

Harrogate District Sites and Policies Development Planning Document (DPD)

Publication Consultation Representation Form:

This form has two parts:

Part A Personal Details and **Part B** Your Representation

Please read the guidance notes overleaf carefully **before** completing the form.
 Because of the information required by the Inspector appointed to carry out the Public Examination of the Sites and Policies DPD, **representations must be submitted on this form.**
 Please copy and fill a separate Part B for each issue/representation you wish to make.
 Any additional sheets must be clearly referenced. If hand writing, please use BLOCK CAPITALS in blue or black ink.

OFFICE USE ONLY
 Customer ref:

 Date ack:

Part A

(please complete in full, representations must be attributable to named individuals or organisations at a postal address).

1. Personal Details	2. Agent's Details (if applicable)
Title	
First Name	
Last Name	
Job Title <small>(where relevant)</small>	
Organisation <small>(where relevant)</small>	
Address – line 1	
Address – line 2	
Address – line 3	
Address – line 4	
Address – line 5	
Postcode	
E-mail Address	
Telephone Number	

**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.**

NOTES:

We are now advised that written responses will also be considered by HBC Planners and put before the Inspector but there can be no guarantee he will read them

To play 'safe' you may wish to make just a brief outline response on this form but attach an update of your more complete written response as an additional sheets which you reference

The Parish Council will make a response following the meeting on Tuesday 18th June but this does not preclude individuals also making their own response.

Any response which are placed in the Post office before 1.00am on Friday will be collected by a member of the Parish Council and taken to the council offices

Response can be emailed back which may help as the deadline approaches in that it is quicker and you can ask for an electronic receipt

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.**

NOTES:

Most key documents, many of them stripped of non-Hampsthwaite details, have now been posted on our web site at <http://www.hampsthwaite.org.uk/parishcouncil/582>

Each document is accompanied by a Commentary of points you wish to make note of.

The Commentaries are biased in that they are made in the context of the current Parish Council position of objecting to the proposals

If this is not your view then you may need to read the documents themselves to help you form your own arguments.

We are now advised that written responses may also be considered so, bearing in mind that we are told previous responses don't count, you may wish simply to update and resubmit what you sent in last time.

To play 'safe' you should make a brief outline response on this form but attach your more complete written response as an additional sheet which you reference.

The Parish Council will make a response following the meeting on Tuesday 18th June but this does not preclude individuals also making their own response.

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>

On the basis of the points raised in these Commentaries, we take the view that the proposal is not legally compliant because: there is no proven need, access is poor, it will harm the distinctive character of Hampsthwaite and its rural setting, and it fails to take into account 30 years of vigorous local objection - hitherto supported by HBC itself!

Parish Council Commentary on the National Planning Policy Framework has now been posted on our web site at <http://www.hampsthwaite.org.uk/parishcouncil/582>

On the basis of the points raised in this Commentary, we take the view that the proposal is not sound because it ignores 30 years of local opposition to large-scale development on this site, it makes no contribution to sustainable non-car transport, together with proposals for north of Skipton Road and Pennypot it encourages urban sprawl between Hampsthwaite and Harrogate and, to quote HBC in 1990 development on this site "*will cause harm to the character of the village and its landscape setting.*"

It would make quite a statement if everyone expressed a wish to be present at the hearing!

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

Name/Organisation:

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.**

NOTES:

These are the page and map references for Hampsthwaite in the Sites and Policies DPD Document - see <http://www.harrogate.gov.uk/plan/Pages/Sites-and-Policies-DPD.aspx>

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 : Parish Council Commentary on the HBC Consultation Statement]

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

On the basis of the points raised in these Commentaries, we take the view that the proposal is **not legally compliant** because: there is no proven need, access is poor, it will harm the distinctive character of Hampsthwaite and its rural setting, and it fails to take into account 30 years of vigorous local objection - hitherto supported by HBC itself!

Parish Council Commentary on the National Planning Policy Framework has now been posted on our web site at <http://www.hampsthwaite.org.uk/parishcouncil/582>

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

On the basis of the points raised in this Commentary, we take the view that the proposal is **not sound** because it ignores 30 years of local opposition to large-scale development on this site, it makes no contribution to sustainable non-car transport, together with proposals for north of Skipton Road and Pennypot it encourages urban sprawl between Hampsthwaite and Harrogate and, to quote HBC in 1990 development on this site "will cause harm to the character of the village and its landscape setting."

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; 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 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]

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.

NOTES:

**The HBC Sustainability Appraisal (SA) asks if the proposal will make housing available to people in need and especially disadvantaged groups (SA1 and SA4).
The HBC Consultation Statement requires local ownership of what is required and the Duty to Co-operate alludes to the need to protect green spaces between settlements**

There is no proven need for this number of additional houses on this site. 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 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. Finally, 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.

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

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 same 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"*.

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

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.

NOTES:

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."*

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.

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

The Ministerial foreword to the National Planning Framework by Rt Hon Greg Clark MP Minister for Planning defines sustainable as "ensuring that better lives for ourselves don't mean worse lives for future generations" It further states that our "natural environment is essential to our well-being" and planning should be "should be a collective enterprise".

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 other than perhaps a maximum of 20 new homes in small scale scattered developments - as has been the case up until now.

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]

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.

NOTES:

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
- 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.

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.

NOTES:

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.

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

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

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.

NOTES:

- 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 - i.e. in excess of £20 for an average family.

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!

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.

NOTES:

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:

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:

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.



NOTES:

We advise that everyone ticks the box to appear - this would make quite a statement!

We wish to have the opportunity to clarify any points of details that may emerge

The Parish Council will submit a response on behalf on the community but you may also consider if you wish to make an individual response.

Our advice is that the more responses there are : the greater the impact (regardless of the statement otherwise at the top of this form).