

GUIDANCE NOTES

What can I make comments on?

You can make representations on any part of the DPD, the Proposals Map and supporting documents which include the Sustainability Appraisal; Habitat Regulations Assessment and the Consultation Report. Comments may also refer to the justification and evidence in the supporting technical papers. Your comments must focus on the 'soundness' of the plan (see below) and should set out what changes you want to see made.

Do I have to use the response form?

Because further changes to the DPD will be a matter for a Planning Inspector to consider, providing responses in a consistent format is important. For this reason, all responses should use this consultation response form. Please be as succinct as possible on the form. You can attach additional evidence to support your case, but please ensure that it is clearly referenced. It will be a matter for the Inspector to invite additional evidence in advance of, or during the Public Examination. Additional response forms can be found at www.harrogate.gov.uk/LPConsult and then follow the links to the Sites and Policies DPD.

Can I submit representations on behalf of a group or neighbourhood?

The Council welcomes submissions from groups who share a common view on how they wish to see a policy changed. A single representation will be as effective as a large number of individuals submitting separate representations that repeat the same points however; representations must still be submitted on this response form.

Question 4(1) - What does 'legally compliant' mean?

Legally compliant essentially means asking whether or not the plan has been prepared in line with the Duty to Cooperate and legal procedural requirements such as the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). Details of how the plan has been prepared is set out in the published Consultation Statement and the Duty to Cooperate Statement, which can be found at www.harrogate.gov.uk/LPConsult and then follow the links to the Sites and Policies DPD.

Question 4(2) - What does 'soundness' mean?

Soundness may be considered in this context within its ordinary meaning of 'fit for purpose' and 'showing good judgement'. The Inspector will use the Public Examination process to explore and investigate the plan against the National Planning Policy Framework's 'four tests of soundness' as listed after question 5. The scope of the Public Examination will be set by taking into consideration the key issues raised by responses received and other matters the Inspector considers relevant.

Question 8 - Do I need to attend the Public Examination?

You can indicate whether at this stage you consider there is a need to present your representation at a hearing session during the Public Examination. You should note that Inspectors do not give any more weight to issues presented in person than to written evidence. The Inspector will use his/her own discretion in regard to who participates at the Public Examination. All examination hearings will be open to the public.

**Representations must be received by 4.30pm on Friday 21 June 2013.
Representations received after this time will not be considered
by the Council or the Inspector.**

Part B (please use a separate sheet for **each** representation).

Name/Organisation: **Hampsthwaite Parish Council**

3. To which part of the Development Plan Document does your representation relate?					
Page No.	131	Paragraph No.	1,2,3, 6 & 7	Policy Ref.	SG6
Site Ref.	RL3036(1)	Development Limit (put name of settlement)	Hampsthwaite	Proposals Map	RL3036(1)

4. Do you consider the Development Plan is:									
4.(1) Legally compliant	Yes		No	✓	4.(2) Sound	Yes		No	✓

If you have selected No to Question 4.(2), please continue to Question 5

In all other circumstances please go to Question 6

5. If you consider the Development Plan is UNSOUND, is this because it is not:			
Justified	✓	Effective	✓
Consistent with National Policy	✓	Positively Prepared	✓

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) provides the following explanation regarding the soundness of the plan:

Justified - the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence.

Effective - the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross boundary strategic priorities.

Consistent with national policy - the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.

Positively Prepared - the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development.

Please note: your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

**Representations must be received by 4.30pm on Friday 21 June 2013.
Representations received after this time will not be considered
by the Council or the Inspector.**

6. If you consider the document is not legally compliant or is unsound please set out your reasons below (please be as precise as possible). If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the document, please use this box to set out your comments.

Hampsthwaite Parish Council Commentaries on Sustainability Appraisal (SA); Consultation Statement; and the Duty to Cooperate Statement have now been posted on our web site at <http://www.hampsthwaite.org.uk/parishcouncil/582>

[Ref Appendix 3 : Commentary on the HBC Sustainability Appraisal Report]

[Ref Appendix 4 : Commentary on the HBC Consultation Statement]

[Ref Appendix 5 : Commentary on the HBC Duty to Co-operate Statement]

The proposal is counter to the HBC Sustainability Appraisal Report because: there is no proven need (SA1), access is poor (SA6; SA10; SA14), it will harm the distinctive character of Hampsthwaite and its rural setting (SA8; SA13), and it fails to take into account 30 years of vigorous local objection (SA4) - hitherto supported by HBC itself!

HBC's Consultation Statement ignores 30 years of well documented local opposition (para 1.1) and HBC's assertion that it reduced "*the site size in response to concerns raised at the scale of proposed growth*" 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 (paras 7.8 and 8.1).

The Duty to Cooperate requires HBC to:

- i) provide adequate infrastructure - but public transport is poor, drainage inadequate.
- ii) conserve and enhance the natural and historic environment, including landscape - yet in relation to his same site HBC stated in 1990 that development on this site "*will cause harm to the character of the village and its landscape setting.*"
- iii) make no changes to the Green Belt boundary (Policy EQ3) - HBC's own evidence to the 1990 Appeal by Victor Homes to build 29 homes on this same site stated: "*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.

On the basis of the points raised in these Commentaries, we take the view that the proposal is **not legally compliant**.

The National Planning Policy Framework quotes Resolution 42/187 of the United Nations General Assembly and defines "*sustainable development as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs*" but this proposal has been rejected on two previous occasions. In 1984, the Appeal Judgement stated: "*. . .the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and to the general environment of Hampsthwaite*". A view was revisited by HBC's own evidence to the 1990 Appeal by Victor Homes to build 29 homes on this same site which stated: "*. . . the development of the appeal sites will cause harm to the character of the village and its landscape setting.*"

continue on a separate sheet if necessary

**Representations must be received by 4.30pm on Friday 21 June 2013.
Representations received after this time will not be considered
by the Council or the Inspector.**

6. If you consider the document is not legally compliant or is unsound please set out your reasons below (please be as precise as possible). If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the document, please use this box to set out your comments.

We take the view that:

It is **not justified** because: there is no proven need given recent developments and the existence of 22 houses for sale currently in the village (over 40 within 5 miles of the village centre); it is the most contentious site and not one with "*least adverse affects*" [HBC LDF 2010], this site was previously dismissed by HBC and at Appeal and objected to locally for over 30 years leading to the conclusion that the site is proposed mainly because of the landowner's willingness to sell and not necessarily in the interests of the community or in response to any proven need.

It is **not effective** because the strength of local opposition means that any plans are likely to be vigorously opposed at every stage by residents, leading to real risk of expensive appeals; and HBC's responses to the Key Issues of traffic and drainage are too vague to be meaningful.
[Ref Appendix 1 : Commentary on the HBC Response to Summary of Key Issues]

It is **not consistent with national policy** in that this proposed development south of the village when considered together with HBC proposals for development north of Skipton Road and Pennypot, threaten urban sprawl and the diminution of the green corridor between Hampsthwaite and Harrogate.

It has **not been positively prepared** in that it is a negative imposition on the residents of Hampsthwaite who have for 30 years expressed their clear opposition to large-scale development on this particular site because of access issues and the irreparable harm it will cause to "*the character of the village and its landscape setting*". There is no proven need since there are 22 houses for sale in the village now and more to follow soon (local knowledge). Furthermore, HBC's own statement of affordable housing need has already been met at Cruet Fold, St Thomas a'Becket Walk and Dawson Court.

[Ref Appendix 2 : Commentary on the HBC Draft Homes for Local People SPD]

The HBC proposal to allow the building of 56 homes on land south of Brookfield is **unsound** because it is clear from the evidence from Appeals relating to previous attempts to build even less houses here, that such large scale development will cause irreparable "*harm to the character of the village and its landscape setting*" and is therefore by definition **not sustainable**.

Previous evidence also showed that such development on this site "*would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and general environment of Hampsthwaite*" in direct contradiction to the 'environmental role' as described in the National Planning Framework itself.

Furthermore, this proposal ignores some 30 years of consistent and vigorous local opposition to such large-scale development 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 www.hampsthwaite.org.uk/ParishPlan/planindex.html

It is clear from the views expressed at local public meetings in October 2011 and responses to our own subsequent Housing Survey in November 2011, there should be a maximum of 20 new homes in small-scale scattered developments - as has been the case up until now.

continue on a separate sheet if necessary

**Representations must be received by 4.30pm on Friday 21 June 2013.
Representations received after this time will not be considered
by the Council or the Inspector.**

6. If you consider the document is not legally compliant or is unsound please set out your reasons below (please be as precise as possible). If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the document, please use this box to set out your comments.

HBC has ignored not only the views of residents expressed consistently over the past 30 years or more and has contradicted its own previous statements with regard to this site made in 1984 and 1990. The claim by HBC that they have responded 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 poor accessibility, its rising landscape and its projection towards other planned developments out from Harrogate.

[Ref Appendix 6 : Commentary on the National Planning Policy Framework]

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

- 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"*.

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

continue on a separate sheet if necessary

**Representations must be received by 4.30pm on Friday 21 June 2013.
Representations received after this time will not be considered
by the Council or the Inspector.**

6. If you consider the document is not legally compliant or is unsound please set out your reasons below (please be as precise as possible). If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the document, please use this box to set out your comments.

- 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.

Danger of urbanisation: (Core Strategy Objective 1 and 7)

- 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.

The need for more houses and affordable homes: (Core Strategy Objective 2)

- 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 over the following 5 years. With Cruet Fold alone, we have already met our fair share of Affordable Homes.

Access and transport: (Core Strategy Objectives 3 and 5)

- 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 where visibility is below standard and vehicles approaching along Hollins Lane enter the village on a downhill length of road.

continue on a separate sheet if necessary

**Representations must be received by 4.30pm on Friday 21 June 2013.
Representations received after this time will not be considered
by the Council or the Inspector.**

6. If you consider the document is not legally compliant or is unsound please set out your reasons below (please be as precise as possible). If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the document, please use this box to set out your comments.

- 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
- In the objection to the Tay Homes application for development of 65 homes on this site in 1984 the inspector stated *“the centre of the village is small . . . I believe that the possible addition of not only 150 - 200 people but also the additional vehicular traffic generated by this increase would impose a social and physical strain on the village and would have a seriously adverse effect on the environment in the centre of Hampsthwaite and on the surrounding roads”* Nothing physically has changed since then, the centre of the village is still small, but there is increased car ownership.
- 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)
 - this service is 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 - i.e. the cost of a return journey from Hampsthwaite to Harrogate by bus, a return distance of 8 miles, would be prohibitive for many costing £23.30 (£7 per adult and £4.65 per child)

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”!
- 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!

[Ref Appendix 7 : Comparisons with Harrogate Borough Council’s Core Strategy]

continue on a separate sheet if necessary

**Representations must be received by 4.30pm on Friday 21 June 2013.
Representations received after this time will not be considered
by the Council or the Inspector.**

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Development Plan Document legally compliant or sound, having regard to the Test of Soundness you have identified at Question 5 above where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the Development Plan Document legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you could put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

HBC must accept that this particular site is unsuitable for large-scale development and not have its judgement swayed by the natural keenness of a landowner to profiteer. In failing to accept this, HBC is contradicting its own previous judgements.

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 www.hampsthwaite.org.uk/get.html?_Action=GetFile&_Key=Data5811&_Id=582&_Wizard=0&_DontCache=1370588692&TinyMCE=1

There are several sites in the village where some small scale scattered development *may* be acceptable but 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 and are completely opposed – i.e. when is a village not a village?

For this proposal to be legally compliant and sound, HBC need adhere more closely to the principles set out in the National Planning Policy framework and to be consistent with the previous decisions relating to land south of Brookfield and protect the “*the character of the village and its landscape setting*”

HBC must also take local needs and views more into account and not disregard the considerable development that has already taken place or ignore the weight of evidence-based local opposition to large-scale development on this site over the previous 30 years.

Nothing has changed since 1990, when HBC argued against an even smaller development here, except that Hampsthwaite has already absorbed several smaller scale building projects and is now put in real danger of losing its village identity.

continue on a separate sheet if necessary

**Representations must be received by 4.30pm on Friday 21 June 2013.
Representations received after this time will not be considered
by the Council or the Inspector.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing sessions of the Public Examination?			
No , I do not wish to participate at the hearing sessions at the Examination. I would like my representation to be dealt with by written representation.		Yes , I wish to appear at the Examination	✓
If you have selected No , your representation(s) will still be considered by the independent Planning Inspector by way of written representations.			

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:
<p>We wish to have the opportunity to clarify any points of detail that may emerge</p>

Please note: the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing sessions of the Examination.

10. Do you wish to be notified of any of the following? Please mark all that apply. We will contact you using the details you have provided on this form:	
a) When the Sites & Policies DPD has been submitted for independent examination.	✓
b) When the Inspector's Report is published.	✓
c) When Harrogate Borough Council adopts the Sites & Policies DPD.	✓



Signature: Date: 20th June 2013

(Signed on behalf of Hampsthwaite Parish Council by G.Howard, Vice-Chair of HPC.)

Please return the completed form by no later than 4:30pm on Friday 21 June 2013 to:
 Planning Policy Team, Department of Development Services, Harrogate Borough Council, Knapping Mount, West Grove Road, Harrogate HG1 2AE.
 Or Email: planningpolicy@harrogate.gov.uk
 (electronic copies of this form are available at www.harrogate.gov.uk/LPConsult then follow the links to the Sites and Policies Development Plan Document.)

Data Protection

Information will be stored on a computer database used solely in connection with the Local Plan and in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1988. Representations will be available to view on the Council's website, although address and contact details will not be included. However, as copies of representations must be made available for public inspection, they cannot be treated as confidential and will be available for inspection in full.



Hampsthwaite Parish Council : Appendix 1

Commentary on the HBC Response to Summary of Key Issues (Site RL3036 - Preferred Option)

Issue:

- The junction at Brookfield and Hollins Lane could not cope with the extra traffic.
- Concern about volume of traffic and safety. Bus service is inadequate.

Commentary on HBC response:

1. Too non-specific to be meaningful

Issue:

- The village school could not cope with the extra pupils.

Commentary on HBC response:

1. The school has been extended but is already over-scribed in spite of this

Issue:

- Surface water drainage/flooding are a problem in the area around Brookfield and are already a problem for existing development.

Commentary on HBC response:

1. Too non-specific to be meaningful

Issue:

- The site is too large.

Commentary on HBC response:

1. A generalised response which does not address the opposition to this scale of development on this particular site because:
 - a. Its poor accessibility because of all traffic funnelling through the poor junction at Hollins Lane and the need to drive through residential play streets
 - b. 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."*
 - c. 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.
 - d. The proposal ignores 30 year of vigorous local opposition to building on this particular site – opposition which was hitherto supported by HBC.
 - e. 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?

Issue:

- Impact on the doctor's surgery.

Commentary on HBC response:

1. Residents report difficulty in getting appointments and planning approval for a second surgery in Hampsthwaite granted in recent past demonstrates inconsistency in HBC planning decisions.

Issue:

- The development should not impact on the conservation and adjacent listed buildings (The Old Mill, The Grange).

Commentary on HBC response:

1. Too vague to be meaningful

Issue:

- There is insufficient foul sewer capacity - off site sewer improvements, and the Killinghall WWTW would need to be upgraded.

Commentary on HBC response:

1. Killinghall Water Treatment Works "*has limited capacity for expansion*".

Issue:

- Need mix of housing for young, old etc. and mix of tenures.

Commentary on HBC response:

1. There is no proven need for this number of additional houses
2. Currently there are 22 houses for sale in Hampsthwaite (*and more are known about locally*)
3. Affordable homes have been provided on the St Thomas a'Becket development and most recently, 11 affordable homes were built at Cruet Fold
4. a 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.
5. 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

Issue:

- Disagree with housing need and scale of development.

Commentary on HBC response:

1. 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
2. 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>
3. 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

Issue:

- Existing facilities will not be able to support development. Not enough employment within the village.

Commentary on HBC response:

1. The existing footpath across this site is impassable for wheelchairs and pushchairs and does not give direct access to village centre amenities
2. 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
3. The local bus service is inadequate

Issue:

- Impact on landscape and loss of countryside.

Commentary on HBC response:

1. The 1984 Tay Homes Appeal Judgement to develop 65 dwellings on this same site stated “*I have reached the conclusion that there is no clear evidence of an existing Council commitment to this proposal, the relevant planning policies militate against the kind of development proposed, and that the proposal would be **detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and general environment of Hampsthwaite***” and in response to an application by Victor Homes to build just 29 homes on this site in 1990, HBC stated “*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”.*

Issue:

- Impact on form and character of the village.

Commentary on HBC response:

1. HBC’s own evidence to the 1990 Appeal by Victor Homes to build 29 homes on this same site 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.*”

Issue:

- Impact on biodiversity.

Commentary on HBC response:

1. There is no pond – further evidence of a poorly researched proposal by HBC

Issue:

- Impact on walkers using the footpath to the south.

Commentary on HBC response:

1. The existing footpath across this site is impassable for wheelchairs and pushchairs and does not give direct access to village centre amenities

Hampsthwaite Parish Council : Appendix 2

Commentary on the HBC Draft Homes for Local People Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

- Hampsthwaite is included in the Sub-Area for Lower Nidderdale Villages used in the analysis the Strategic Housing Market Assessment in 2011
- The Lower Nidderdale Villages Sub-Area comprised 9 villages :
 - Birstwith
 - Bishop Thornton
 - Clint cum Hamlets
 - Felliscliffe
 - Hampsthwaite
 - Killinghall
 - Nidd
 - Ripley
 - part of Saltergate Ward
- The Harrogate District SHMA in 2011 predicted an annual need for 19 affordable homes in this sub-area

Commentary:

1. 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?
2. Affordable homes have been provided on the St Thomas a'Becket development and most recently, 11 affordable homes were built at Cruet Fold
3. 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.
4. 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

Hampsthwaite Parish Council : Appendix 3

Commentary on the HBC Sustainability Appraisal Report

Appendix 5a(i): Askwith - Hampsthwaite

RL1141 and RL1141(1) : Land adjacent to Brookfield, Hampsthwaite

SA Objective 1 - Quality housing available to everyone

- Will it make housing available to people in need?

Commentary:

1. There is no proven need for this number of additional houses
2. Currently there are 22 houses for sale in Hampsthwaite (*and more are known about locally*)
3. Affordable homes have been provided on the St Thomas a'Becket development and most recently, 11 affordable homes were built at Cruet Fold
4. a 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.
5. 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

SA Objective 4 - Vibrant communities which participate in decision making

- Will it reduce the potential for social isolation with particular regard to disadvantaged groups?

Commentary:

1. The community is already vibrant and well-balanced
2. Hampsthwaite is already well served in terms of affordable housing - as described in SA 1
3. The existing footpath across this site is impassable for wheelchairs and pushchairs and does not give direct access to village centre amenities
4. 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.
5. For some 30 years, the overwhelming majority of Hampsthwaite residents have participated by voicing their opposition to any large scale development on this site.

SA Objective 5 - Culture, leisure and recreation activities available to all

- Will it increase availability and accessibility of culture/leisure/recreation activities/venues

Commentary:

1. The site is too sloping, rock strewn and too far from the main village recreation centres to be a sensible option for most sporting activities

SA Objective 6 - Local needs met locally

- Will it ensure that everyone has access to essential services & resources within reasonable non-car based travelling distance?

Commentary:

1. The existing footpath across this site is impassable for wheelchairs and pushchairs and does not give direct access to village centre amenities
2. 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
3. The local bus service is inadequate

SA Objective 8 - Bio-diverse and attractive natural environment

- Will it contribute to local distinctiveness and countryside character?

Commentary:

1. No, quite the opposite. HBC's own evidence to the 1990 Appeal by Victor Homes to build 29 homes on this same site 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."*
2. This danger of 'creeping urbanisation' is now intensified because of the DPD proposals for development North of Skipton Road (H3021(1)) and Pennypot Lane (H3(1)), is likely to result in more housing between Hampsthwaite and Harrogate and will threaten Hampsthwaite's continued existence as a village community.

SA Objective 10 - A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impacts

- Will it increase access to key resources and services by means other than the car?

Commentary:

1. The existing footpath across this site is impassable for wheelchairs and pushchairs and does not give direct access to village centre amenities
2. 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
3. The local bus service is inadequate

- Will it increase congestion on the road/rail network?

Commentary:

1. this is one of the least accessible of all the sites considered because:
 - a. all traffic to this site would have to be funnelled through an existing bad junction between Brookfield and Hollins Lane
 - b. 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

- Will it increase provision of public transport where needed?

Commentary:

1. No - it will increase pressure on an existing poor service thus making it worse

- Will it improve the existing provision of cycleways and footpaths?

Commentary:

1. The existing footpath is completely unsuitable for wheelchair and push chair users and provides no direct access to the village centre.
2. 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

SA Objective 11 - Minimise greenhouse gas emissions and a managed response to climate change?

- Will it reduce the risk of flooding

Commentary:

1. No - the clue is in the name, 'Brookfield'!
2. The village drainage systems are regularly overwhelmed by excessive rainwater running off this hillside - see <http://www.hampsthwaite.org.uk/351>
3. 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

SA Objective 13 - Protect and enhance the historic environment

- Will it conserve the character of historic settlements and conservation areas?

Commentary:

1. No - quite the opposite - The Tay Homes Appeal Judgement to develop 65 dwellings on this same site stated *"I have reached the conclusion that there is no clear evidence of an existing Council commitment to this proposal, the relevant planning policies militate against the kind of development proposed, and that the proposal would be **detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and general environment of Hampsthwaite**"* and in response to an application by Victor Homes to build just 29 homes on this site in 1990, HBC stated *"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"*.

SA Objective 14 - A quality built environment and efficient land use patterns, that make good use of derelict sites, minimise travel and promote balanced development

- Will it promote the development of communities with accessible services, employment and leisure facilities?
- Will it ensure new developments provide essential services accessible without use of a car and are accessible by public transport

Commentary:

1. No - on the contrary - The existing footpath across this site is impassable for wheelchairs and pushchairs and does not give direct access to village centre amenities
2. 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
3. The local bus service is inadequate

SA Objective 16 - Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment

Commentary:

1. HBC declined to comment on accessibility in SA 14 on the grounds that it would lead to double counting yet the affordable housing argument is repeated 4 times even though HBC's own figures show this would result in a disproportionate amount allocated to Hampsthwaite in the Lower Nidderdale sub-area of 9 villages for 19 per year – see Draft Homes for Local People SPD at http://www.harrogate.gov.uk/plan/Documents/Planning%20Policy/Publication%20Consultation/DS-P-LP_HLP-SPD.pdf
2. This demonstrates a distinct bias by HBC to build on this site regardless of local opinion and renders the entire Appraisal Statement invalid as an objective exercise

Hampsthwaite Parish Council : Appendix 4

Commentary on the HBC Consultation Statement

1.0 Introduction

Quotes:

- “1.1 The planning system requires Local Planning Authorities to involve the wider community including stakeholders at an early stage in preparing Local Plans in order to achieve local ownership of and legitimacy for its policies and proposals”
- “1.3 work done under the previous Regulations is still valid”
- “7.8 RL3036 Hampsthwaite Preferred Option - Sufficient flexibility in meeting the dwelling requirement for the villages and countryside at the preferred options stage to mean that the boundary of this site could be amended to reduce the site size in response to concerns raised at the scale of proposed growth”

Commentary:

1. In 2010 Hampsthwaite Parish Council represented residents’ overwhelming opposition to the proposal to build 100 dwellings on Land South of Brookfield (RL3036)
2. RL3036 (comprising RL1141 and RL1141(1)) included the current RL3036(1) plus other land parcels to the south east (i.e. mainly comprising RL2061)
3. In the face of strong local opposition HBC indicate they have reduced the number of houses proposed BUT they have done this by singling out the most contentious site and proposing to build only on that site – this is a disingenuous and cynical manoeuvre on the part of HBC
4. RL3036(1) is the most contentious because access to it requires all cars to be funnelled through an existing poor junction between Brookfield and Hollins Lane, then can only access the site after driving through what are effectively ‘play streets’ on the residential Brookfield estate
5. HBC’s continued insistence to include RL1141 against strong local opposition paves the way for development too far up the contours to the south to the detriment of the distinctive character of Hampsthwaite as a village settlement nestling in the Nidd Valley.
6. The name “*Thwaite*” comes from the Old Scandinavian word *thveit*, meaning ‘*clearing, meadow or paddock*’. The proposal to build on the rising landscape to the south of the village will adversely change the skyline, increase light pollution and harm the identity of Hampsthwaite not only physically, but literally.
7. 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.
8. 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.*”
9. In 1984, the Tay Homes Appeal Judgement to develop 65 dwellings on this same site stated “*I have reached the conclusion that there is no clear evidence of an existing Council commitment to this proposal, the relevant planning policies militate against the kind of development proposed, and that the proposal would be **detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and general environment of Hampsthwaite***” and in response to an application by Victor Homes to build just 29 homes on this site in 1990, HBC stated “*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".

10. 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>
11. 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

8.0 Conclusion

Quote:

8.1 "The Council considers that it has carried out comprehensive consultation exercises . . . "

Commentary:

1. But HBC has ignored not only the views of residents expressed consistently over the past 30 years or more and has contradicted its own previous statements with regard to this site made in 1984 and 1990.
2. The claim by HBC that they have responded 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.

Hampsthwaite Parish Council : Appendix 5

Commentary on the HBC Duty to Co-operate Statement

APPENDIX 1

Quote:

- "the provision of infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat);"

Commentary:

1. Hampsthwaite is poorly serviced by public transport:
 - a. 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 £6.20 per person for a return ticket covering just the 5 mile route to Harrogate.
 - b. this service was further reduced by removing the winter Sunday and Bank Holiday runs between all villages on route from Harrogate to Pateley Bridge.
 - c. 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.
2. The village drainage systems are regularly overwhelmed by excessive rainwater running off this hillside - see <http://www.hampsthwaite.org.uk/351>
3. 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'!

Quote:

- "climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape."

Commentary:

1. In 1984, the Tay Homes Appeal Judgement to develop 65 dwellings on this same site stated *"I have reached the conclusion that there is no clear evidence of an existing Council commitment to this proposal, the relevant planning policies militate against the kind of development proposed, and that the proposal would be **detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and general environment of Hampsthwaite**"* and in response to an application by Victor Homes to build just 29 homes on this site in 1990, HBC stated *"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"*.

Quote:

- "The Core Strategy makes clear that there will be no changes to the Green Belt boundary (Policy EQ3)"

Commentary:

1. 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."*

2. 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.

Quote:

- "Ensure that development is planned alongside infrastructure (NYCC)"

Commentary:

1. See commentary on poor public transport provision above
2. Local primary school is already over-subscribed

Hampsthwaite Parish Council : Appendix 6

Commentary on the National Planning Policy Framework

Ministerial foreword by Rt Hon Greg Clark MP Minister for Planning

Quotes:

1. *"Sustainable means ensuring that better lives for ourselves don't mean worse lives for future generations."*
2. *"Our natural environment is essential to our wellbeing, and it can be better looked after than it has been. Habitats that have been degraded can be restored . . . Green Belt land that has been depleted of diversity can be refilled by nature – and opened to people to experience it, to the benefit of body and soul . . . Our historic environment – buildings, landscapes, towns and villages – can better be cherished if their spirit of place thrives, rather than withers"*
3. *"This should be a collective enterprise. Yet, in recent years, planning has tended to exclude, rather than to include, people and communities. In part, this has been a result of targets being imposed, and decisions taken, by bodies remote from them . . . Dismantling the unaccountable regional apparatus and introducing neighbourhood planning addresses this"*
4. *"In part, people have been put off from getting involved because planning policy itself has become so elaborate and forbidding – the preserve of specialists, rather than people in communities."*

Commentary:

1. Hampsthwaite residents are insistent that we remain a village discrete from any creeping urbanisation from nearby Harrogate. It is noted that 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.
2. The Tay Homes Appeal Judgement to develop 65 dwellings on this same site stated *"I have reached the conclusion that there is no clear evidence of an existing Council commitment to this proposal, the relevant planning policies militate against the kind of development proposed, and that the proposal would be **detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and general environment of Hampsthwaite**"* and in response to an application by Victor Homes to build just 29 homes on this site in 1990, HBC stated *"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"*.
3. On 20th Oct 2010 at a Public Meeting, residents made their opposition to the HBC scheme very clear with no votes for the proposal as it stands and an overwhelming majority voting in favour of no further development at all and 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 www.hampsthwaite.org.uk/ParishPlan/planindex.html.

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

4. The Public Consultation Response Form is generally considered to be too rigid and phrased in legalistic terms, thus rendering it too confusing for most residents to be able to complete accurately.
5. The HBC Consultation exercise had been conducted principally online thus disenfranchising many people in rural communities who do not have internet access (estimated to be 25%) or have only limited access to the internet as a result of the poor connectivity in these areas.

Introduction

Quotes:

"1. National Planning Policy Framework . . . provides a framework within which local people and their accountable councils can produce their own distinctive local and neighbourhood plans, which reflect the needs and priorities of their communities."

Commentary:

- Following 30 years of opposition, previously supported by HBC(!), to building on this particular site, the overwhelming view of the vast majority of residents continues to oppose any large development - see the results of our latest Housing Survey at http://www.hampsthwaite.org.uk/get.html?_Action=GetFile&_Key=Data5811&_Id=582&_Wizard=0&_DontCache=1370588692&TinyMCE=1

Achieving sustainable development

Quote:

"Resolution 42/187 of the United Nations General Assembly defined sustainable development as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs."

Commentary:

- This proposal has been rejected on two previous occasions. In 1984, the Appeal Judgement stated: *" . . .the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and to the general environment of Hampsthwaite"*
- This view was revisited by 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."*
- 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?
- The name *"Thwaite"* comes from the Old Scandinavian word *thveit*, meaning *'clearing, meadow or paddock'*. The proposal to build on the rising landscape to the south of the village will adversely change the skyline, increase light pollution and harm the identity of Hampsthwaite not only physically, but literally.

Quote:

"7. a social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities . . . with accessible local services. . ."

Commentary:

- There have been repeated applications to build over the original farm gate access to this site thus precluding any direct access for wheelchair and pushchair users to the village centre and

its services. The existing footpath running along the top of the site is not direct and is impassable for wheelchairs and pushchairs.

Quote:

"7. an environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment"

Commentary:

- 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."*

Quote:

10. "Plans and decisions need to take local circumstances into account"

Commentary:

- 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 www.hampsthwaite.org.uk/ParishPlan/planindex.html
- It is clear from the views expressed at local public meetings in October 2011 and responses to our own subsequent Housing Survey in November 2011 other than perhaps a maximum of 20 new homes in small-scale scattered developments as has been the case up until now.

Core planning principles

Quote:

"17 planning should: be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings"

Commentary:

- Local people have made clear their views on how to shape their surrounding for the past 30 years - most recently in the Parish Council Response to the LDF proposals in 2010 (see http://www.hampsthwaite.org.uk/get.html?_Action=GetFile&_Key=Data5795&_Id=582&_Wizard=0&_DontCache=1370437070&TinyMCE=1) and their own Housing Survey in November 2011 (see http://www.hampsthwaite.org.uk/get.html?_Action=GetFile&_Key=Data5811&_Id=582&_Wizard=0&_DontCache=1370588692&TinyMCE=1)

Quotes:

"17 planning should: take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the Green Belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it"

"Allocations of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value"

Commentary:

- Hampsthwaite residents are insistent that we remain a village discrete from any creeping urbanisation from nearby Harrogate. It is noted that 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.
- 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."

Quote:

"17 planning should: actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling,"

Commentary:

- There have been repeated applications to build over the original farm gate access to this site thus precluding any direct access for wheelchair and pushchair users to the village centre and its services. The existing footpath running along the top of the site is not direct and is impassable for wheelchairs and pushchairs.

4. Promoting sustainable transport

Quotes:

"32. safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people"

"35. give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements". . . "create safe and secure layouts which minimise conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians". . . "consider the needs of people with disabilities by all modes of transport"

Commentary:

- this is one of the least accessible of all the sites considered in that 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 thus endangering children.
- There have been repeated applications to build over the original farm gate access to this site thus precluding any direct access for wheelchair and pushchair users to the village centre and its services. The existing footpath running along the top of the site is not direct and is impassable for wheelchairs and pushchairs.

6. Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes

Quotes:

"for market and affordable housing, illustrate the expected rate of housing delivery through a housing trajectory for the plan period and set out a housing implementation strategy for the full range of housing describing how they will maintain delivery of a five-year supply of housing land to meet their housing target"

Commentary:

- Affordable homes have been provided on the St Thomas a'Becket development and most recently, 11 affordable homes were built at Cruet Fold
- a 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

8. Promoting healthy communities

Quotes:

"69. safe and accessible developments, containing clear and legible pedestrian routes,"

"75 Planning policies should protect and enhance public rights of way and access.

"Local authorities should seek opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks including National Trails."

Commentary:

- There have been repeated applications to build over the original farm gate access to this site thus precluding any direct access for wheelchair and pushchair users to the village centre and its services.
- The existing footpath is completely unsuitable for wheelchair and push chair users and provides no direct access to the village centre

9. Protecting Green Belt land

Quotes:

"79. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence."

80. Green Belt serves five purposes

"to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment"

84. "When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. They should consider the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary."

Commentary:

- Hampsthwaite residents are insistent that we remain a village discrete from any creeping urbanisation from nearby Harrogate. It is noted that 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.
- 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."*

10. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Quote:

"103. When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere"

Commentary:

- 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.
- 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!

11. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Quotes:

"109. The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: protecting and enhancing valued landscapes"

Commentary:

- 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."*

12. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Quotes:

"126. local planning authorities should take into account . . . the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness"

Commentary:

- 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."*

Plan-making

Local Plans

Quote:

"155. Early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations and businesses is essential. A wide section of the community should be proactively engaged, so that Local Plans, as far as possible, reflect a collective vision and a set of agreed priorities for the sustainable development of the area, including those contained in any neighbourhood plans that have been made"

Commentary:

- Local people have made clear their objections to development on this scale and on this site for the past 30 years - most recently in the Parish Council Response to the LDF proposals in 2010 (see http://www.hampsthwaite.org.uk/get.html?_Action=GetFile&_Key=Data5795&_Id=582&_Wizard=0&_DontCache=1370437070&TinyMCE=1) and their own Housing Survey in November 2011 (see http://www.hampsthwaite.org.uk/get.html?_Action=GetFile&_Key=Data5811&_Id=582&_Wizard=0&_DontCache=1370588692&TinyMCE=1)
- 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 www.hampsthwaite.org.uk/ParishPlan/planindex.html
- It is clear from the views expressed at local public meetings in October 2011 and responses to our own subsequent Housing Survey in November 2011 other than perhaps a maximum of 20 new homes in small scale scattered developments as has been the case up until now.

Using a proportionate evidence base

Housing

Quote:

"159. Local planning authorities should have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area"

Commentary:

- There is no proven need for this number of houses in Hampsthwaite since at present there are 22 for sale (plus others which are known about locally) and the Cruet Fold development alone has met our Affordable Housing need

Ensuring viability and deliverability

Quote:

“173. Plans should be deliverable”

Commentary:

- After 30 years of vigorous opposition to development on this scale and on this site it must be expected that residents of Hampsthwaite will continue to object in the strongest possible terms to any future planning application associated with this site.
- This may result in costly appeals which cannot be considered good use of tax payers money.

Appendix 7 : Comparisons between Harrogate Borough Councils Core Strategy (adopted 2009)and Harrogate District Sites and Policies DPD (currently the subject of consultation)

Core Strategy	Sites and Policies DPD
<p>Settlement growth Core Objectives</p> <p>Objective 1 – To distribute the District’s housing development broadly in proportion to each settlement’s or area’s need for affordable housing (Policies SG1/SG2)</p>	<p>The proposal is for 56 new homes, 50% of which are to be affordable. In recent years there has been considerable development in Hampsthwaite</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 19 houses on St Thomas a Becket walk (8 of which are affordable) - 10 affordable homes on Cruet Fold - 11 houses Dawson’s Court/Dale Close <p>There are currently 23 properties for sale in the village with prices ranging from £174,950 - £1.1million</p> <p>A housing survey carried out in 2006 identified the need for 10 – 12 two and three bedroom dwellings /affordable homes this need has been more than met with the recent developments.</p>
<p>Objective 2 – To seek the use of appropriate previously developed land within the District’s six largest settlements in preference to developing greenfield land (policies SG1/SG\$)</p>	<p>The area to the south of Brookfield that Harrogate Borough Council are seeking to include in the DPD is currently greenfield agricultural pasture land. Development on this site would expand the development area of the village and take away significant areas of open countryside contrary to the spatial vision and headline outcomes of the RSS and Policy H2/B1 which requires local planning authorities to prioritise housing development on previously developed brownfield land and through conversions of existing buildings.</p>
<p>Objective 3 – Subject to the provision of appropriate traffic management and new infrastructure, to focus the District’s growth in the town of Harrogate</p> <p>This paragraph from the Core Strategy acknowledges the fact that due to the popularity of Harrogate as a tourist destination and the range of jobs, schools etc means “these roles combined with high car ownership and limited road capacity, bring with them problems of traffic congestion”</p>	<p>The proposed site for 56 houses to the south of Hampsthwaite could potentially show an increase of 112+ cars accessing or egressing the village during peak hours. Many of these vehicles would need to access Harrogate for the jobs and services provided there. The way into Harrogate from Hampsthwaite is via the notoriously congested Ripon and Skipton Roads. The Skipton road has recently been identified as No2 in the Top 10 most congested roads in the UK outside London, with an average journey speed of 1.5mph.</p> <p>In the ‘Preferred Options Sites – Hampsthwaite’ Document under Traffic issues – the statement “Access can be made to the ‘Brookfield’ estate on either Brookfield, Brookfield Garth or Brookfield Crescent’ this statement is misleading as it fails to identify that the only ways to gain access/ egress to ‘Brookfield’ is via the junctions of Dale Close and Hollins Lane. Most of the traffic uses the Brookfield/Hollins Lane junction which is closer to Harrogate. The visibility at both junctions is below standard which can give rise to potential accident situations, particularly at the Brookfield junction where vehicles approaching along Hollins Lane enter the village</p>

<p>on a downhill length of road. Trips generated by the proposed development would have to use the same junctions, increasing forecast traffic flows on Brookfield which in turn would raise the accident potential without necessary junction improvements. In addition Hollins Lane, and other roads in the village are in a constant state of disrepair, an increase in traffic flow would only serve to cause additional damage to roads that NYCC are unable to maintain. In the objection to the Tay Homes application for development of 65 homes on this site in 1984 the inspector states “<i>the centre of the village is smallI believe that the possible addition of not only 150 - 200 people but also the additional vehicular traffic generated by this increase would impose a social and physical strain on the village and would have a seriously adverse effect on the environment in the centre of Hampsthwaite and on the surrounding roads</i>” Nothing physically has changed since then, the centre of the village is still small, but the number of cars has increased over the past 30 years in line with increased car ownership and the need to travel further afield for schooling etc.</p>	
<p>As demonstrated in objective 1 – the needs of local people have been met by extensive development in Hampsthwaite over recent years. The village cannot go on absorbing developments on the scale proposed. There are currently 23 houses on the open market in Hampsthwaite.</p> <p>Hampsthwaite has been categorised in the Core Strategy as a Group B settlement ie “villages that have the best access to jobs, shops and services by non car modes of transport” Page 18 Para 3.27</p> <p>In fact Hampsthwaite is a rural village with poor transport links with Harrogate. The roads from Hampsthwaite to the A59, which is the main approach road to Harrogate from the west, are country roads in poor condition. They are unlit. There are no continuous footpaths or cycle paths in to Harrogate. There is no local railway and the bus service is infrequent and will be further cut at the end of June 2013. With the current timetable it would be very difficult to access jobs or leisure services. The cost of a return journey would be prohibitive for many. For example for a family of four to make a return journey from Hampsthwaite to Harrogate by bus, a return distance of 8 miles, it would cost £23.30 (£7 per adult and £4.65 per child)</p>	<p>Objective 4 – To ensure that Ripon, Knaresborough, Boroughbridge , Masham and Pateley Bridge are the main focus for housing, developing local services and employment in the rest of the District</p> <p>Objective 5 – To provide small scale housing growth in the District’s smaller settlements, mainly to meet local needs and support local services whilst minimising travel to work by car.</p>
<p>Identification of the proposed site for development has been vigorously opposed for</p>	<p>Objective 6 – To manage the release of land for housing to prioritise the use of previously developed land and control the pattern and speed of growth in general</p> <p>Objective 7 – To protect the countryside and Green Belt from inappropriate</p>

development.

over 30 years. In fact Harrogate Borough Council has itself been opposed to development on this site until now. The reasons for opposition are still valid. The Rule 6 statement on behalf of the local Planning Authority to a planning appeal by Victor Homes for development of 29 dwellings in 1990 contains the following statements

- “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 site will cause harm to the character of the village and its landscape setting”
 - “the development will also diminish the amenities of residents living in the areas to the west, north and east of the site and diminish the rural character and hence the public’s enjoyment of the public footpath which lies to the south”
 - “with regard to the environment the inspector did not consider that this extensive area of pasture land can be regarded as a pocket of land within the development limits of the village”
 - “the proposed development would result in the extension and consolidation of estate development into open pasture land to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area and to the general environment of Hampsthwaite”
 - “... development on this scale would adversely affect the character of Hampsthwaite”
 - “the proposal would be detrimental to the amenities of the area”
- Permission for the allocation of this site for development was refused.

I conclude that the DPD for the Hampsthwaite site is unsound since it does not meet the objectives set in Harrogate Borough Councils Core Strategy:

- The proposed area is not a Brownfield site
- There are woeful public transport links and costs are extortionate for an 8 mile return journey – therefore any travel to work, shops or leisure would rely on car usage
- The site proposed is sensitive in terms of landscape, visual amenity and biodiversity
- Development on the scale proposed is totally inappropriate in comparison to other sites in the main urban areas
- Inconsistent approach to the appraisal of site options
- Despite a 30 year history of valid opposition to development of this site, supported on appeal by the Inspector with reasons that are still valid today, Harrogate Borough council, for this exercise, have completely ignored the history and continuing views of the residents of Hampsthwaite
- Harrogate Borough Council have done a complete u-turn as in the past they have vigorously opposed development