

## Hampsthwaite Parish : summary of points raised in Commentaries on HBC DPD papers and other references.

- HBC summary of key issues for Hampsthwaite (*for Commentary see Appendix 1*)
- HBC Draft Homes for Local People (*for Commentary see Appendix 2*)
- HBC Sustainability Appraisal Report (*for Commentary see Appendix 3*)
- HBC Consultation Statement (*for Commentary see Appendix 4*)
- HBC Duty to Co-operate Statement (*for Commentary see Appendix 5*)
- National Planning Policy Framework (*for Commentary see Appendix 6*)

## History of previous application to build on this site:

- 1984 – Tay Homes application to build 65 dwellings between Rowden Lane and Brookfield Crescent
  - Application rejected at Appeal because “*the proposal would be **detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and general environment of Hampsthwaite***”
- 1990 – Victor Homes application to build 29 homes on land off Brookfield
  - Refusal strongly recommended by HBC stating “*In conclusion, I do not consider the scheme even on a reduced scale [29 detached dwellings] overcomes the inspectors conclusions and recommendations [given in 1984]” and as evidence to the subsequent Appeal stated “Neither of the proposals under appeal overcomes the fundamental objections raised by the Council to the development of land between the Brookfield estate and Rowden Lane, these objections were considered in detail at the Inquiry into the 1984 appeal and endorsed by the Inspector in his decision letter”.*

## Danger of urbanisation:

- Since the early 1980's, Hampsthwaite has absorbed the very considerable developments of the Brookfield Crescent estate and, most recently, the St Thomas a'Becket estate, Dawson Court and Cruet Fold. Additional large-scale proposals such as this seriously undermine the identity of the village – i.e. when is a village not a village?
- Development extends too far up rising ground and HBC's own evidence to the 1990 Appeal by Victor Homes to build 29 homes on this same site which states: “*The Appeal sites are part of the countryside which surrounds Hampsthwaite and which is an important element in the character of the village. By distancing the built-up area of the village from the countryside, the development of the appeal sites will cause harm to the character of the village and its landscape setting.*”
- The DPD proposals for development north of Skipton Road (H3021(1)) and Pennypot Lane (H3(1)), in addition to this proposal for development south of Brookfield (RL3036(1)), is likely to result in more housing between Hampsthwaite and Harrogate and will threaten Hampsthwaite's continued existence as a village community.

## Local opposition:

- Contrary to assertions in their Consultation Statement and the requirement set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, HBC have ignored 30yrs of strong local opposition to large-scale building on this site
- In Hampsthwaite's Village Plan of 2006, some 75% of respondents wanted no further building development: a 56-question survey was distributed to 441 households in the village during May 2006 and 258 questionnaires were returned. This was a 59% response rate, demonstrating a high level of interest in the survey – see <http://archive.hampsthwaite.org.uk/ParishPlan/HampsthwaiteVillagePlan.pdf>

- This overwhelming opposition was repeated in November 2011 when a survey was instigated by the Hampsthwaite Parish Council to provide an evidence-base of residents' opinions following a meeting held in the village Memorial Hall during October 2011. It was clear from the responses that the vast majority of residents are opposed to any further housing development in the village and, of those willing to accept a compromise position, a maximum of 20 new homes was indicated by most respondents – see <http://www.hampsthwaite.org.uk/get.html? Action=GetFile& Key=Data5811& Id=582& Wizard=0& DontCache=1370588692& TinyMCE=1>
- HBC has ignored not only the views of residents expressed consistently over the past 30 years or more but has contradicted its own previous statements with regard to this site made in 1984 and 1990.
- The claim by HBC that they have responded to local concerns, by reducing in the number of houses proposed, is cynical and disingenuous because it misses the key point that it is this particular site which attracts most opposition because of its accessibility, its rising landscape and its projection towards other planned developments out from Harrogate.

### **The need for more houses and affordable homes:**

- There is no proven need for this number of additional houses
- Currently there are 22 houses for sale in Hampsthwaite (*and more are known about locally*)
- Affordable homes have been provided on the St Thomas a'Becket and Dawson Court developments and most recently, 11 affordable homes were built at Cruet Fold
- Planning permission exists for other potential affordable homes at another site in the village.
- Housing Needs Survey, conducted by the Rural Housing Trust in March 2006, recommended a local needs housing scheme of 10 to 12 two and three bedroom dwellings. The recently built affordable homes at Cruet Fold have already met this need.
- HBC's own projections for the 9 villages in Lower Nidderdale (see Homes for Local People SPD at <http://www.harrogate.gov.uk/plan/Pages/HLP-SPD.aspx>), of which Hampsthwaite is just one, predicted in 2011, a future annual need of just 19 homes between them. With Cruet Fold alone, we have already met our fair share of Affordable Homes for the next five years.

### **Access and transport:**

- this is one of the least accessible of all the sites considered because:
- all traffic to this site would have to be funnelled through an existing bad junction between Brookfield and Hollins Lane
- all traffic (est. 100 extra cars per day each way) would need to access the site by driving through what are effectively residential play streets on the Brookfield Estate
- The existing footpath across this site is impassable for wheelchairs and pushchairs and does not give direct access to village centre amenities
- There have been repeated applications to build on the original farm entrance to the site thus blocking any potential wheelchair/pushchair direct access to the village centre amenities
- Hampsthwaite is poorly serviced by public transport:
  - the Route 24 Harrogate to Pateley Bridge bus is the only transport service which runs mainly hourly up to 6:30pm (last bus from Harrogate) and currently costs over £6 per person for a return ticket covering just the 5 mile route to Harrogate.
  - this service was further reduced by removing the winter Sunday and Bank Holiday runs between all villages on route from Harrogate to Pateley Bridge.
  - For people living in affordable accommodation and on low incomes and without vehicle transport, access to and from the village by public transport is very expensive indeed.

## Drainage and flooding:

- The village drainage systems are regularly overwhelmed by excessive rainwater running off this hillside - see <http://www.hampsthwaite.org.uk/351>
- Garden ponds along the southern edge of Brookfield have been deluged to the point that residents were trying to catch their pet fish which had been washed out into the gutters along Brookfield - the clue is in the name, 'Brookfield'!
- the clue is in the name "Brookfield"! Even at times of only moderate rain, surface water drainage in from Hollins Lane and Brookfield is already overwhelmed. Brookfield itself has been inundated with water flooding off the fields behind.
- Drainage systems down Hollins Lane and leading into Hollins Close have not been able to cope with the volume despite recent attempts to improve the situation. During severe weather, roads are flooded and drainage covers lifted, thus creating a traffic hazard - see <http://www.hampsthwaite.org.uk/351>
- We note also the 2010 LDF proposal recognised that Killinghall Water Treatment Works "*has limited capacity for expansion*".
- The name *Hamps* derives from its Middle English title, "*Hanespe*" which derives from the British name, which means "*summer dry*", i.e. dry in summer - and therefore wet in winter!