One of the positive comments was from someone who liked the central location. About 75% of comments were negative.

A resident observed that from the 127 attendees at the consultation there were 40 comments of which around 75% were negative. He thought this was a strong message to the Steering Group and asked how they would respond.

The Chairman said that the consultation indicates issues that we need to look so we can show why the site does (or doesn't) work, but site selection isn't a popularity contest. The SG need to find out whether the site is technically feasible or unfeasible, and it will either stay in or come out as a result. It can only be eliminated for sound technical reasons rather than due to unpopularity. We are aware that it wouldn't be good to put forward an unpopular site into a public referendum.

Another resident referred to the earlier discussion on leading questions. It would be interesting to see where people live who have made negative comments about Enterpen. Maybe all people who put the 'red' comments live on Enterpen.

The Chairman said that the person who had raised the leading question point had made a useful contribution to interpretation of results, and it didn't matter where they lived or why they had made the point. Similarly it doesn't matter where the people making the negative comments about Enterpen live, what matters is whether their points are valid.

- **Q11. Paddocks End / Langbaurgh Rd**

This site received mainly positive comments, and the few negative comments were mainly related to access and congestion impacts on Langbaurgh.

The Chairman commented that this is the type of site that is a nice to have – one that scores very well and is also popular. However, it is not yet proven, and there are still issues to follow up. It cannot be automatically selected simply because it is popular, just as Enterpen cannot be rejected because simply because it is unpopular.

Section 3 – Green Space and Settlement Character

The SG felt the consultation was a good opportunity to come back to these issues as there were some loose ends and issues where it would be useful to get input from a larger group than had been involved in some of the earlier workshops.

Taken as a whole, the responses to the Green Space questions very clearly showed that the community supported green spaces designation wherever there was a reasonable case, and all potential areas were strongly supported. The Chairman said that for Green Spaces work now needs to be focused on proving the case for each site.

Q12. The first group of Green Space candidates arose through the HDC Local Plan process, and the proposed designation was subsequently supported by an NP workshop. These sites were also supported by this consultation, but there was one point of confusion due to lack of clarity in the mapping. A number of people thought that the field around the recreation area was being recommended as a Green Space, but only the recreation area itself was being recommended.

The Steering Group's opinion is that although the view across the arable field is valued, this does not provide sufficient justification for a Green Space designation. We need to be consistent

when considering other candidates where views are the main justification for designation e.g. the Flagpole field.

Q13. The consultation showed support for designation of some land at Hundale Gill (originally proposed through the HDC Local Plan process). This was rejected by HDC due to lack of public access. Most of the negative comments focused on this aspect. However, public access is not a pre-requisite of the NPPF for Green Space designation so the HDC decision may not be sound.

A resident asked about the implications of designation of land that is in gardens.

The Chairman said that Local Green Space can be allocated if it is on private land. This doesn't create any right of access, but it does mean that there would be stricter planning control on those parts which are designated. To use Hundale Gill as an example, designation might prevent further culverting and associated loss of biodiversity. However, it probably would not be appropriate to include the culverted part within any designation.

Q14. Rudby Farm (originally proposed through the HDC Local Plan process). There is a complex history within the HDC process for this site, with both housing and Green Space designation proposed. The Neighbourhood Plan had looked at the development case first, and having decided that it was not a preferred site now needed to consider the case for Green Space.

There are three distinct zones to the site: Bank Wood (a SINC), the lower part of the field with archaeological features, and the upper part of the field. All areas were supported, but there was most support for the SINC and least for the upper part of the field.

Concerns were expressed in comments that it would be inconsistent to designate the upper part of this field and not designate other similar fields around the village (e.g. the area between Paddocks End and Langbaugh Rd).

Q15. The final group consisted of potential areas identified through Neighbourhood Plan consultation work which have not yet been considered by HDC. Again these were all supported.

Some useful information about ownership of small informal open spaces within the Linden estate emerged during the consultation.

The Chairman commented on the disparate views expressed in the post-it note "conversation" between consultation participants about the possible Green Space at the Flagpole field.

Q16. For a view to be included, it has to be from a public space; e.g. public footpath, road. "Private views", from someone's garden for example, cannot be included as there is no right to a private view in planning. This was not made clear in the first session, and a number of private views were submitted which will have to be rejected.

The additional views proposed will be checked to ensure they are from public spaces, and the scoring of any sites affected will be reviewed (a preliminary desktop inspection suggests only one site assessment will need to be amended).

Section 4 – Miscellaneous Policy Issues

The purpose of this group of questions was to test whether there was support for a number of specific policies which had been suggested in workshops.

Q17. Although the response rate was only 50% of attendees, all were positive responses stating that residents would prefer developments not to encroach on footpaths too tightly. This will feed into Site Design Briefs and policy development.

Q18. Similarly there was support for maintaining undeveloped buffer zones around water courses. This could potentially provide amenity space or biodiversity zones and in some cases is needed anyway for flood management.

A resident commented that some water courses are already degraded and are not much more than drainage ditches (e.g. parts of Hundale Gill).

Q19. Tree replacement. There was some unexpected reaction to this question with some participants viewing it as an encouragement to unnecessarily remove trees, or to facilitate the development of particular sites. The Chairman stressed that this was not in any way related to site selection, and the intent of the policy if introduced would be to provide a tool to help maintain tree cover when for example diseased or damaged trees have to be removed. The comments included some useful suggestions on species, maturity of replacements, and including TPOs outside the conservation area with the policy scope.

Section 5 – Housing

These questions were intended to generate evidence of community opinion to give guidance to the SG on issues where there a need to make choices might arise either in policy development or in connection with preferred sites.

Q20. Affordable Housing. The most recent publicly available information from HDC is that they are aiming for 30% affordable housing on sites with more than 10 homes. With a total parish target of 70 homes, this would deliver enough affordable housing to meet about half of the identified local need. A number of options for were put forward which could increase the amount of affordable housing delivered by the Neighbourhood Plan.

The clear message from the consultation was to stick with HDC policy provision and not look to provide more. There was very little appetite for rural exception sites (100% affordable).

Q21. Housing mix. The response rate to this question was much lower than any other question, and significantly lower than for Q20 and Q22. The low response rate and the comments submitted suggests to the Steering Group that most people struggled to make sense of the question. The SG view is that this question failed to generate reliable data.

Q22. This question asked what people think the Steering Group should do if a developer says their site isn't viable for the preferred housing mix (with full quote of affordable housing and mainly smaller homes).

The consultation gave a clear response that if a particular developer is not able to deliver the preferred mix the SG response should be 'go away and we'll look at another site'.

A member of the public raised the issue of timing with respect to site viability testing and said that he was surprised that the Steering Group did not have a reserve site.

The Chairman confirmed that viability had to be tested well before the referendum, and if a site was not viable then it would be dropped and the housing reallocated elsewhere. It was noted

that a site may be dropped for a variety of reasons, and one particular site would not necessarily be suitable for all eventualities, so the SG did not believe it was useful to have a reserve site.

Katie Atkinson added that this was a reasonable approach and a sound process.

A resident commented that if the public didn't understand the housing mix question, they don't know what they are getting so couldn't give a proper response to this question either.

The Chairman said that the response rate for this question was in the normal range which indicated that it had been understood, and that it gave clear direction to the Steering Group.

A member of the public commented that it was good there had been this consultation.

Section 6 Site Design Briefs

All the questions in this section are predicated as "if this site was to be developed, how should it be developed.", although this does not mean that the sites will ultimately be allocated. Some people made comments in this section which were objections in principle to the particular site selection. The more appropriate place for these type of comments would have been within the Section 2 (Preferred Sites).

Stokesley Rd

Q23. Preferences were for small family homes, and participants didn't want to see retired or sheltered accommodation there. Distance to and from services seeming to be the issue driving the view on mix.

Q24. There was a clear preference for a single access if the site was to go ahead. Some people left comments disagreeing with the site being allocated in principle

Enterpen

Q25. Housing preferences were mainly for bungalows and small family homes, with weak preference for sheltered homes and homes for the elderly.

The response to the housing mix question across the three sites suggests that good access to the village shop is seen as the most important for those perceived as having limited mobility.

Q26. There are two potential highway access points for Enterpen. People were asked their preferences (either as a single access or both).

A write-in response of "none" was added by a participant and received some support. This is in effect an objection in principle, as such does not fit the context of a site design brief question.

Q27. A majority supported the approach of using the non-vehicle access point for a pedestrian/cycle access.

A resident said that it was his understanding that land owner doesn't want access on to flagpole field, and that accessing by that route would adversely affect viability. Does that have any bearing on this as a site, and also does flag pole Landscape Character Protection Area (LCPA) designation come into play?

The Chairman said that the Neighbourhood Plan is an opportunity for the community to set out how they would like the parish/sites to be developed. If an owner/developer doesn't want to follow community preferences then there needs to be a conversation between the community and land owner, and sites may come off the table at that point. We will get guidance on dealing with the LCPA through the Heritage Assessment.

Paddocks End / Langbaurgh Rd

Q28. Participants favoured small family homes, bungalows and homes for the retired and for supported living.

Q29. There was strong support for a footpath/cycleway linking Paddocks End to Langbaurgh Rd.

Q30. The majority opposed a road link from Paddocks End to Langbaurgh, but an unexpectedly large minority was in favour. Approximately 2/3rds opposed a link and 1/3rd favoured one. It was thought those favouring a link may see this as an opportunity to reduce traffic on Doctors Lane.

This illustrates the principle that development brings some pros and cons. The SG have to try to find a balance between them. One group of people don't like site A, whilst others don't like site B and so on. Development in one place has a consequential effect for another group of existing residents so they object etc.

Q31. There was a clear response that if there is only one access it should be from the Paddocks End side and not from Langbaurgh Rd.

Q32. There was a clear response in favour of phasing.

Q33. There was a fairly even split of opinion on whether there should be a physical gap between the phases. Some respondents saw this as an opportunity to create amenity space while others saw it as a waste of land.

Q33. This was a 'catch all' opportunity at the end of the consultation so that participants could tell the SG anything else they wanted to raise about the Preferred Sites.

7. AOB

None

8. Next Meeting

Time & Date: **Tuesday** 7pm, 8th May 2018: Location: Chapel Schoolroom

Note that the May meeting is one day later than the normal schedule to avoid meeting on the Mayday Bank Holiday.

Appendix 1: Letter from RPC to Chief Executive of HDC

Dear Dr Ives,

Rudby Parish Council is writing to express its serious concern and deep disappointment about the apparent and completely unexpected change in HDC's approach to Neighbourhood Planning which was communicated to representatives of the Parish Council and our Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group at a meeting with your Planning Policy team held on 21 March. It is possible that there was a misunderstanding, but we believe that we were advised that HDC now intend to make pre-emptive site allocations for our Parish in the publication version of the Local Plan, thereby in effect leaving our community with no say over where development will be located. Prior to that meeting our expectation and understanding was that Hambleton were supportive of our intention to allocate sites with capacity to deliver whatever housing target for our Parish is set by Hambleton through our Neighbourhood Plan and that these sites would be given preference over sites identified through HDC's own process.

Our understanding of Hambleton's former position was based inter alia on the following:

- A letter dated 3 November 2016 sent to Rudby Parish Council by your then Head of Planning Policy which states *"However it is expected that where alternative, appropriate sites have been identified in Neighbourhood Plans which meet a similar scale of development that these will take precedent."*
- HDC Preferred Option Consultation Part 1 section 2.31 which states *"Through the Localism Act the Government has introduced new rights and powers to allow local communities to come together to prepare Neighbourhood Plans. It enables a community, be it a group of residents, employees or businesses, to have a say in where new development should go"*
- HDC Preferred Options Consultation Part 1 sections 3.24 & 3.25 which states *"Neighbourhood Plans must be in general conformity with the strategic Local Plan policies. There are a number of designated Neighbourhood Plan areas in Hambleton and although the Preferred Options document identifies allocation sites it is recognised that if alternative suitable sites are identified through a Neighbourhood Plan that these would take precedent over the emerging local Plan."*
"3.25 The alternative options considered were: There is no realistic alternative to this option."
- Our on-going dialogue with Hambleton's Planning Policy team throughout our process in which it was always made clear that it was our intention to allocate sites and at no stage were we advised that Hambleton intended to pre-empt soundly made choices. This dialogue included a meeting between members of our Steering Group and Planning Policy Officers held in October 2017 shortly before our site selection decision. At this meeting (which was held just after the departure of Caroline Skelly who had been our main contact) we provided a briefing on our objectives which included site selection and provided details of our site assessment process to your Planning Policy team.

HDC's previous position as set out in your letter to RPC and as described in your Preferred Options document seem to us to be very clear and unambiguous and entirely consistent with both the letter and the intent of the Localism Act and other relevant elements of the NPPF. It seemed to us that our LPA was fully embracing the spirit of Localism as described by the "architect" of the Localism Act, John Howell MP at a public meeting in which Rishi Sunak MP and Mr Mick Jewitt also participated. Mr Howell described the division of responsibilities as the LPA decides how much development should

take place and the Neighbourhood Plan decides where it should be located. This message has resonated strongly within our community.

As such we had every expectation that HDC would continue to support our objective of allocating sites through the Neighbourhood Plan and work with us to resolve any practical issues in incorporating these into the Local Plan process. Our Neighbourhood Plan has been supported by an MRTPI qualified consultant who has attested that our site selection process is sound, objective and evidence based so we see no good reason why our process should suddenly be set aside at this late stage. We acknowledge that the Local Plan must take priority in resource allocation at HDC but surely resource constraints can be addressed through appropriate work sequencing without changing the ownership over this key decision.

Our community has embraced Neighbourhood Planning and engaged strongly with it on the clear understanding that it could give them ownership over the decision on where development would be located in our Parish. Through the Neighbourhood Plan the community, which was initially resistant to any development, has come to recognise the positive role of development in providing housing that meets local needs. We are deeply concerned that if HDC were to impose sites through the Local Plan it could fatally undermine confidence in the Neighbourhood Planning process. Our community has invested a great deal of time and effort into our Neighbourhood Plan and were looking forward to successfully delivering the first adopted Neighbourhood Plan in the District.

This inexplicable decision will have to be communicated to our community at our next Steering Group and Parish Council meetings so we ask, as a matter of urgency, that you respond to our letter within 7 days to clarify Hambleton's position and provide us with a full explanation of the reasons and justification for your decision to take the choice over the location of development out of the hands of our community. We ask you to reconsider your decision and find a better option that meets the aspirations of our community

J A Pyle
Clerk to the Council

Appendix 2: HDC Response

Dear Mrs Pyle,

I write in response to your email of 28th March 2018 to Justin Ives and further to the initial response from Mick Jewitt on the 28th March.

At the meeting on 21st March officers thought that the meeting had been positive in terms of discussing areas of commonality between the emerging Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan and looking at how the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan could fit together to provide a comprehensive and coherent set of policies. The Local Plan will provide the strategic context for any Neighbourhood Plans brought forward and the Council is happy to discuss the strategic context with representatives of the Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.

In brief part of the strategic context for the Neighbourhood Plan that will be set by the Local Plan will be the Settlement Hierarchy, policies on spatial distribution of development, district wide development need, flood risk and the historic and natural environment. With regards to the Settlement Hierarchy Hutton Rudby is considered to be a sustainable settlement and is and will continue be designated as a Service Village. Given its location, range of facilities and position in the hierarchy the Council would anticipate some level of housing allocation within Hutton Rudby.

At the meeting we discussed the timetables of both the Neighbourhood Plan and the Local Plan, with the Local Plan coming forward in advance of the Neighbourhood Plan. One of the key requirements for the Council is to ensure that the Local Plan provides for the housing need of the area. An option identified in the meeting was the potential for the Council to consider the allocation of one or a very small number of sites for Hutton Rudby, where emerging assessments indicated that there is common ground, in order to provide certainty of a site coming forward. This option was suggested for the purpose of discussion and was not intended to cut across the Neighbourhood Plan.

While it was considered that this would not undermine the ability of the Neighbourhood Plan to allocate sites it is clear that this is not considered to be an attractive option to the representatives of the Parish and Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. In the light of this and having considered the development requirements for the Local Plan further, it will be proposed to Members that the Local Plan does not make any allocations and that the allocation of sites is left entirely to the Neighbourhood Plan.

Assuming that the Neighbourhood Plan group would prefer this alternative option the Council hopes that the Neighbourhood Plan group will continue to make good progress with the Neighbourhood Plan. Good progress and consistency with the strategic policies of the Local Plan will be crucial in order to reduce the risk of speculative development, given the strategic context for the settlement provided by the Local Plan. The Council will liaise with you regarding the wording in the Local Plan in relation to Hutton Rudby and the Neighbourhood Plan and look forward to continuing positive engagement on the production of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Yours Sincerely,

James

James Campbell
Planning Policy Manager