

PARISH of INGLEBY ARNCLIFFE

NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR 2018-2035

CONSULTATION STATEMENT



**Produced by the Neighbourhood
Development Plan Steering Group
on behalf of Ingleby Arncliffe Parish
Council**

CONSULTATION STATEMENT

1. INTRODUCTION

This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012. Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the Regulations sets out what a Consultation Statement should contain, which is:

- a) details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan.
- b) an explanation of how and when they were consulted.
- c) a summary of the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted.
- d) Description of how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan (NP). All abbreviations listed in Appendix 1

2. BACKGROUND TO THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

The Parish Community Plan (CP) was completed and published in August 2013. The CP contained a number of Community Action Points that resulted from a survey of ways to improve the life of residents in the parish. Four of these recognised as not being within the power of the Parish Council (PC) by itself to resolve and two remain outstanding. These are:

- Action to reduce vehicle speeding in the Parish.
- Action to provide for the housing needs of the residents as identified in a number of Housing Needs surveys (HNS).

Most solutions to address speeding were not possible for the PC to achieve but a Community Speed Watch programme is currently being undertaken to deter drivers from speeding down Cross Lane.

The housing need of residents were not being met. There was no Affordable Housing (AH); a lack of modest sized dwellings for young people to buy or rent; and no small bungalows to enable the elderly to downsize while remaining within the community.

The need for specific extra housing had gone unresolved for many years as Ingleby Arncliffe/Ingleby Cross was designated a “secondary village” by Hambleton District Council (HDC) with a Development Boundary restricting any new housing to infill plots. Part of the parish lies within the North York Moors National Park (NYMNP) and in 2008 was not considered to be part of their development hierarchy.

Residents were notified in the December 2011 Parish Newsletter that the results of the 2011 HNS would be discussed by the PC and Rural Housing Enabler (RHE) on 12th December 2011. An Affordable HNS in November 2013 confirmed the AH need but no undeveloped land remained within the existing boundary for those houses to be built. The PC was advised that drawing up a NP would provide a framework for the allocation of land to meet identified development needs.

Between 2012 and 2014, the PC, assisted by the RHE for Hambleton, searched for a site to build a small number of affordable houses in the village. However, the CP had shown that the real wish of the community was for a development of both open market and affordable houses **on the same site**, so the attention moved to this “mixed housing scheme” as the primary objective of the proposed NP.

The PC took the decision to produce a NP on 27th March 2013 following a proposal by the Chair of the Community Plan Steering Group (SG). The two local planning authorities, HDC and the NYMNP, were informed of the PC’s intention to produce a NP. In June 2014 the formal Area Designation for the NP was submitted, comprising all land within the parish boundary. This was approved by the two planning authorities in September 2014 and October 2014. Documents can be accessed by the following links:

<https://www.inglebyarncliffe.org.uk/designation-of-the-neighbourhood-plan.html>

<https://www.inglebyarncliffe.org.uk/supporting-documents.html>

3. COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

Throughout the process, the community has been kept informed of progress and was consulted on both an informal and formal basis. The community includes both residents and businesses within the parish. Additionally, interested parties have been fully involved, including landowners and the relevant local planning authorities. This section describes the chronology of the informal consultation process. A copy of the minutes of the meetings referred to can be found on the NP website under the relevant years using the following link: <https://www.inglebyarncliffe.org.uk/the-neighbourhood-plan.html>

Consultation with LPAs

The Parish has two LPAs, HDC and NYMP. As most of the Parish’s area, population, and housing falls within the HDC side, HDC act as the lead authority in assisting with the NP. At each consultation stage both LPAs have been formally consulted, responses received, considered by the SG and where considered relevant, acted upon. In the Parish’s search for sites both LPA’s planning representatives were consulted and thorough the process, both LPA’s and particularly HDC in their role as lead authority have been helpful and supportive to the planning process. Although the HDC’s preparation of its own Local Plan has at times place pressure on HDC’s role with the Parish.

Additional Communications with the Community

In addition to regular meetings and events, the SG has engaged the community in many aspects of the NP process through a variety of different ways, including:

- Sixteen PC Newsletters up to June 2020 including updates on progress of the NP.
- Four HNS in 2011 (46% response), 2013 (An affordable housing survey only), 2016, (70% response), 2017 (An affordable housing survey only). Each HNS was conducted on a confidential basis with only the RHE being aware of the households interested in AH.
- Six meetings with village landowners in 2016 and 2017.
- A whole section of the parish website is devoted to the NP, providing a record of the meetings, activities and NP’s key documents <https://www.inglebyarncliffe.org.uk/the-neighbourhood-plan.html>. The pages are regularly updated.
- SG chair reports to the PC meetings and other items are made available for inclusion in the Local Press.
- No formal written consultations were carried out before the distribution of the Policy Intentions Consultation Draft NP but residents had the opportunity to ask questions at meetings of the PC and SG.
- The RHE has been invited and present at most of Open Meetings (OM).

- An Affordable Housing Need Consultation took place with a representative of the Beyond Housing Association (BHA) at the Drop-In Session in November 2019.

All meetings involving the community took place in the Village Hall (VH). Notification or Invitations to those meetings were printed on paper and hand-delivered to each household or posted to outlying remote homes. The date, time and subject of each meeting was stated on the leaflets. Whenever a PC meeting had the NP on its agenda, the residents were notified by email/paper copy, or by posting on the parish noticeboards.

2014

June. The two local planning authorities were informed of the PC's intentions to produce a NP, and an application was made for the formal Area Designation for a NP.

There was little activity between late 2014 until late 2015. This period of inaction came about as a result of the advice given by HDC. There was a warning given that the re-writing of their revised Local Plan could have an important impact on the housing proposals for our parish. Taking their advice, work on the NP was suspended. After about 9 months, when the new Local Plan was still not available, the decision was taken to resume work on the NP and form a SG.

September/October. The Area Designation (the whole of the parish) was approved by the two planning authorities of HDC and NYMNP.

19th November. The 1st Open Meeting (OM) for village residents took place to judge the continued level of support for new housing in the community. More people attended than at a regular PC meeting but the actual number was not recorded. The meeting outlined the objectives and the process for producing a NP. Comments made during the evening illustrated residents' concerns that **without** the protection of a NP, any developer might be able to build in the parish. Residents welcomed the fact that by having a **made** NP, the community would have a say in any future development.

2015

15th October. A consultation meeting took place at HDC offices with members of the PC seeking advice about grants and what help might be available from the District Council.

3rd December. The Chair of the SG reported to the PC that the HDC Local Plan would not be available for some months so applying for a grant to make progress with the NP should be delayed.

2016

11th April. A NP SG was formed of volunteers from the village community and members of the PC.

18th April. Terms of reference were drawn up and a copy is on the website with the link in Appendix 2. An up to date HNS was planned in conjunction with the RHE.

https://www.inglebyarncliffe.org.uk/uploads/7/4/8/9/74891323/parish_of_ingleby_arncliffe_neighbourhood_plan_-_terms_of_reference.pdf

14th July. The 2nd OM took place. Display boards illustrating the various stages in the process of drawing up a NP were arranged in the VH. Representatives from the SG, both local authorities and the RHE, were available to answer questions. 39 people attended during the evening. Questions were asked about

possible sites if a Housing Need was confirmed. Comments were made that residents didn't want an AH development to be built right on the edge of either village but would prefer a more inclusive approach. Photos in Appendix.

26th August. A full HNS was conducted. Questionnaires were distributed by hand to every household in the parish to be returned by this date.

26th September. SG discussed results of survey after analysis by HDC. An estimate of the land needed to accommodate the number of houses requested by the community was made and village landowners identified.

10th October. Results of meetings with the landowners discussed by SG. Four pieces of land were offered; two for early use and two for future use in 2027.

25th October. The Chair of the SG met with representatives of HDC and NYMNP for an update on the Hambleton Local Plan and to provide a progress report on our NP.

3rd November. SG Meeting asked the Chair to contact six landowners and give them forms for the "Call for Sites" exercise being carried out by HDC and NYMNP as part of their Local Plans revision.

The assessment of the sites by the authorities was not encouraging. A further request was made to local landowners which resulted in an extra site being offered for early use. Details of the various sites are set out in Appendix C of the NP.

2017

24th February. An OM took place to bring the community up to date with the results of the request for sites. 52 people attended. None of the sites offered for immediate use was a preferred site as concluded by HDC assessment following their Call for Sites. Presentations on the loss of village facilities and services over the preceding 20 years were given by members of the SG. Charts illustrating the change in village demographics and the resulting inadequate housing stock in the parish were displayed.

8th May. Members of the SG met with HDC and NYMNP planning departments to discuss cross boundary issues. It was made clear that only AH could be built on the Grain Store Site (Site 4, NP Appendix C)

1st June. A meeting was held with a representative from Broadacres Housing Association (BH) a local Housing Association.

18th September. The SG met again with BH personnel to assess the viability for AH to be built on the NYMNP Grain Store site.

On-going throughout. The two sites offered for early use were evaluated as possible locations for the proposed "mixed" housing scheme resulting from the 2016 HNS. Assistance was provided by BH, who evaluated the economics of the scheme for 20 units, which included 50%, 40% or 30% level of AH. The work demonstrated the difficulty, in economic terms, of including even 30% of AH. During 2017 the NYMNP re-stated the fact that the parish was "not within their Development Hierarchy" so the Grain Store (Site 4, NP Appendix C), offered for early use, could not be considered for the proposed mixed scheme, as it would not meet the strict criteria for housing within the NYMNP. Site 5, (NP Appendix C) the only other site available, would require a road closure so the SG needed to look for additional sites.

End of December. The village school, owned by the Diocese of York (DOY) closed due to the falling numbers of pupils. It was made clear that the DOY would consider the re-use of the school for an alternative educational or community use for the building and land. Members of the village community and others made strenuous efforts to find suitable business partners throughout the following year to no avail.

2018

05/11/2020

Parish of Ingleby Arncliffe Consultation Statement

Page 5 of 88

22nd January. A meeting between members of the SG and a representative of BH took place with the outcome that the Grain Store site was considered not economically viable.

14th March. The SG met with Policy Planning Managers from HDC and NYMNP, a local landowner and the RHE seeking advice on the conformity with the two planning authorities on putting forward the demand for new housing within the parish. The Grain Store was not a viable site for the number of houses needed. HDC rejected the one preferred site after their examination of the sites offered during the "Call for Sites" exercise, but agreed that the school site (Site 6, NP Appendix C) would be a possibility for the following reasons: good access; within the development boundary; had existing services; would have minimal impact on other village residents. A split site - using the school (Site 6) and Site 5, NP Appendix C) was suggested to accommodate the existing housing demand but was not acceptable to the SG. It would require a road closure and segregation of the AH to the edge of the village on an exception site.

15th May. The PC applied for the village school to be registered as an Asset of Community Value. The application proposed the use of the school site for a much-needed housing development supported by the latest HNS.

HDC refused the Asset registration application on the grounds that too few people would benefit. At the same time the PC became aware that the DOY had approached HDC to explore the possibility of selling the school site for development. The SG met with the DOY and registered an interest in the site as the ideal location for the new housing scheme. The school land is within the development boundary and could accommodate more than 50% of the number of houses proposed. Additional land behind the school, but owned by NYCC, would need to be acquired in order to build the whole mixed scheme.

19th July. A meeting took place with representatives of NYCC and members of the SG to bring them up to date with progress on the draft NP and in particular the idea of a mixed housing scheme to meet the needs of the community. NYCC had set up a development group, Brierley Homes (BR), who would look at the proposed scheme for the school site to assess its viability before contacting the DOY to discuss using the two sites as one.

31st August. GH and CW met with the Chancellor of the Exchequer (who is also the Parish Constituency MP) to make him aware of the intention of the NP and to enlist his help and support.

Between August and September. The RHE contacted Beyond Housing Association (BHA) - a housing association – managing social housing and retirement properties, to suggest the possibilities of a development on the school site and part of its playing field.

1st October. A letter was sent to Mr C.P. Director of Wharfedale Homes, referring to the school site opportunity. No interest shown.

16th October. GH and CW had talks with the Chancellor of the Exchequer - our Constituency MP) and a member of parliament with knowledge of NPs in rural communities at Portcullis House, London, to explain our parish's need for a mixed housing development.

18th October. PC and SG both wrote to DOY about the future of the site in anticipation of a DOY board meeting.

15th November. Further correspondence with BHA.

30th November. Residents were updated on progress with the NP at a well-attended OM (Photo Appendix 5). 51 residents were present and 36 apologies were given. Discussions about the former school site becoming an acceptable location for future housing. All the slide presentations are on the website. https://www.inglebyarncliffe.org.uk/uploads/7/4/8/9/74891323/full_presentation.pdf

2019

16th January. Members of the SG met with a representative of BHA, and an architect from BSBA architects and the RHE to discuss preliminary layouts and elevations for 18 houses. In addition to the school site, some adjacent land on the former school's playing field would be needed to accommodate them.

12th February. SG members met with a representative of the DOY to discuss offers received for the sale of the school site. A further meeting was held on 18th February with BR, the NYCC property company, to enquire about progress on the sale of the adjacent school playing field.

14th March. Residents at a well-attended OM heard the proposals for a mixed housing development from BHA. Their architect's drawings of a possible arrangement of houses on the school site were available to view.

31st March. A week after the closing date for Open Market offers to purchase the school site the SG was made aware that *BHA* was the preferred bidder.

1st May. A representative of BHA and the RHE met with NYCC to discuss use of the school site and playing field for housing.

13th August. The PC formally objected to the outline planning application, submitted to HDC by the DOY, for 4 Detached Houses on the school site, because the SG knew that BHA had entered into earnest negotiations with both the DOY and NYCC.

BHA had entered negotiations with NYCC to purchase the playing field but progress to come to an agreement was slow. A petition from residents stated a concern over the lack of new housing provision in the parish. It called upon NYCC to facilitate the housing project, as outlined in the draft NP, by the speedy sale of the former school playing field to BHA.

18th September. The petition was handed to the Leader of NYCC. 178 residents were offered an opportunity to sign the petition and 169 did so.

15th October. SG members visit a BHA site at Brotton.

17th October. SG members and a few village residents attended the HDC Planning Committee Meeting to hear the outcome of the DOY outline planning application. HDC Planning Committee voted to defer their decision on the application in order to allow discussion to take place between the village community and the DOY, to address the identified local housing needs.

9th November. PC Newsletter reported to residents that the prospective buyer of the school site and its playing field was BHA.

21st November. The Drop-In Public Consultation event, required as part of the formal planning application process, hosted by BHA attracted 79 residents. Comments from villagers on a possible arrangement of houses, suggested building design, landscaping, parking and services, were recorded by BHA.

Invitation <https://www.inglebyarncliffe.org.uk/uploads/7/4/8/9/74891323/invite.pdf>

In December 2019, consultation on the Regulation 14 version of the NP commenced to give an opportunity for the community, statutory consultees and interested parties to comment on the contents of the Draft NP.

2020

9th January. 4 SG members attended the HDC Planning Committee Meeting. Outline planning permission for housing on the school site was granted to the DOY, with a number of conditions.

Week beginning 21st January. NYCC Strategic Planning Team submitted a Section 77 application to the Dfe in respect of the former school playing field.

6th February. An OM with presentations by members of the SG was attended by 24 residents with 4 apologies. It was made clear that the NP had two aims. One was to protect the parish from unwelcome development and the second was to secure new housing according to need. A representative of BHA brought residents up to date. She showed drawings of possible housing styles and a suggested layout and answered residents' questions about surveys being carried out on the site. Residents were reminded of the importance of responding to the Section 14 Pre-Consultation response forms, and the date by which to return forms.

Invitation link: https://www.inglebyarncliffe.org.uk/uploads/7/4/8/9/74891323/invitation_06-02-20.pdf

Meeting summary here: https://www.inglebyarncliffe.org.uk/uploads/7/4/8/9/74891323/final_summary_060220_presentation.pdf

23rd March. Lockdown for Covid-19 announced by Government. No public meetings possible. SG continued to meet by Zoom with invitations to join the "virtual" meetings sent to residents.

4. CONSULTATION ON THE POLICY INTENTIONS CONSULTATION DRAFT

An initial version of the NP was prepared to set out the draft contents being considered for inclusion within the document. The purpose was to gauge opinion as to the breadth of topics to be covered within the NP.

The Policy Intentions version of the NP was hand delivered, posted or sent electronically on the 6th of December 2018 to all parish households, landowners and statutory consultees. All had the choice of responding by hard copy response form or by a web-based response form (hosted by HDC), and responses were sought by 19th January 2019. The maximum number of resident responses possible was 271 and it was pleasing to report that 109 responses were received. A summary and the individual (anonymised) responses of the 109 (40%) responses are available on the website, together with a blank form and responses returned by statutory consultees, together with details of how the draft plan was subsequently updated.

<https://www.inglebyarncliffe.org.uk/policy-intentions-consultation-draft-neighbourhood-plan.html>

5. STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT (SEA/HRA) SCREENING OPINION

A full description of the process for drafting the SEA/HRA is included within the document itself. Reference to the process has been included within this Statement for completeness and so as to make clear where it sits within the wider NP process. Directions Planning Consultancy undertook the screening process on behalf of the SG.

A copy of the Screening Report was sent in February 2019 to:

- HDC
- NYMNP
- Historic England

- English Nature
- Environment Agency

During the six-week consultation period, none of the Statutory Consultees raised any concerns or believed that the Plan needed to be subjected to a SEA or would impact on any European protected wildlife sites. As such, a Screening Determination statement was issued in August 2019, which included a copy of the comments received during the consultation period. A request was subsequently made to HDC and NYMNP for the statement to be published on their respective websites. It was adopted by the PC on 13th August.

https://www.inglebyarncliffe.org.uk/uploads/7/4/8/9/74891323/ingleby_arncliffe_pre-submission_ndp_screening_determination_040819.pdf

6. REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION

With reference to the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations (2012, as amended), consultation was undertaken on a Regulation 14 draft version of the NP.

Between 17th and 21st December 2019, consultation on the Regulation 14 version of the NP commenced with a view to providing a further opportunity for the community, statutory consultees and interested parties to comment on the contents of the NP. As with previous versions of the plan, all households were provided with a copy of the document, a response sheet and a map of the Parish, inviting comments from each member of the household aged 18 or older. The opportunity to respond electronically was once again possible thanks to the help of HDC. Additionally, the statutory consultees, local businesses and landowners were notified of the consultation and provided with a copy of the consultation document, a Parish area plan and response form, by either email or post. All comments were invited to be returned by midnight on February 20th 2020. A blank response form and summary of the 68 responses received and in addition those from statutory consultees is available here. <https://www.inglebyarncliffe.org.uk/regulation-14-pre-submission-consultation.html>. Following receipt of comments, a number of amendments were made to the NP in order to update the NP as a result of time moving on and also to address comments raised during the Regulation 14 consultation period. That document details the changes made to the Regulation 14 draft NP which lead into the Final NP being submitted to HDC.

The SG material changes in arriving at its final version of the Neighbourhood Plan submission document following Regulation 14 consultation are summarised below:

1. Policies

- a. The three main housing policies were rearranged so that policies P2 and P3 which together set out how any new housing development in the Parish should take place now precede the application of those policies to Site 6.
- b. It was felt that our residents may find the plan difficult to read, particularly because of the technical justification for each policy and there was a risk that residents would lose sight of why the policy was felt to be required. So, each policy now opens with an “intent” section which explains the context of the policy in relationship to the Parish’s Vision statement.
- c. Changes were made to the Design policy (P4) to incorporate submissions from North Yorkshire Police, bringing in the objective of planning for anti-crime measures and Natural England, in maintaining and where practical enhancing the Parish’s biodiversity.

2. Text and Appendices

- a. There were several responses which suggested that the pre-submission draft did not demonstrate adequate consideration of the Parish's medium- and longer-term housing needs. The text was amended as necessary to take into account those responses.
- b. The text was revised to incorporate additional references to the Parish two LPA's newly emerging local plans.
- c. Responses had raised questions of what steps can be taken to maximise the opportunity of any new Parish housing, being provided to Parish residents:
 - i. An indicative letting policy for Affordable housing is included now as an Appendix. This policy sets out any new Affordable housing will be allocated, emphasising the need and priority given to applicants with a local connection to the Parish.
 - ii. The text now includes an outline of the arrangements, BHA intends to make in its initial marketing of open market houses. Advertising initially restricted to the Parish will provide interested residents with the first opportunity to purchase the properties before they are advertised more widely.
- d. An Ordinance Survey map of Site 6 has now been included, showing how much of the playing field would be used for new housing build.

During the consultation period residents received invitations delivered by hand or by post to attend an OM on 6th February 2020. 24 residents attended and 4 gave their apologies. A summary of the meeting is on the website.

https://www.inglebyarncliffe.org.uk/uploads/7/4/8/9/74891323/final_summary_060220_presentation.pdf

7. HEALTHCHECK

The SG applied for technical assistance and availed themselves of submitting the draft Final NP, the draft Consultation Statement, and the draft Basic Conditions to a review by Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd. The outcome of the review was considered by the SG and where it was felt appropriate, changes were made to the SG's draft documents. The review along with a note of changes made to the draft documents are available athtml

APPENDICES:

- 1. Abbreviations used
- 2. SG Terms of Reference
- 3. Policy Intentions consultation results
- 4. Statutory Consultees contacted at each stage of the process
- 5. Photographs of Community Engagement
- 6. Regulation 14 Pre Submission consultation results

APPENDIX 1: ABBREVIATIONS

Community Plan	CP
Diocese of York	DOY
Parish Council	PC
Affordable Housing	AH
Rural Housing Enabler	RHE
Hambleton District Council	HDC
North York Moors National Park	NYMNP
Neighbourhood Plan	NP
North Yorkshire County Council	NYCC
Village Hall	VH
Steering Group	SG
Strategic Environmental and Habitats Regulations Assessment	SEA/HRA
Housing Needs Survey	HNS
Open Meeting	OM
Beyond Housing Association	BHA
Brierley Homes	BR
Broadacres Housing Association	BH
Local Planning Authority (ies)	LPA

APPENDIX 2: SG TERMS OF REFERENCE

https://www.inglebyarncliffe.org.uk/uploads/7/4/8/9/74891323/parish_of_ingleby_arncliffe_neighbourhood_plan_-_terms_of_reference.pdf

APPENDIX 3: POLICY INTENTIONS CONSULTATION RESULTS

<https://www.inglebyarncliffe.org.uk/policy-intentions-consultation-draft-neighbourhood-plan.html>

APPENDIX 4: LIST of STATUTORY CONSULTEES CONTACTED at EACH STAGE OF THE PROCESS

The NP Regulations (2012) includes a list of statutory consultees that are expected to be consulted at Regulation 14 stage. The PC referred to this same list at each consultation stage of the NP so as to ensure consultation was comprehensive and would be legally compliant. Any new consultees who expressed an interest at each stage were added to the list so they would be consulted at the subsequent phase.

British Gas

Civil Aviation Authority
County Councillor Bryn Griffiths
District Councillor David Hugill
East Harlsey Parish Council
Environment Agency
Hambleton District Council
Hambleton Richmondshire and Whitby Clinical Commissioning Group
Highways England
Historic England
Homes and Communities Agency (HCA)
Local Bus Service - Abbots of Leeming
Member of Parliament for Richmondshire, Chancellor of the Exchequer - Rishi Sunak M.P.
National Grid c/o Amec
Natural England
North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC)
North York Moors National Park Authority
North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service
Northumbrian Water LTD
Osmotherley Parish Council
Planning Inspectorate
Potto Parish Council
Sports England
The Blue Bell Inn
The Coal Authority
The Gardens Trust
The Joiner's Shop

The Rountons Parish Council
Whorlton Parish Council
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust

Landowners

M and D Atkinson
P and G Chapman
Diana Peacock
J and J Wright
North Yorkshire County Council
Diocese of York School Services

Local Businesses

H Atkinson & Sons (Ingleby) Ltd - Coach Company
Blue Bell Inn
Joiners Coffee Shop
The Tontine

Appendix 5:

PHOTOGRAPHS OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT



14/07/2016 Second Open Meeting
 The various stages in the process of drawing up a NP were explained.

Representatives from the SG, both local authorities and the RHE, were available to answer questions.

30/11/2018 Open Meeting

Discussions about the former school site becoming an acceptable location for future housing.

Displays charting progress of the NP and photographs of recent village events.

Representatives from the SG, HDC and the RHE, were available to answer questions.





18/09/2019

Residents, SG members and the County Councillor to the PC gathered at the school gate for the handing over of the petition to the Leader of NYCC.

A site visit of the playing field was also carried out.

**21/11/2019 Drop-In
Public Consultation Event**

This was hosted by BHA as required during the formal planning application process.

Displays available of possible arrangement of houses, suggested building designs and landscaping.

BHA recorded all the residents' comments on these, on services. and the





6/02/2020 Open Meeting

This event took place in the Section 14 Pre-Consultation period. It began with a number of brief presentations by members of the SG and included a reminder to return response forms.

6/02/2020 Open Meeting

Residents had the opportunity to study the proposed housing layout and possible designs.

A representative from BHA answered questions.



Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
1.	P1	24	R51		Y Opposition re number of Affordable Houses. 18 Affordable Houses is too many for this site.	The plan intends to deliver 18 houses rather than 18 affordable houses. The figures has been determined by the 2016 housing needs survey, supported by the interest generated by Beyond's project. House sizes, amenity space, roads and pavements are all expected to satisfy local standards set by the Parish Council in order to address local need	No Change
2.	P2	25	R51		Opposition .Before accessible housing and specialist accommodation is provided for older people we need to provide walking paths to Ingleby Cross and/or more bus stops at the top of village.	Agreed. This point is addressed in policy P4, but it is not practical to accommodate bus stop. The Main Street leading to the proposed new housing is a No Through Road with insufficient space for a bus to turn around.	No Change
3.	P4	26	R51		Support provision of off road car-parking commensurate with nature of development. It is currently very difficult to get into Priory Way due to on-road obstruction and on-street parking.	This point is addressed in policies P4 & P6 which aim to ensure sufficient parking is provided as part of development or else existing parking is protected.	No Change
4.	P6	28	R51		Support essential. A proper walking route down to Ingleby Cross is essential. We arrived in this village with two small children in 1994 (aged 4 and 8) I needed to take them walking around during school holidays and always had to get into my car to get out of the	New footpaths either need to be secured as part of development or because of NYCC funding. Consequently, the matter is addressed by policy P5 and also in the community actions.	No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
					village safely. It was a good job we could afford two cars.		
5.	P1	24	R52		I greatly regret the closure of the Primary School- a big loss for the village. However, as that cannot now be prevented, I support the plan to use this land for a mixed housing development as described. I am happy with the proposed development which I feel is much better than placing a small number of small executive houses on this site.	Support offered so no change proposed to the NP. Policy P1 is intended to make clear the Parish Council's preference for the future of the site and how it provides an important opportunity to deliver housing need	No Change
6.	P2	25	R52		I think that the housing mix which meets the needs of the community, as identified in surveys, is essential. It is most important that the development includes sufficient affordable accommodation to provide for the members of the village community unable to afford to rent or buy any of the many large houses we have at present. This is vital to help maintain a balanced community into the future. I hope that a scheme can be devised for allocation of affordable homes that is sustainable into the long term future.	The expectation is that a minimum of 18 units will provide a range of smaller house types to meet the identified local housing need.	No Change
7.	P6	28	R52		It is right to have a policy to manage car parking and minimise its effect on the street scene. I would like to see a significant improvement in the public transport services for the village. This would provide a	Whilst the plan can address parking and cycling, it is unable to address public transport provision. The plan therefore seeks to influence future development where it is possible to do so.	No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
					<p>viable alternative to the use of private cars and enable those who wish to do so to live without cars in the future. A revival of schemes for safe cycling links to the village would contribute to this.</p>		
8.		17	Diocese		<p>We do not believe that the evidence base provided by the November 2016 housing needs survey on which the present scheme is based can be considered is sufficiently robust for a development plan document. The 2016 survey predates the closure of the school in December 2018 I was undertaken at a time when the future of the school must have been in doubt owing to the low number of children attending it and this could easily have influence how people identified the need</p> <p>A housing needs survey needs to be undertaken after the closure of the village school to illustrate the present scale and nature of the housing need.</p>	<p>The plan clearly demonstrates the changing demographics within the parish which took place when the school was opened. The number of pupils attending the school had been falling for years So, whether the Primary school remained open or closed it had either no or minimal effect on changing the Parish's demographics. Primary school was already in the state of decline when the housing survey was conducted. Therefore, in our view whether the school remained open or closed had no material effect either way on the housing survey. Indeed, the under 5-year housing need demand of those responding who provided family details shows only 3 out of 16 with children. Looking at the within 10 year need only 5 out of 29 had children. Following the 21/11/19 Open Evening, by Beyond Housing, interest has been registered for 19 affordable and 4 open market purchases.</p>	<p>Wording changed to reflect comment</p>

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
					policies on meeting housing needs of the village up to 2035. In our opinion the document does not achieve this. The approach to housing provision after 5 years is not properly covered.		
11.	P1	24	Diocese		We believe the diocese land should be removed from the allocation under policy P1. This allocation need only relate to the North Yorkshire County Council land which is outside the development limits. The diocesan land is within development limits developed as planning permission for 4 dwellings and could be considers its allocated for housing.	There is no disputing that the former school site is appropriate for housing, but the Plan's policies are directed to setting out what type, number and tenure of housing should be built. Therefore, no land on which there is now or will be up to 2035 which is put forward for new housing consideration has to be included within the plan's dictates. The land has outline planning permission rather than full planning permission, which could lapse. It is also appropriate to include a policy for the wider site.	No Change
12.	P1	24	Diocese		The extension to the development limits for Policy P1 is based on an indicative layout scheme that is flawed and not suitable for such a purpose. Development limits should be based on a village plan and reflect features on the ground.	It is our view that the school site, the playing field and the recreation ground are all part of one contiguous whole and indeed part therefore of Ingleby Arncliffe village. The NP does not look to move the development limits, especially as the emerging local plan does not include development limits. Instead, the boundary is an expression of the extent of the developable area.	No Change
13.	P1	24	Diocese		There is no need to allocate the diocese land for housing in the	The land only has outline planning permission rather than	No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
					plan. It already forms part of the village development envelope and has planning permission for housing.	full planning permission, which could lapse. It is also appropriate to include a policy for the wider site.	
14.	P1	24	Diocese		<p>Representing in our opinion the key deliverable stakeholder for this site we feel it should not be assumed that a comprehensive housing scheme with the NYCC land will be achievable within 5 years. Negotiations with a preferred developer Beyond housing have been protracted. Notwithstanding comments in the plan document there is no other policy in place to guide development should the NYCC land not proceed for housing. The DNDP needs to set out alternatives in the event that the site does not come forward. The parish have recognised that delivery of the site for housing cannot be assumed. It is necessary for the DNDP to recognise this in this policies and proposals. Clearly policies need to be incorporated to indicate where alternative sites would be considered should the policy one site not become available. This has not occurred.</p>	<p>Part of the allocation currently has outline planning permission, where there is no certainty the permission will be implemented. Especially as the offer by Beyond has been accepted and they have no interest in the current permission. Instead they wish to develop the scheme currently supported by the NP. As such, it is appropriate for the NP to refer to continue to allocate the site to meet local need.</p> <p>Policy P2 sets out support for alternative sites (and for site (6) if the proposed development should not come to fruition) in the event the preferred allocation does not come forward or additional need is identified during the plan period.</p>	No Change
15.	P4	26	Diocese		There is no clear advice within the DNDP on the character and appearance of the village required to assess compliance with policy P4. We consider it important that this is included if Policy P4 is to have any relevance.	The justification to policy P4 has been expanded upon to address the point raised.	Wording for Policy P4 has been amended

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
16.	P4	26	Diocese		The aim of "protect and enhance" in the policy is a high bar particularly where value judgements are used to determine compliance. It is more often the case that development is acceptable provided there is no material effect on character and appearance. We will suggest consideration is given to replace and with or. It would then read protect or enhance.	The tests of 'protect' and 'enhance' are well trodden in case law and so it is not considered necessary to change the wording.	No change
17.		32	Diocese		The local planning authority may have concerns over the introduction of quarter house fronting the street in terms of its scale massing and appearance. It could be viewed as being out of keeping with adjoining buildings and streetscapes and against well established development plan policy on this issue.	HDC and NPYMNP have been given the opportunity to comment and they have not raised concerns. The indicative plan has been replaced with a red line location plan to make clear the area to which the policy applies.	No change
18.		32	Diocese		The local planning authority might also have concerns over the rear gardens of the bungalows. It is normal practice to see a minimum of 9 metres to the boundary where it backs onto open land to provide some protection for any future development.	HDC and NYMNP have had chance to comment and they have not raised any concerns at this stage. The indicative plan has been replaced with a red line location plan to make clear the area to which the policy applies.	No change
19.		32	Diocese		The layout does not provide for a vehicular link west to serve other dices land which could be a requirement. Also the layout does not provide for a vehicular link northwards to access any surplus NYCC land.	The indicative plan has been replaced with a red line location plan to make clear the area to which the policy applies. The layout has yet to be confirmed, and so the matter of access can be addressed once	An OS map has been provided and an updated indicative plan shows a vehicular route to the rest of the playing field land.

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
						a planning application has been submitted.	
20.	P1	24	DL6 3ND		Support development of Grain Store.	Policy P2 supports the development of sites, such as Grain Store, in the event the former primary school does not come forward or further housing need is to be addressed.	No Change
21.	P6	28	DL6 3ND		Support that any new development needs to have provision for parking - at least two for the smallest houses- must keep same level of provision.	Parking is to be provided in accordance with NYCC standards, which roughly equates to one car parking space per bedroom.	No Change
22.	P6	28	DL6 3ND	Parking requirements arising from new development must be provided within the boundaries of the application site, and not give rise to demand for on-site parking.	Paragraph 2 should say ".....must not give rise to demand for on-street parking" - not on-site parking"	Agree	Change wording
23.	CAP N1	29	DL6 3ND		Very supportive of development on Grain Store site in the future.	Policy P2 supports the development of sites, such as Grain Store, in the event the former primary school does not come forward or further housing need is to be addressed.	No Change
24.	CAP IC1	30	DL6 3ND		Agree parking needs to be monitored. Ensure ample parking is provided with new development.		No Change
25.	P4	26	DL6 3NG		Y Wildlife should be considered if any buildings are to be built on the Grain Store. Bats, sixteen types of birds, squirrels etc. Also for any building not to be imposing on existing properties.	Agree any site proposed for housing would have to be subject to a SEA/HRA. Any planning application would also need to be accompanied with a Phase 1 Habitat Survey, which would identify if protected species are present. Mitigation measures would then be required.	Wording changed to recognise the need to consider the effect of any proposed development on the environment.

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
26.	P6	28	DL6 3NG		I support provision of off-road parking for Ingleby Cross.		No Change
27.	P6	28	DL6 3NG		Y I support a provision of extra parking facility in Ingleby Cross. There are still a number of visitors who park outside of people's homes, even the Manager of the Coffee Shop who also parks on the dropped kerbs.		No Change
28.	P4	26	R56		Y The appearance of the proposed dwellings should be in keeping with the existing village houses. Omit full storey height windows, replace with normal depth windows. A mix of dwellings in stone, brick, rendered walls and pantile roofing may also be considered.	The policies within the plan aim to seek development that integrates with the appearance and character of the villages. As such, the policies are not intended to be prescriptive in order to acknowledge how the villages have been developed over an extended period of time and so there is a great variety of design references that might be incorporated into future development.	Wording changed to Policy P4 to set out more clearly the different characters of the two villages and the differences within Ingleby Arncliffe.
29.		32	R56	Appendix A Indicative Layout of Site (6)	Orientation of houses at south side. Reposition the house/houses at the south of the development to front on to Main Street to maintain the "feel" of the street. This also prevents a direct view into our property	The layout is only indicative at this stage and would ultimately need to satisfy HDC's design standards, which includes preventing overlooking, overbearing, and overshadowing.	Indicative layout has been revised by Beyond Housing and an OS red line boundary plan has been included.
30.	P1	24	R57		Y Affordable Housing and bungalows for older people have been needed in this Parish for as long as I have lived here, so I would wholeheartedly support Policy 1.		No Change
31.	P2	25	R57		Strongly Support		No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
32.	P3	25	R57			Strongly Support	No Change
33.	P4	26	R57		Strongly support. I would hope the new housing would be as energy efficient as possible including PV panels on all suitably facing roofs. Bungalows should be fully accessible - cheaper than trying to adapt/make changes later. Support but have a concern about too few parking spaces being provided. Would like to see a minimum provision stated. HDC allows 2 parking spaces per dwelling and in this village car use is essential due to lack of public transport. Most adults will require use of a car.		No Change
34.	P5	27	R57		Strongly support. Would like a safe all-weather footpath provided to Ingleby Cross. CIL money?	The Parish Council would consult with the community on the use of any CIL funds at the time.	No Change
35.	P6	28	R57		Strongly support. More car parking at Ingleby Cross is essential. CIL money?		No Change
36.		19	HDC	HDC's Local Development Framework (LDF) was adopted on the 3rd April 2007 when it categorised the Parish as a secondary village under the Stokesley "Service Centre" grouping. In neither the existing suite of documents that form the LDF, nor in the emerging Local Plan, is there an allocation of new houses for the Parish.	Although the LDF is the adopted policy at this moment in time the local plan is gaining weight. 'Planning Policy Context within HDC' Please note in the local plan (subject to examination) there will be no development limits and the IPG shall not form part of the local plan moving forward. Therefore this text should be	The LDF is still the adopted plan and the draft local plan has limited weight now. Its therefore more appropriate to refer to being in transition at this moment in time. The wording will be updated before the NP is submitted to reflect the status of the local plan at that time.	No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
				<p>The HDC development boundary (identified in black on the map below) tightly follows the line of the existing houses and gardens and permits only infill development if suitable parcels of land exist. Given the lack of available space in the Parish to accommodate infill development, the development boundary is a policy constraint to achieving the delivery of new houses to meet identified housing needs, especially as there are a number of sites adjacent to the villages that are capable of being developed.</p> <p>In addition to infill developments, HDC's existing planning policy allows for development of rural exception sites for only Affordable housing outside the Development Boundary. Due to changes in national planning policy, HDC published an Interim Housing Policy Guidance Note in 2015 and although this policy is not part of the LDF, the policy is used by the Local Planning Authority in the consideration of current planning applications. The guidance varied the settlement hierarchy set out in the adopted Core Strategy</p>	<p>revised to reflect the local plan and not the LDF.</p> <p>It is suggested that the amount of text is reduced.</p> <p>Suggest that you review whether having a map here is necessary.</p> <p>The need for further references to the LDF should be reviewed.</p> <p>It is understood that there is a requirement for affordable housing and therefore more emphasis should be added to housing need surveys and information on how to bring a site forward for rural housing.</p> <p>Positive wording could be useful such as why different house types are important for health and wellbeing and that the aim of the neighbourhood plan is to promote the right type of homes for the local communities. Also to enable older people to down size to accommodation better suited for their individual requirements. Further information on specific housing mix can be sought by the LPA and through housing need surveys.</p>		

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
				and HDC's approach to the location for new development. In addition, the guidance offers support for development of small-scale sites for up to 5 houses, subject to meeting criteria within settlements where such development was to be resisted under the Core Strategy approach.			
37.		19	HDC	In relation to the Parish of Ingleby Arncliffe, promoting sustainable development means protecting the Parish's natural rural setting and green spaces, its cultural heritage, tourism businesses and local facilities, together with the "feeling" of the community. All these aspects are essential to supporting a sustainable future for the Parish and its residents. Ensuring there are appropriate homes for local needs is essential for a well-balanced and self-sustaining community	The definition of sustainable development should focus on: Economic objectives; tourism, businesses, local facilities Social objectives; Cultural heritage, local facilities, community Environmental objectives, rural setting, green spaces. Neighbourhood plan policies should balance the objectives of sustainable development.	Text to be expanded upon to make clear the explanation of sustainable development.	Wording changed to reflect the comment.
38.		19	HDC	In summary, NYMNPA's planning policy will not allow the development of the Grain Store site. However, this policy may change if the site was no longer in use and has fallen into disrepair	For NYMNPA to provide comment.	In recognition of the current policy circumstances, Policy P2 supports development of the grain store in the event circumstances were to change.	No Change
39.		22	HDC	When adopted, the Plan and the accompanying Proposals Map will be a statutory planning document with the	This text would benefit from being specifically stating that it would be the neighbourhood	Agree, to update wording accordingly.	Amend last sentence of first paragraph to read "...reference to the Parish's Plan because it will form part

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
				same status as the HDC LDF and NYMNPA Core Strategy and Development Policies Plan and with the two LPA's emerging LPs when adopted, and any development plan documents that supersede those mentioned. As such, future planning applications must be considered with reference to the Parish's Plan.	plan that would be used to help determine planning applications. Again reference to the LDF should be reviewed.		of the statutory development plan against which planning applications will be determined."
40.		23	HDC	Whole page refers to LDF	It is acknowledged that the LDF is the current policies. However greater emphasis should be placed on the emerging local plan. It is suggested that the text referring to the IPG is removed. It is considered that the text referring to NYMNPA does not add any value	The emerging local plan is now reaching a stage where its unlikely to substantially change so it should be safe to start referring to it, but it is only still a draft document and so it is appropriate to continue to refer to the previous version too.	Update wording throughout the plan.
41.	P1	23	HDC	First paragraph	It is suggested that the text should relate to housing need surveys but not a figure as this could change through time.	The NP currently aims to justify the allocation of a site for 18 houses so its appropriate to justify the number with the evidence being relied upon	No Change
42.	P1	24	HDC	P1: Housing Allocation – Land at the Former Primary School and Playing Field The Neighbourhood Plan allocates the land within the Former Primary School site, together with a part of the former Playing Field, situated immediately to the North, for residential development, with a capacity for 18 new dwellings, to meet local housing needs.	Suggest either removing the figure for housing from the policy, or add 'approximately' before it. The policy refers to allocating the former school, however there is no map to follow this policy. It is suggested that a map would aid clarity as to what land is allocated.	The evidence suggests 18 houses is the right number so there is no need to alter the reference. The indicative plan is to be replaced with an OS location plan.	The indicative plan has been updated by Beyond Housing. The Appendixes now include an OS plan with a red line around the extent of the site to be allocated.

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
43.		25	HDC	With respect to the HDC Core Strategy, policy CP9 sets out how 50% of dwellings on sites greater than 2 or more dwellings (or sites of 0.1 acres or more) must make provision for an element of housing that is accessible and affordable. Where development is to take place outside of development limits, policy CP9A sets out how housing schemes will be supported for 100% affordable housing to meet identified housing need and where any development is small in scale. Development should not conflict with environmental protection, nature conservation policies, heritage assets and provide necessary mitigation or compensation to address harmful implications.	<p>This information is not up to date. It is suggested that a less detailed summary is included as figures and percentages can become dated.</p> <p>This text needs to be positively worded Please refer to our general advice about policies and about the use of terminology. Maybe consider if there are local connections, the development would remain in perpetuity and the impact on the landscape.</p> <p>How the requirements for mixed balanced community would be served as identified in the NPPF(Chapter 5) . This would back the Government's objective of boosting the supply of homes,</p> <p>It maybe also be helpful to state that affordable housing should be met on site or a contribution should be justified.</p>	Update the wording of the plan accordingly to ensure it is consistent with the local plan.	Wording in the plan changed to reflect the comment
44.	P2	25	HDC	P2: Housing Mix Housing development that complies with other policies in the Neighbourhood Plan and in the Hambleton and North York Moors National Park Local Plans, and provides a housing mix consistent with the most up-to-date housing market assessment and/or local	As it stands the requirements of this policy are not clear. There is scope here for you to really make the plan locally specific, link to local character and distinctiveness, the earlier identification of historic assets, green spaces etc; as it stands there is no supporting text to explain what is considered to be high quality design. The current wording of the policy is unlikely to add value. National policy is	The policy makes clear the Parish Council's support if a certain set of circumstances are met, i.e. a scheme that is consistent with policy and targets will be supported.	No change the policies need to be parish led and not LPA driven as the Parish Council want to deliver local housing need rather than be driven by housing demand arising from outside the Parish

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
				needs survey will, in principle, be supported. The need for accessible housing and specialist accommodation for older people should be particularly considered within the mix.	clear that plans should not set or require their own housing standards and that only nationally defined standards are used, which applies to neighbourhood plans as well as local plans. Perhaps reference the SPD on size, type and tenure and the emerging Local Plan requirement for national space standards. As it stands this policy is unlikely to meet basic conditions.		
45.	P3	25	HDC	P3: Affordable Housing Housing development that complies with other policies in the Neighbourhood Plan and in the Hambleton and North York Moors National Park Local Plans, and provides affordable housing consistent with the most up-to-date housing market assessment and/or local needs survey will, in principle, be supported	There is no need to state that development should comply with adopted policies, so as it stands this policy adds little value. It is suggest that the policy is reworded to concentrate on local requirements.	The policy sets out the Parish Council's support for the delivery of housing that meets the needs of the Parish. The intention is that the delivery of housing will be driven by the parish to meet the needs of the parish.	No amendment considered necessary.
46.	P4	26	HDC	Policy: Development that would result in the loss or harm to the recreational value or accessibility of an existing footpath, cycleway and / or bridleway will be resisted.	This policy should be reworded in a positive manner, to state the circumstances that are required for a development proposal to be supported.	No change required as its reasonable to set out how loss will be resisted – the emerging local plan refers to resisting development for the same purpose.	No amendment considered necessary.
47.	P5	26	HDC	Walking and Cycling Provision justification	Reference to the LDF should be reviewed. It may be worth adding that the use of cycle and foot paths would go some way to reduce	Wording to be updated to refer to the emerging local plan.	Update wording to refer to the emerging local plan.

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
					greenhouse gas emission and promote a healthy lifestyle choice.		
48.	P6	28	HDC	<p>P6: Car Parking Any new development that would lead to the loss of existing car parking areas, including public car parking and private off-street parking areas will be resisted unless alternative off-street provision can be provided elsewhere that will meet the needs of development whilst also maintaining the existing level of vehicle parking provision in Ingleby Cross. Parking requirements arising from new development must be provided within the boundaries of the application site, and not give rise to demand for on-site parking. The number of spaces must be in accordance with local planning policy standards, as set out in the most up to date guidance determined by the local highways authority or local planning authority. Development which complies with other policies in the Neighbourhood Plan and in the Local Plan that would provide for additional car parking capacity, particularly to service Ingleby Cross, will be supported</p>	<p>This policy should be reworded in a positive manner, to state the circumstances that are required for a development proposal to be supported.</p> <p>Parking standards are currently set by NYCC not the LPA. However, current national planning policy is for standards to be set only where necessary.</p> <p>We would suggest considering a different form of words so that this relates more to the specific local circumstances, such as narrow roads, that are unsuitable for on-street parking. As it stands this policy therefore unlikely to meet basic conditions.</p>	<p>No change considered necessary as its reasonable to set out how loss will be resisted – the emerging local plan refers to resisting development for the same purpose.</p> <p>The policy refers to the local highways authority, which is another way of referring to NYCC.</p> <p>Supporting text to be reviewed <i>in light of comments.</i></p>	<p>Neighbourhood Plan consultations have identified how parking is one of the community's key concerns. In particular, the parking of visitors, parking by walkers, and blocking of access to residents' properties. The roads through the villages are generally narrow and many are not served by pavements. Consequently, on-street parking narrows the roads so vehicles cannot pass, or else visibility is affected. Such situations are undesirable and so opportunities to protect existing off-street parking are important in order to prevent the creation of further pressures for on-street parking</p>

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
49.		29	HDC NYMPA	Community Action Points N1	<p>This text is a little confusing, it is suggested that it is either removed or consultation with NYMNPAs is undertaken and they advise on the wording of this section.</p> <p>It is suggested that the dates are revised on the community plan action points 2012 – 2014?</p> <p>Local Plan does include a couple of site specific 'Environmental Enhancement Sites' and the Plan is required to be reviewed every five years, so it may be an option to consider the Grain Store site under this policy in a future review. You will understand we cannot commit to this at this early stage as future plans need to go through extensive consultation, and issues of viability of the site may remain if the site is to be for housing to meet local needs.</p>	The community plan took place at a point in time and so the reference is correct.	No Change
50.		30	HDC	S1 Parish Traffic Speeds Concerns ICI Ingleby Cross Parking C1 Coast to Coast National Trust C2 Countryside and Footpaths R1 Recreation Ground W1 Website B1 High Quality Broadband and Internet Communications	<p>It is suggested that an explanation is included to introduce this section and to emphasise that this section contains commitments or aspirations of the Parish and should not to be read as policy. This would then reduce any potential confusion as they are not considered to be policies and do not need to meet the basic conditions.</p>	Introduction to be added to the section to make clear its purpose.	Wording in the plan amended to accommodate the comment.

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
				T1 Tourist and Recreational Support BS1 Bus Service			
51.		6	HDC	Only policies directly relating to the development and the use of land will be the subject of the referendum vote. All other policies, more appropriately termed "community action points," are not part of the referendum decision process	Supporting text to Policy P1 states that the policy indicates the circumstances under which the Parish Council would support development – however the Plan will eventually become part of the development Plan of the two Authorities who will be responsible for making decisions based on it.	Agreed	Wording amended
52.		7	HDC	Reliance on the Internet.	It is suggested that the first two sentences are removed as they do not add any value to this paragraph	Agreed	Wording amended
53.	P1	24	R58		Support.: Consideration to be given to the development of two sites? Suggest Grain Store to allow for additional housing and increased options.	CAP N1 is seeking to enable the Grain Store to become a candidate site for housing. A two-site solution may restrict the opportunity on either or both sites of achieving a mixed housing option	No Change
			R58		Support: I support this plan and would like to thank all concerned with developing this plan. This is a very comprehensive and well presented document.		No Change
54.	P4	26	R58		Support: Off-road parking, road infrastructure, more lighting and better signage. Suggest lighting and signage at all crossing and	Signage is a matter for the highway's authority rather than the NP, which is concerned with	No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
					turning points. Clear speed limit signage.	managing the impact of development.	
55.	P5	27	R58		Support: Footpaths to be made more accessible between Ingleby Arncliffe and Ingleby Cross. Suggest: Footpath and lighting to be established on Cross Lane. Clearly identified crossing points.		No Change
56.	P6	28	R58		I support this decision and thought should be given to parking at Ingleby Cross. Public car park?- Suggest car park at the top of the cricket pitch near Village Hall.	Parking at the top of the cricket pitch would require the landowner's agreement, which has not yet been explored.	No Change
57.		32	R59	Appendix A Indicative Layout of Site (6)	I agree the Plan without modifications; however, I do feel that for the number of houses/bedrooms planned the parking provided may be a concern. The parking outside the development on Main Street is already used by current residents. Dwellings 1-4 have only one parking space each, but as these properties will most likely be bought by young couples and taking into consideration that there is insufficient public transport, there could be potentially 2 cars at each of these developments. There will be limited parking outside the houses as access to the full outside of each property will be needed. This could cause obstructions on the new road	It is expected that parking will be provided in accordance with NYCC standards, which roughly equates to one parking space per bedroom.	No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
					and cause people to park on the grass verges opposite.		
58.	P1	24	R60		Agree. It's the ideal site within the village boundary and is "crying out" for appropriate use as long as the emphasis is on including Affordable Houses. No changes only to ensure Affordable Housing is included.		No Change
59.	P2	25	R60 and provides a housing mix consistent with the most up-to-date housing market assessment and/or local needs survey will, in principle, be supported.	Fully agree with last paragraph of Policy 2 Paragraph 1 Remove the words "In principle" Remove "In principle". This is just a way of giving wriggle room not to achieve.	Agreed	Amend the relevant policies P2 & P3, which have now been stated as being P1 & P2.
60.	P4	26	R60		Agree . The aim should be to attain the highest standards in all areas that can be achieved within the budget to ensure all elements can be incorporated.eg Affordable Homes.		No Change
61.	P5	27	R60		Agree that the path to the Recreation Area should be maintained/ have improved access. Ensure that the path down to the Play Area is retained improved in its existing location.		No Change
62.	P6	28	R60		Agree. On the plan, the Quarter houses - 1 bed 2 person, properties 1-4 show single parking bays per property that is unrealistic in this day and age. 2 people likely to be 2 professionals requiring a car each.	At this stage, the layout is only indicative. Once a planning application has been submitted then HDC will need to ensure it satisfies design standards, including in relation to parking provision.	An OS plan has been added with the allocated area shown in red. The indicative plan has been updated.
63.		32	R61	Appendix A Indicative Layout of Site (6)	Support the plan but would like to see more parking for the	At this stage, the layout is only indicative. Once a planning	No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
					quarter houses. I know there are minimum requirements, but they need to be exceeded. Each house may have two cars and visitors and if there is only one space it will lead to conflict.	application has been submitted then HDC will need to ensure it satisfies design standards, including in relation to parking provision.	
64.		32	R61	Appendix A Indicative Layout of Site (6)	Please make sure that all of the properties have adequate space to store bins out of sight.	This is a matter for the detailed planning application	No Change
65.	P1	24	R62		Support development of Primary School site for provision of mixed dwellings. 18 needs to be the max. as I would have some concerns about increased traffic through the village.	18 is the minimum to ensure local housing need can be met.	No Change
66.	P2	25	R62		Support - this will help prevent further stagnation of the village and hopefully bring new life to the village.		No Change
67.	P3	25	R62		Support as above		No Change
68.	P4	26	R62		Support. Absolute must to provide off road parking and I would say where possible for at least two cars per property. On-road parking on the Main Road in particular, is becoming an issue.		No Change
69.	P5	27	R62		I am not aware of any cycleway connecting IA to any other villages and the A172 is a very busy road - I have given up cycling. Walking down to IC can be dangerous with lack of pavement.	Policy P5 supports improvements to the footpath network within the villages rather than to alterations across the wider network.	No Change
70.	P6	28	R62		Support. Any additional parking particularly to serve IC would be welcomed.		No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
71.		17	R63		<p>18 homes are far too many. A development of this size will increase traffic on the High Street which is underdeveloped with respect to pavements and should remain so.</p> <p>Reduce number of dwellings in the development. Some of the open market homes will undoubtedly be bought as an investment for rental income. Legally restrict sale of open market houses to owner occupier only.</p> <p>There is no assurance that the Affordable Homes will be allocated to people from the local area. Ensure that the Housing Association only allocates Affordable Homes to people from the local area.</p> <p>Whilst the development is designed to address the needs indicated by the survey of 2016, it cannot be certain that those needs are still current nearly four years later. Re-check the individual requirements that determined the overall size of the development and, if necessary , carry out another survey.</p> <p>The needs indicated in the surveys have no personal commitment and we may be providing a development to match needs that are never taken up by those who indicated them on the survey. Obtain</p>	<p>The housing numbers are determined by the 2016 housing needs survey. The houses themselves are sized in accordance with national housing sizes criteria and allow for the appropriate amount of amenity space.</p> <p>It is accepted that additional housing will increase traffic movements but that is acceptable.</p> <p>Discussions are underway with Beyond on what (if any) procedures can be in place to afford Parish residents, either first choice or preference on open market house purchases.</p> <p>A housing policy setting out the Affordable Housing allocation system has been added as an Appendix.</p> <p>Following the 21/11/19 Open Evening, interest has been registered for 19 affordable and 4 open market purchases.</p>	<p>A draft of an Affordable Housing Policy added as <u>Appendix D.</u></p> <p>Wording added to Plan to set out the ambition of Beyond Housing to take what reasonable steps they can to provide Parish residents with priority on Open Market purchases.</p>

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
					some form of personal commitment from individuals that indicated their needs on the survey.		
72.	P1	24	R63		<p>Y 18 homes are far too many. A development of this size will increase traffic on the High Street which is underdeveloped with respect to pavements and should remain so.</p> <p>Reduce number of dwellings in the development. Some of the open market homes will undoubtedly be bought as an investment for rental income. Legally restrict sale of open market houses to owner occupier only.</p> <p>There is no assurance that the Affordable Homes will be allocated to people from the local area. Ensure that the Housing Association only allocates Affordable Homes to people from the local area.</p> <p>Whilst the development is designed to address the needs indicated by the survey of 2016, it cannot be certain that those needs are still current nearly four years later. Re-check the individual requirements that determined the overall size of the development and, if necessary, carry out another survey.</p> <p>The needs indicated in the surveys have no personal</p>	<p>The housing numbers are determined by the 2016 housing needs survey. The houses themselves are sized in accordance with national housing sizes criteria and allow for the appropriate amount of amenity space.</p> <p>It is accepted that additional housing will increase traffic movements but that is considered to be acceptable.</p> <p>Discussions are underway with Beyond on what (if any) procedures can be in place to afford Parish residents, either first choice or preference on open market house purchases.</p> <p>Following the 21/11/19 Open Evening, interest has been registered for 19 affordable and 4 open market purchases.</p>	No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
					commitment and we may be providing a development to match needs that are never taken up by those who indicated them on the survey. Obtain some form of personal commitment from individuals that indicated their needs on the survey.		
73.	P4	26	R63		Quarter Houses are not appropriate to the form and character of the settlement. Provide cottage style houses to satisfy the one bedroom hose requirement.. The housing density for the available area is far too high and not in keeping with the rest of the village. Reduce the number of dwellings in the development and consider an alternative location for the remainder if required.	Provision of cottages would take up more space and make the properties more expensive. There is no comparable provision of smaller houses within the Parish and the proposed development would not be "visible" in the same manner as the rest of the Parish housing	No Change
74.	P1	24	R64		We support this development as it is already within the village envelope and reuses an empty site.		No Change
75.	P2	25	R64		We support this principle in an ageing population.		No Change
76.	P3	25	R64		We support this principle in order to retain younger people in the community. The Parish Council has shown this need through their admirable and diligent canvassing of the need within the village.		No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
77.	P4	26	R64		We support this principle. It should be common to all development.		No Change
78.	P5	27	R64		We support this principle, especially as the Coast to Coast Walk passes through the village.		No Change
79.	P6	28	R64		We support this principle - the village is on the National Park boundary and every effort should be made to encourage a car-free street scene		No Change
80.	P2	25	R66		Y Good Housing mix. Design of houses needs a bit more thought. Build property aimed at elderly people nearer the Main Street for easier access.	The design and layout is to be considered at the planning application stage. To avoid confusion, the block plan is to be replaced with a layout plan.	An OS plan has been added with the allocated area shown in red. The indicative plan has been updated.
81.	P3	25	R66		Affordable Housing. Will there be a cap on pricing increase if, and/or when they are sold on? Otherwise they may become unaffordable.	This is to be determined by the affordable housing provider in consultation with the LPA and with reference to the local housing needs survey to ensure provision is compliant with the requirements of the plan	No Change
82.	P4	26	R66		Parking/garages. Not all properties have garages. Would permission be possible to build one where space is available, or extend existing garages?	The appropriateness of extensions will be a matter for the LPA to consider. The community will, however, be able to comment on a planning application.	Beyond Housing's updated indicative plan shows that access is provided.
83.	CAP RI	30	R66		Will there be access to the Recreation ground via the right of way from the bottom of the site?	This will be a consideration of any future planning application.	No Change
84.	P1	24	R65		We support this development as it is already within the village		No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
					envelope and reuses an empty site.		
85.	P2	25	R65		We support this principle in an ageing population.		No Change
86.	P3	25	R65		We support this principle in order to retain younger people in the community. The Parish Council has shown this need through their admirable and diligent canvassing of the need within the village.		No Change
87.	P4	26	R65		We support this principle. It should be common to all development.		No Change
88.	P5	27	R65		We support this principle, especially as the Coast to Coast Walk passes through the village.		No Change
89.	P6	28	R65		We support this principle - the village is on the National Park boundary and every effort should be made to encourage a car-free street scene		No Change
90.	P4	26	North Yorkshire Police		There are no specific policies in the plan relating to Designing Out Crime. It is accepted that any planning application would be subject of policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Local Authority Plans, which include Hambleton and North Yorkshire Moors (NYM), and these include policies around the prevention of crime and disorder and ensuring that any new developments are	In addition, the Police Liaison Officer would have the opportunity to comment on a planning application.	Policy P4 has been amended

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
					safe for all users. It is noted that the Ingleby Arncliffe pre-submission plan does make reference to both paragraph 91 and 127 of the NPPF, which are relevant in terms of Designing Out Crime. This does not preclude the Neighbourhood Plan from containing a policy in relation to Designing Out Crime and therefore consideration could be given to including such a policy or incorporating wording into an existing policy, such as Policy P4: Key Guiding Principles for Development. An example of suitable wording would be: "Proposals will be expected to demonstrate how the design has been influenced by the need to plan positively to reduce crime and the fear of crime and how this will be achieved. The advice should be sought of a Police Designing out Crime representative for all developments of 10 or more dwellings."		
91.	General		NYMPA		Our main point is that the policies need to be expressed with the end user in mind. This is principally Hambleton DC. It is mainly this District Council that will be deciding planning applications against policies in this Plan. Policies therefore should need to set out the circumstances under which development would (and would not) be permitted.	Whilst the Parish Council would be happy to take on board the proposed amendment, the PC is not the decision-making body so it is considered appropriate to simply express support for development.	No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
					<p>Supporting text to Policy P1 states that the policy indicates the circumstances under which the Parish Council would support development – however the Plan will eventually become part of the development Plan of the two Authorities who will be responsible for making decisions based on it.</p> <p>I would therefore advise that some revisions may need to some policies so that they can be used in decision making on planning applications. <u>One initial suggestion would be for policies to use the phrase 'will only be permitted' rather than 'will be supported' (My underlining not NYMPA)</u></p>		
92.		19	NYMPA		<p>The NYMNPA Core Strategy and Development Policies will almost certainly be superseded by the new Local Plan by the time the Neighbourhood Plan is 'made' (we are anticipating adoption in June 2020). References should refer to the North York Moors Local Plan only.</p>	Reference to the respective plans to be updated throughout NP.	The wording has been updated accordingly
93.		19	NYMPA		<p>This states that 'NYMNPA's planning policy will not allow the development of the Grain Store site' which implies some sort of 'blanket ban' on development, whereas the Plan then goes on to state on page 54 that in NYMNPA's view the site could be considered as an exception</p>	Agreed	Update the wording of the plan accordingly

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
					<p>site or as a mix of affordable and local occupancy units. Planning policy is only one of the considerations when deciding a planning application (although it is the primary one). The Authority shares the Parish Council's view that a mix of local needs and affordable housing would be beneficial to the village - the issue is more one of viability once these tenures are introduced. Policy conformity could also change over the life of the Plan (as Community Action Point N1 indicates could be the case). I would suggest 'NYMNPAs planning policy focusses on delivery housing schemes to meet local and affordable housing needs, which has implications for whether the site can be viably developed (see page 54).'</p>		
94.		22	NYMPA		<p>The NYMNPAs Core Strategy and Development Policies will almost certainly be superseded by the new Local Plan by the time the Neighbourhood Plan is 'made' (we are anticipating adoption in June 2020). References should refer to the North York Moors Local Plan only.</p>	<p>The plan needs to reflect the policy context at the time of drafting and so presumptions cannot be made in respect of the stage either local plan will have reached. As such, the wording of the plan is being updated as the process progresses.</p>	<p>Updated references within the plan to ensure it remains up to date.</p>
95.		22	NYMPA	When adopted the Plan and the accompanying Proposals Map will be a statutory planning document.....	<p>Refers to an 'accompanying Proposals Map' becoming a statutory planning document. There is also no proposals</p>	<p>The NP includes a map of the designated area and then Appendix C has been updated with a red line location plan.</p>	<p>An OS red line plan of the area allocated has been included..</p>

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
					<p>map in the Plan (i.e. a map of the whole neighbourhood plan area indicating where plan policies will change areas) – are you intending to include one at the next stage?</p> <p>There's no requirement for a neighbourhood plan to include a Policies Map. However, on adoption of the Neighbourhood Plan there will be a single 'Policies Map' for both HDC and the NYMNP which forms part of the development plan and which would include any allocations made by the Neighbourhood Plan. I would suggest deleting 'and the accompanying Proposals Map' or including a Policies Map on an Ordnance Survey base which can then be incorporated to the Policies Map of each authority.</p>		
96.		23	NYMPA		<p>The NYMNP Core Strategy and Development Policies will almost certainly be superseded by the new Local Plan by the time the Neighbourhood Plan is 'made' (we are anticipating adoption in June 2020). References should refer to the North York Moors Local Plan only</p>	Agreed	General references to the two local plans to be updated to reflect the current status of the plans.
97.		23	NYMPA		<p>A minor point, but text states that the purpose of National Park designation is to conserve and enhance... This is the first of two statutory purposes; hence I would suggest adding 'first'</p>	Agreed	Update as requested

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
					before 'purpose'. The same point applies at the bottom of Page 24.		
98.		24	NYMPA		The NYMNPA Core Strategy and Development Policies will almost certainly be superseded by the new Local Plan by the time the Neighbourhood Plan is 'made' (we are anticipating adoption in June 2020). References should refer to the North York Moors Local Plan only	Agreed	General references to the two local plans to be updated so as to reflect the current status of the plans.
99.		24	NYMPA		A minor point, but text states that the purpose of National Park designation is to conserve and enhance... This is the first of two statutory purposes; hence I would suggest adding 'first' before 'purpose'. The same point applies at the bottom of Page 24.	Agreed	Update as suggested.
100.		26	NYMPA		The NYMNPA Core Strategy and Development Policies will almost certainly be superseded by the new Local Plan by the time the Neighbourhood Plan is 'made' (we are anticipating adoption in June 2020). References should refer to the North York Moors Local Plan only.	Agreed	General references to the two local plans to be updated to reflect the current status of the plans.
101.	P4	26	NYMPA		Paragraph 3 and 4 are issues covered by building regulations rather than planning policy. Whilst we support the aim the issue is how the decision maker would understand the circumstances under which failure to comply would warrant	Agreed	General references to the two local plans to be updated to reflect the current status of the plans.

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
					refusal of a planning application (or how an applicant would know how to comply with this policy). As background local planning authorities are generally discouraged from adopting energy/ carbon standards in excessive building regulation standards and also have to provide evidence of need and viability if they wish to adopt higher optional technical standards on accessibility and adaptability of new housing. I would advise either removing these two criteria or including more information on the standards that would need to be applied and the evidence justifying them.		
102.		27	NYMPA		The NYMNPA Core Strategy and Development Policies will almost certainly be superseded by the new Local Plan by the time the Neighbourhood Plan is 'made' (we are anticipating adoption in June 2020). References should refer to the North York Moors Local Plan only.	Agreed	General references to the two local plans to be updated to reflect the current status of the plans.
103.	CAP N1	29	NYMPA		Hambleton's DC's response suggest you check the wording with us. Our new local plan does include a couple of site specific "Environmental Enhancement Sites" and the plan is required to be reviewed every 5 years so it may be an option to consider the Grain Store site under this policy in a future review. You will	Understood	No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
					understand we cannot commit to this at this early stage as future plans need to go through extensive consultation and issues of viability of the site may remain if the site is to be for housing to meet local needs.		
104.		6	NYMPA	As above	<p>On a similar point, it is not clear as to whether the whole document is the neighbourhood plan or whether the intention is to separate out the neighbourhood plan 'policies' section and submit that for referendum. At the moment the document contains the community plan and a wealth of background information that would not be relevant when it comes to deciding planning applications.</p> <p>The text does state that only the policies directly relating to the development and the use of land will be the subject of the referendum vote, however the legislation treats a neighbourhood plan as a single legal entity and the question arises of how the Examiner would treat any comments made on other parts should they be made.</p> <p>My suggestion would be to separate the 'planning policies' part of the document and include the rest of the plan as supporting evidence or background. I would also agree with Hambleton BC</p>	NP wording to be updated to make clear the whole document is the plan that is to be adopted	Update wording on Policy P4 accordingly.

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
					that it is the 'whole' of the neighbourhood plan (including the supporting text) that has to go to referendum, and not just the policies.		
105.	P1	24	R67		Y If space provide garages.	At this stage the layout plan is only indicative and HDC will need to be satisfied development meets necessary standards when an application is submitted.	No Change
106.		17	R68		<p>Y 18 homes are far too many. A development of this size will increase traffic on the High Street which is underdeveloped with respect to pavements and should remain so.</p> <p>Reduce number of dwellings in the development. Some of the open market homes will undoubtedly be bought as an investment for rental income. Legally restrict sale of open market houses to owner occupier only.</p> <p>There is no assurance that the Affordable Homes will be allocated to people from the local area. Ensure that the Housing Association only allocates Affordable Homes to people from the local area.</p> <p>Whilst the development is designed to address the needs indicated by the survey of 2016, it cannot be certain that those needs are still current nearly four years later. Re-check the individual requirements that</p>	<p>The housing numbers are determined by the 2016 housing needs survey. The houses themselves are sized in accordance with national housing sizes criteria and allow for the appropriate amount of amenity space.</p> <p>It is accepted that additional housing will increase traffic movements but that is acceptable.</p> <p>Discussions are underway with Beyond on what (if any) procedures can be in place to afford Parish residents, either first choice or preference on open market house purchases.</p> <p>Following the 21/11/19 Open Evening, interest has been registered for 19 affordable and 4 open market purchases.</p>	No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
					<p>determined the overall size of the development and, if necessary , carry out another survey.</p> <p>The needs indicated in the surveys have no personal commitment and we may be providing a development to match needs that are never taken up by those who indicated them on the survey. Obtain some form of personal commitment from individuals that indicated their needs on the survey.</p>		
107.	P1	24	R68		<p>Y 18 homes are far too many. A development of this size will increase traffic on the High Street which is underdeveloped with respect to pavements and should remain so.</p> <p>Reduce number of dwellings in the development. Some of the open market homes will undoubtedly be bought as an investment for rental income. Legally restrict sale of open market houses to owner occupier only.</p> <p>There is no assurance that the Affordable Homes will be allocated to people from the local area. Ensure that the Housing Association only allocates Affordable Homes to people from the local area.</p> <p>Whilst the development is designed to address the needs indicated by the survey of 2016,</p>	<p>The housing numbers are determined by the 2016 housing needs survey. The houses themselves are sized in accordance with national housing sizes criteria and allow for the appropriate amount of amenity space.</p> <p>It is accepted that additional housing will increase traffic movements but that is acceptable.</p> <p>Discussions are underway with Beyond on what (if any) procedures can be in place to afford Parish residents, either first choice or preference on open market house purchases.</p> <p>Following the 21/11/19 Open Evening, interest has been registered for 19 affordable and 4 open market purchases.</p>	No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
					<p>it cannot be certain that those needs are still current nearly four years later. Re-check the individual requirements that determined the overall size of the development and, if necessary , carry out another survey.</p> <p>The needs indicated in the surveys have no personal commitment and we may be providing a development to match needs that are never taken up by those who indicated them on the survey. Obtain some form of personal commitment from individuals that indicated their needs on the survey.</p>		
108.	P4	26	R68		<p>Quarter Houses are not appropriate to the form and character of the settlement. Provide cottage style houses to satisfy the one bedroom hose requirement.</p> <p>The housing density for the available area is far too high and not in keeping with the rest of the village. Reduce the number of dwellings in the development and consider an alternative location for the remainder if required.</p>	There is no comparable provision of smaller houses within the Parish and the proposed development would not be "visible" in the same manner as the rest of the Parish housing	No change
109.			Natural England	Your plan or order can offer exciting opportunities to enhance your local environment. If you are setting out policies on new development or proposing sites for development, you		Response considered	Policy P4 changed

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
				may wish to consider identifying what environmental features you want to be retained or enhanced or new features you would like to see created as part of any new development.			

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

Ref Number	Policy	Page	Name or Stat. Consul	Text from Neighbourhood Plan	Comments	Steering Group Response	Change made or otherwise to Plan
110.	P1	24	R51		Y Opposition re number of Affordable Houses. 18 Affordable Houses is too many for this site.	The plan intends to deliver 18 houses rather than 18 affordable houses. The figures has been determined by the 2016 housing needs survey, supported by the interest generated by Beyond's project. House sizes, amenity space, roads and pavements are all expected to satisfy local standards set by the Parish Council in order to address local need	No Change
111.	P2	25	R51		Opposition. Before accessible housing and specialist accommodation is provided for older people we need to provide walking paths to Ingleby Cross and/or more bus stops at the top of village.	Agreed. This point is addressed in policy P4, but it is not practical to accommodate bus stop. The Main Street leading to the proposed new housing is a No Through Road with insufficient space for a bus to turn around.	No Change
112.	P4	26	R51		Support provision of off-road car-parking commensurate with nature of development. It is currently very difficult to get into Priors Way due to on-road obstruction and on-street parking.	This point is addressed in policies P4 & P6 which aim to ensure sufficient parking is provided as part of development or else existing parking is protected.	No Change
113.	P6	28	R51		Support essential. A proper walking route down to Ingleby Cross is essential. We arrived in this village with two small children in 1994 (aged 4 and 8) I needed to take them walking around during school holidays and always had to get into my car to get out of the village safely. It was a good job we could afford two cars.	New footpaths either need to be secured as part of development or as a result of NYCC funding. Consequently, the matter is addressed by policy P5 and also in the community actions.	No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

114.	P1	24	R52		I greatly regret the closure of the Primary School- a big loss for the village. However, as that cannot now be prevented, I support the plan to use this land for a mixed housing development as described. I am happy with the proposed development which I feel is much better than placing a small number of small executive houses on this site.	Support offered so no change proposed to the NP. Policy P1 is intended to make clear the Parish Council's preference for the future of the site and how it provides an important opportunity to deliver housing need	No Change
115.	P2	25	R52		I think that the housing mix which meets the needs of the community, as identified in surveys, is essential. It is most important that the development includes sufficient affordable accommodation to provide for the members of the village community unable to afford to rent or buy any of the many large houses we have at present. This is vital to help maintain a balanced community into the future. I hope that a scheme can be devised for allocation of affordable homes that is sustainable into the long term future.	The expectation is that a minimum of 18 units will provide a range of smaller house types to meet the identified local housing need.	No Change
116.	P6	28	R52		It is right to have a policy to manage car parking and minimise its effect on the street scene. I would like to see a significant improvement in the public transport services for the village. This would provide a viable alternative to the use of private cars and enable those who wish to do so to live without cars in the future. A revival of schemes for safe cycling links to	Whilst the plan can address parking and cycling, it is unable to address public transport provision. The plan therefore seeks to influence future development where it is possible to do so.	No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

					the village would contribute to this.		
117.		17	Diocese		<p>We do not believe that the evidence base provided by the November 2016 housing needs survey on which the present scheme is based can be considered is sufficiently robust for a development plan document. The 2016 survey predates the closure of the school in December 2018 I was undertaken at a time when the future of the school must have been in doubt owing to the low number of children attending it and this could easily have influence how people identified the need</p> <p>A housing needs survey needs to be undertaken after the closure of the village school to illustrate the present scale and nature of the housing need.</p>	<p>The plan clearly demonstrates the changing demographics within the parish which took place when the school was opened. The number of pupils attending the school had been falling for years So, whether the Primary school remained open or closed it had either no or minimal effect on changing the Parish's demographics. Primary school was already in the state of decline when the housing survey was conducted. Therefore, in our view whether the school remained open or closed had no material effect either way on the housing survey. Indeed, the under 5-year housing need demand of those responding who provided family details shows only 3 out of 16 with children. Looking at the within 10 year need only 5 out of 29 had children. Following the 21/11/19 Open Evening, by Beyond Housing, interest has been registered for 19 affordable and 4 open market purchases.</p>	Wording changed to reflect comment

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

					does not achieve this. The approach to housing provision after 5 years is not properly covered.		
120.	P1	24	Diocese		We believe the diocese land should be removed from the allocation under policy P1. This allocation need only relate to the North Yorkshire County Council land which is outside the development limits. The diocesan land is within development limits developed as planning permission for 4 dwellings and could be considered its allocated for housing.	There is no disputing that the former school site is appropriate for housing, but the Plan's policies are directed to setting out what type, number and tenure of housing should be built. Therefore, no land on which there is now or will be up to 2035 which is put forward for new housing consideration has to be included within the plan's dictates. The land has outline planning permission rather than full planning permission, which could lapse. It is also appropriate to include a policy for the wider site.	No Change
121.	P1	24	Diocese		The extension to the development limits for Policy P1 is based on an indicative layout scheme that is flawed and not suitable for such a purpose. Development limits should be based on a village plan and reflect features on the ground.	It is our view that the school site, the playing field and the recreation ground are all part of one contiguous whole and indeed part therefore of Ingleby Arncliffe village. The NP does not look to move the development limits, especially as the emerging local plan does not include development limits. Instead, the boundary is an expression of the extent of the developable area.	No Change
122.	P1	24	Diocese		There is no need to allocate the diocese land for housing in the plan. It already forms part of the village development envelope and has planning permission for housing.	The land only has outline planning permission rather than full planning permission, which could lapse. It is also appropriate to include a policy for the wider site.	No Change
123.	P1	24	Diocese		Representing in our opinion the key deliverable stakeholder for	Part of the allocation currently has outline planning permission,	No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

					<p>this site we feel it should not be assumed that a comprehensive housing scheme with the NYCC land will be achievable within 5 years. Negotiations with a preferred developer Beyond housing have been protracted. Notwithstanding comments in the plan document there is no other policy in place to guide development should the NYCC land not proceed for housing. The DNDP needs to set out alternatives in the event that the site does not come forward. The parish have recognised that delivery of the site for housing cannot be assumed. It is necessary for the DNDP to recognise this in this policies and proposals. Clearly policies need to be incorporated to indicate where alternative sites would be considered should the policy one site not become available. This has not occurred.</p>	<p>where there is no certainty the permission will be implemented. Especially as the offer by Beyond has been accepted and they have no interest in the current permission. Instead they wish to develop the scheme currently supported by the NP. As such, it is appropriate for the NP to refer to continue to allocate the site to meet local need.</p> <p>Policy P2 sets out support for alternative sites (and for site (6) if the proposed development should not come to fruition) in the event the preferred allocation does not come forward or additional need is identified during the plan period.</p>	
124.	P4	26	Diocese		<p>There is no clear advice within the DNDP on the character and appearance of the village required to assess compliance with policy P4. We consider it important that this is included if Policy P4 is to have any relevance.</p>	<p>The justification to policy P4 has been expanded upon to address the point raised.</p>	<p>Wording for Policy P4 has been amended</p>
125.	P4	26	Diocese		<p>The aim of "protect and enhance" in the policy is a high bar particularly where value judgements are used to determine compliance. It is more often the case that development is acceptable provided there is no material effect on character and appearance. We will</p>	<p>The tests of 'protect' and 'enhance' are well trodden in case law and so it is not considered necessary to change the wording.</p>	<p>No change</p>

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

					suggest consideration is given to replace and with or. It would then read protect or enhance.		
126.		32	Diocese		The local planning authority may have concerns over the introduction of quarter house fronting the street in terms of its scale massing and appearance. It could be viewed as being out of keeping with adjoining buildings and streetscapes and against well established development plan policy on this issue.	HDC and NPYMNP have been given the opportunity to comment and they have not raised concerns. The indicative plan has been replaced with a red line location plan to make clear the area to which the policy applies.	No change
127.		32	Diocese		The local planning authority might also have concerns over the rear gardens of the bungalows. It is normal practice to see a minimum of 9 metres to the boundary where it backs onto open land to provide some protection for any future development.	HDC and NYMNP have had chance to comment and they have not raised any concerns at this stage. The indicative plan has been replaced with a red line location plan to make clear the area to which the policy applies.	No change
128.		32	Diocese		The layout does not provide for a vehicular link west to serve other dices land which could be a requirement. Also the layout does not provide for a vehicular link northwards to access any surplus NYCC land.	The indicative plan has been replaced with a red line location plan to make clear the area to which the policy applies. The layout has yet to be confirmed, and so the matter of access can be addressed once a planning application has been submitted.	An OS map has been provided and an updated indicative plan shows a vehicular route to the rest of the playing field land.
129.	P1	24	DL6 3ND		Support development of Grain Store.	Policy P2 supports the development of sites, such a the Grain Store, in the event the former primary school does not come forward or further housing need is to be addressed.	No Change
130.	P6	28	DL6 3ND		Support that any new development needs to have provision for parking - at least two for the smallest houses-	Parking is to be provided in accordance with NYCC standards, which roughly equates to one car parking space per bedroom.	No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

					must keep same level of provision.		
131.	P6	28	DL6 3ND	Parking requirements arising from new development must be provided within the boundaries of the application site, and not give rise to demand for on-site parking.	Paragraph 2 should say ".....must not give rise to demand for on-street parking" - not on-site parking"	Agree	Change wording
132.	CAP N1	29	DL6 3ND		Very supportive of development on Grain Store site in the future.	Policy P2 supports the development of sites, such as the Grain Store, in the event the former primary school does not come forward or further housing need is to be addressed.	No Change
133.	CAP IC1	30	DL6 3ND		Agree parking needs to be monitored. Ensure ample parking is provided with new development.		No Change
134.	P4	26	DL6 3NG		Y Wildlife should be considered if any buildings are to be built on the Grain Store. Bats, sixteen types of birds, squirrels etc. Also for any building not to be imposing on existing properties.	Agree any site proposed for housing would have to be subject to a SEA/HRA. Any planning application would also need to be accompanied with a Phase 1 Habitat Survey, which would identify if protected species are present. Mitigation measures would then be required.	Wording changed to recognise the need to consider the effect of any proposed development on the environment.
135.	P6	28	DL6 3NG		I support provision of off-road parking for Ingleby Cross.		No Change
136.	P6	28	DL6 3NG		Y I support a provision of extra parking facility in Ingleby Cross. There are still a number of visitors who park outside of people's homes, even the Manager of the Coffee Shop who also parks on the dropped kerbs.		No Change
137.	P4	26	R56		Y The appearance of the proposed dwellings should be in keeping with the existing village houses. Omit full storey height windows, replace with normal	The policies within the plan aim to seek development that integrates with the appearance and character of the villages. As such, the policies are not	Wording changed to Policy P4 to set out more clearly the different characters of the two villages and the

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

					depth windows. A mix of dwellings in stone, brick, rendered walls and pantile roofing may also be considered.	intended to be prescriptive in order to acknowledge how the villages have been developed over an extended period of time and so there is a great variety of design references that might be incorporated into future development.	differences within Ingleby Arncliffe.
138.		32	R56	Appendix A Indicative Layout of Site (6)	Orientation of houses at south side. Reposition the house/houses at the south of the development to front on to Main Street to maintain the "feel" of the street. This also prevents a direct view into our property	The layout is only indicative at this stage and would ultimately need to satisfy HDC's design standards, which includes preventing overlooking, overbearing and overshadowing.	Indicative layout has been revised by Beyond Housing and an OS red line boundary plan has been included.
139.	P1	24	R57		Y Affordable Housing and bungalows for older people have been needed in this Parish for as long as I have lived here, so I would wholeheartedly support Policy 1.		No Change
140.	P2	25	R57		Strongly Support		No Change
141.	P3	25	R57		Strongly Support		No Change
142.	P4	26	R57		Strongly support. I would hope the new housing would be as energy efficient as possible including PV panels on all suitably facing roofs. Bungalows should be fully accessible - cheaper than trying to adapt/make changes later. Support but have a concern about too few parking spaces being provided. Would like to see a minimum provision stated. HDC allows 2 parking spaces per dwelling and in this village car use is essential due to lack		No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

					of public transport. Most adults will require use of a car.		
143.	P5	27	R57		Strongly support. Would like a safe all-weather footpath provided to Ingleby Cross.CIL money?	The Parish Council would consult with the community on the use of any CIL funds at the time.	No Change
144.	P6	28	R57		Strongly support. More car parking at Ingleby Cross is essential. CIL money?		No Change
145.		19	HDC	<p>HDC's Local Development Framework (LDF) was adopted on the 3rd April 2007 when it categorised the Parish as a secondary village under the Stokesley "Service Centre" grouping. In neither the existing suite of documents that form the LDF, nor in the emerging Local Plan, is there an allocation of new houses for the Parish.</p> <p>The HDC development boundary (identified in black on the map below) tightly follows the line of the existing houses and gardens and permits only infill development if suitable parcels of land exist. Given the lack of available space in the Parish to accommodate infill development, the development boundary is a policy constraint to achieving the delivery of new houses to meet identified housing needs, especially as there are a number of sites adjacent to the villages that are capable of being developed.</p>	<p>Although the LDF is the adopted policy at this moment in time the local plan is gaining weight.</p> <p>'Planning Policy Context within HDC' Please note in the local plan (subject to examination) there will be no development limits and the IPG shall not form part of the local plan moving forward. Therefore this text should be revised to reflect the local plan and not the LDF.</p> <p>It is suggested that the amount of text is reduced.</p> <p>Suggest that you review whether having a map here is necessary.</p> <p>The need for further references to the LDF should be reviewed.</p> <p>It is understood that there is a requirement for affordable housing and therefore more emphasis should be added to housing need surveys and information on how to bring a site forward for rural housing.</p>	The LDF is still the adopted plan and the draft local plan has limited weight at the moment. Its therefore more appropriate to refer to being in transition at this moment in time. The wording will be updated before the NP is submitted to reflect the status of the local plan at that time.	No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

				<p>In addition to infill developments, HDC's existing planning policy allows for development of rural exception sites for only Affordable housing outside the Development Boundary. Due to changes in national planning policy, HDC published an Interim Housing Policy Guidance Note in 2015 and although this policy is not part of the LDF, the policy is used by the Local Planning Authority in the consideration of current planning applications. The guidance varied the settlement hierarchy set out in the adopted Core Strategy and HDC's approach to the location for new development. In addition, the guidance offers support for development of small-scale sites for up to 5 houses, subject to meeting criteria within settlements where such development was to be resisted under the Core Strategy approach.</p>	<p>Positive wording could be useful such as why different house types are important for health and wellbeing and that the aim of the neighbourhood plan is to promote the right type of homes for the local communities. Also to enable older people to down size to accommodation better suited for their individual requirements. Further information on specific housing mix can be sought by the LPA and through housing need surveys.</p>		
146.		19	HDC	<p>In relation to the Parish of Ingleby Arncliffe, promoting sustainable development means protecting the Parish's natural rural setting and green spaces, its cultural heritage, tourism businesses and local facilities, together with the "feeling" of the community. All these aspects are essential to supporting a sustainable future for the</p>	<p>The definition of sustainable development should focus on: Economic objectives; tourism, businesses, local facilities Social objectives; Cultural heritage, local facilities, community Environmental objectives, rural setting, green spaces. Neighbourhood plan policies should balance the objectives of sustainable development.</p>	<p>Text to be expanded upon to make clear the explanation of sustainable development.</p>	<p>Wording changed to reflect the comment.</p>

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

				Parish and its residents. Ensuring there are appropriate homes for local needs is essential for a well-balanced and self-sustaining community			
147.		19	HDC	In summary, NYMNPA's planning policy will not allow the development of the Grain Store site. However, this policy may change if the site was no longer in use and has fallen into disrepair	For NYMNPA to provide comment.	In recognition of the current policy circumstances, Policy P2 supports development of the grain store in the event circumstances were to change.	No Change
148.		22	HDC	When adopted, the Plan and the accompanying Proposals Map will be a statutory planning document with the same status as the HDC LDF and NYMNPA Core Strategy and Development Policies Plan and with the two LPA's emerging LPs when adopted, and any development plan documents that supersede those mentioned. As such, future planning applications must be considered with reference to the Parish's Plan.	This text would benefit from being specifically stating that it would be the neighbourhood plan that would be used to help determine planning applications. Again reference to the LDF should be reviewed.	Agree, to update wording accordingly.	Amend last sentence of first paragraph to read "...reference to the Parish's Plan because it will form part of the statutory development plan against which planning applications will be determined."
149.		23	HDC	Whole page refers to LDF	It is acknowledged that the LDF is the current policies. However greater emphasis should be placed on the emerging local plan. It is suggested that the text referring to the IPG is removed. It is considered that the text referring to NYMNPA does not add any value	The emerging local plan is now reaching a stage where its unlikely to substantially change so it should be safe to start referring to it, but it is only still a draft document and so it is appropriate to continue to refer to the previous version too.	Update wording throughout the plan.
150.	P1	23	HDC	First paragraph	It is suggested that the text should relate to housing need surveys but not a figure as this could change through time.	The NP currently aims to justify the allocation of a site for 18 houses so its appropriate to	No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

						justify the number with the evidence being relied upon	
151.	P1	24	HDC	P1: Housing Allocation – Land at the Former Primary School and Playing Field The Neighbourhood Plan allocates the land within the Former Primary School site, together with a part of the former Playing Field, situated immediately to the North, for residential development, with a capacity for 18 new dwellings, to meet local housing needs.	Suggest either removing the figure for housing from the policy, or add 'approximately' before it. The policy refers to allocating the former school, however there is no map to follow this policy. It is suggested that a map would aid clarity as to what land is allocated.	The evidence suggests 18 houses is the right number so there is no need to alter the reference. The indicative plan is to be replaced with an OS location plan.	The indicative plan has been updated by Beyond Housing. The Appendixes now include an OS plan with a red line around the extent of the site to be allocated.
152.		25	HDC	With respect to the HDC Core Strategy, policy CP9 sets out how 50% of dwellings on sites greater than 2 or more dwellings (or sites of 0.1 acres or more) must make provision for an element of housing that is accessible and affordable. Where development is to take place outside of development limits, policy CP9A sets out how housing schemes will be supported for 100% affordable housing to meet identified housing need and where any development is small in scale. Development should not conflict with environmental protection, nature conservation policies, heritage assets and provide necessary mitigation or compensation to address harmful implications.	This information is not up to date. It is suggested that a less detailed summary is included as figures and percentages can become dated. This text needs to be positively worded Please refer to our general advice about policies and about the use of terminology. Maybe consider if there are local connections, the development would remain in perpetuity and the impact on the landscape. How the requirements for mixed balanced community would be served as identified in the NPPF(Chapter 5) . This would back the Government's objective of boosting the supply of homes, It maybe also be helpful to state that affordable housing should be met on site or a contribution should be justified.	Update the wording of the plan accordingly to ensure it is consistent with the local plan.	Wording in the plan changed to reflect the comment

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

153.	P2	25	HDC	<p>P2: Housing Mix Housing development that complies with other policies in the Neighbourhood Plan and in the Hambleton and North York Moors National Park Local Plans, and provides a housing mix consistent with the most up-to-date housing market assessment and/or local needs survey will, in principle, be supported. The need for accessible housing and specialist accommodation for older people should be particularly considered within the mix.</p>	<p>As it stands the requirements of this policy are not clear. There is scope here for you to really make the plan locally specific, link to local character and distinctiveness, the earlier identification of historic assets, green spaces etc; as it stands there is no supporting text to explain what is considered to be high quality design. The current wording of the policy is unlikely to add value. National policy is clear that plans should not set or require their own housing standards and that only nationally defined standards are used, which applies to neighbourhood plans as well as local plans. Perhaps reference the SPD on size, type and tenure and the emerging Local Plan requirement for national space standards. As it stands this policy is unlikely to meet basic conditions.</p>	<p>The policy makes clear the Parish Council's support if a certain set of circumstances are met, i.e. a scheme that is consistent with policy and targets will be supported.</p>	<p>No change the policies need to be parish led and not LPA driven as the Parish Council want to deliver local housing need rather than be driven by housing demand arising from outside the Parish</p>
154.	P3	25	HDC	<p>P3: Affordable Housing Housing development that complies with other policies in the Neighbourhood Plan and in the Hambleton and North York Moors National Park Local Plans, and provides affordable housing consistent with the most up-to-date housing market assessment and/or local needs survey will, in principle, be supported</p>	<p>There is no need to state that development should comply with adopted policies, so as it stands this policy adds little value. It is suggest that the policy is reworded to concentrate on local requirements.</p>	<p>The policy sets out the Parish Council's support for the delivery of housing that meets the needs of the Parish. The intention is that the delivery of housing will be driven by the parish to meet the needs of the parish.</p>	<p>No amendment considered necessary.</p>
155.	P4	26	HDC	<p>Policy: Development that would result in the loss or harm to</p>	<p>This policy should be reworded in a positive manner, to state the circumstances that are required</p>	<p>No change required as its reasonable to set out how loss will be resisted – the emerging</p>	<p>No amendment considered necessary.</p>

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

				the recreational value or accessibility of an existing footpath, cycleway and / or bridleway will be resisted.	for a development proposal to be supported.	local plan refers to resisting development for the same purpose.	
156.	P5	26	HDC	Walking and Cycling Provision justification	Reference to the LDF should be reviewed. It may be worth adding that the use of cycle and foot paths would go some way to reduce greenhouse gas emission and promote a healthy lifestyle choice.	Wording to be updated to refer to the emerging local plan.	Update wording to refer to the emerging local plan.
157.	P6	28	HDC	<p>P6: Car Parking</p> <p>Any new development that would lead to the loss of existing car parking areas, including public car parking and private off-street parking areas will be resisted unless alternative off-street provision can be provided elsewhere that will meet the needs of development whilst also maintaining the existing level of vehicle parking provision in Ingleby Cross. Parking requirements arising from new development must be provided within the boundaries of the application site, and not give rise to demand for on-site parking. The number of spaces must be in accordance with local planning policy standards, as set out in the most up to date guidance determined by the local highways authority or local planning authority. Development which complies with other policies in the</p>	<p>This policy should be reworded in a positive manner, to state the circumstances that are required for a development proposal to be supported.</p> <p>Parking standards are currently set by NYCC not the LPA. However, current national planning policy is for standards to be set only where necessary.</p> <p>We would suggest considering a different form of words so that this relates more to the specific local circumstances, such as narrow roads, that are unsuitable for on-street parking. As it stands this policy therefore unlikely to meet basic conditions.</p>	<p>No change considered necessary as its reasonable to set out how loss will be resisted – the emerging local plan refers to resisting development for the same purpose.</p> <p>The policy refers to the local highways authority, which is another way of referring to NYCC.</p> <p>Supporting text to be reviewed <i>in light of comments.</i></p>	<p>Neighbourhood Plan consultations have identified how parking is one of the community's key concerns. In particular, the parking of visitors, parking by walkers, and blocking of access to residents' properties. The roads through the villages are generally narrow and many are not served by pavements. Consequently, on-street parking narrows the roads so vehicles cannot pass or else visibility is affected. Such situations are undesirable and so opportunities to protect existing off-street parking are considered to be important in order to prevent the creation of further pressures for on-street parking</p>

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

				Neighbourhood Plan and in the Local Plan that would provide for additional car parking capacity, particularly to service Ingleby Cross, will be supported			
158.		29	HDC NYMPA	Community Action Points N1	<p>This text is a little confusing, it is suggested that it is either removed or consultation with NYMNP is undertaken and they advise on the wording of this section.</p> <p>It is suggested that the dates are revised on the community plan action points 2012 – 2014?</p> <p>Local Plan does include a couple of site specific 'Environmental Enhancement Sites' and the Plan is required to be reviewed every five years, so it may be an option to consider the Grain Store site under this policy in a future review. You will understand we cannot commit to this at this early stage as future plans need to go through extensive consultation, and issues of viability of the site may remain if the site is to be for housing to meet local needs.</p>	The community plan took place at a particular point in time and so the reference is correct.	No Change
159.		30	HDC	S1 Parish Traffic Speeds Concerns IC1 Ingleby Cross Parking C1 Coast to Coast National Trust C2 Countryside and Footpaths R1 Recreation Ground W1 Website	<p>It is suggested that an explanation is included to introduce this section and to emphasise that this section contains commitments or aspirations of the Parish and should not to be read as policy. This would then reduce any potential confusion as they are not considered to be policies</p>	Introduction to be added to the section to make clear its purpose.	Wording in the plan amended to accommodate the comment.

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

				B1 High Quality Broadband and Internet Communications T1 Tourist and Recreational Support BS1 Bus Service	and do not need to meet the basic conditions.		
160.		6	HDC	Only policies directly relating to the development and the use of land will be the subject of the referendum vote. All other policies, more appropriately termed "community action points," are not part of the referendum decision process	Supporting text to Policy P1 states that the policy indicates the circumstances under which the Parish Council would support development – however the Plan will eventually become part of the development Plan of the two Authorities who will be responsible for making decisions based on it.	Agreed	Wording amended
161.		7	HDC	Reliance on the Internet.	It is suggested that the first two sentences are removed as they do not add any value to this paragraph	Agreed	Wording amended
162.	P1	24	R58		Support.: Consideration to be given to the development of two sites? Suggest Grain Store to allow for additional housing and increased options.	CAP N1 is seeking to enable the Grain Store to become a candidate site for housing. A two site solution may restrict the opportunity on either or both sites of achieving a mixed housing option	No Change
			R58		Support: I support this plan and would like to thank all concerned with developing this plan. This is a very comprehensive and well presented document.		No Change
163.	P4	26	R58		Support: Off-road parking, road infrastructure, more lighting and better signage. Suggest lighting	Signage is a matter for the highways authority rather than the NP, which is concerned with	No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

					and signage at all crossing and turning points. Clear speed limit signage.	managing the impact of development.	
164.	P5	27	R58		Support: Footpaths to be made more accessible between Ingleby Arncliffe and Ingleby Cross. Suggest: Footpath and lighting to be established on Cross Lane. Clearly identified crossing points.		No Change
165.	P6	28	R58		I support this decision and thought should be given to parking at Ingleby Cross. Public car park?- Suggest car park at the top of the cricket pitch near Village Hall.	Parking at the top of the cricket pitch would require the landowner's agreement, which has not yet been explored.	No Change
166.		32	R59	Appendix A Indicative Layout of Site (6)	I agree the Plan without modifications; however, I do feel that for the number of houses/bedrooms planned the parking provided may be a concern. The parking outside the development on Main Street is already used by current residents. Dwellings 1-4 have only one parking space each, but as these properties will most likely be bought by young couples and taking into consideration that there is insufficient public transport, there could be potentially 2 cars at each of these developments. There will be limited parking outside the houses as access to the full outside of each property will be needed. This could cause obstructions on the new road and cause people to park on the grass verges opposite.	It is expected that parking will be provided in accordance with NYCC standards, which roughly equates to one parking space per bedroom.	No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

167.	P1	24	R60		Agree. It's the ideal site within the village boundary and is "crying out" for appropriate use as long as the emphasis is on including Affordable Houses. No changes only to ensure Affordable Housing is included.		No Change
168.	P2	25	R60 and provides a housing mix consistent with the most up-to-date housing market assessment and/or local needs survey will, in principle, be supported.	Fully agree with last paragraph of Policy 2 Paragraph 1 Remove the words "In principle" Remove "In principle". This is just a way of giving wriggle room not to achieve.	Agreed	Amend the relevant policies P2 & P3
169.	P4	26	R60		Agree . The aim should be to attain the highest standards in all areas that can be achieved within the budget to ensure all elements can be incorporated.eg Affordable Homes.		No Change
170.	P5	27	R60		Agree that the path to the Recreation Area should be maintained/ have improved access. Ensure that the path down to the Play Area is retained improved in its existing location.		No Change
171.	P6	28	R60		Agree. On the plan, the Quarter houses - 1 bed 2 person, properties 1-4 show single parking bays per property that is unrealistic in this day and age. 2 people likely to be 2 professionals requiring a car each.	At this stage, the layout is only indicative. Once a planning application has been submitted then HDC will need to ensure it satisfies design standards, including in relation to parking provision.	An OS plan has been added with the allocated area shown in red. The indicative plan has been updated.
172.		32	R61	Appendix A Indicative Layout of Site (6)	Support the plan but would like to see more parking for the quarter houses. I know there are minimum requirements, but they need to be exceeded. Each house may have two cars and	At this stage, the layout is only indicative. Once a planning application has been submitted then HDC will need to ensure it satisfies design standards, including in relation to parking provision.	No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

					visitors and if there is only one space it will lead to conflict.		
173.		32	R61	Appendix A Indicative Layout of Site (6)	Please make sure that all of the properties have adequate space to store bins out of sight.	This is a matter for the detailed planning application	No Change
174.	P1	24	R62		Support development of Primary School site for provision of mixed dwellings. 18 needs to be the max. as I would have some concerns about increased traffic through the village.	18 is the minimum in order to ensure local housing need can be met.	No Change
175.	P2	25	R62		Support - this will help prevent further stagnation of the village and hopefully bring new life to the village.		No Change
176.	P3	25	R62		Support as above		No Change
177.	P4	26	R62		Support. Absolute must to provide off road parking and I would say where possible for at least two cars per property. On-road parking on the Main Road in particular, is becoming an issue.		No Change
178.	P5	27	R62		I am not aware of any cycleway connecting IA to any other villages and the A172 is a very busy road - I have given up cycling. Walking down to IC can be dangerous with lack of pavement.	Policy P5 supports improvements to the footpath network within the villages rather than to alterations across the wider network.	No Change
179.	P6	28	R62		Support. Any additional parking particularly to serve IC would be welcomed.		No Change
180.		17	R63		18 homes are far too many. A development of this size will increase traffic on the High Street which is underdeveloped with respect to pavements and should remain so.	The housing numbers are determined by the 2016 housing needs survey. The houses themselves are sized in accordance with national housing sizes criteria and allow	A draft of an Affordable Housing Policy added as an Appendix. – To be agreed? Wording added to set out the ambition of Beyond Housing to take what reasonable steps they can to provide

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

				<p>Reduce number of dwellings in the development. Some of the open market homes will undoubtedly be bought as an investment for rental income. Legally restrict sale of open market houses to owner occupier only.</p> <p>There is no assurance that the Affordable Homes will be allocated to people from the local area. Ensure that the Housing Association only allocates Affordable Homes to people from the local area.</p> <p>Whilst the development is designed to address the needs indicated by the survey of 2016, it cannot be certain that those needs are still current nearly four years later. Re-check the individual requirements that determined the overall size of the development and, if necessary , carry out another survey.</p> <p>The needs indicated in the surveys have no personal commitment and we may be providing a development to match needs that are never taken up by those who indicated them on the survey. Obtain some form of personal commitment from individuals that indicated their needs on the survey.</p>	<p>for the appropriate amount of amenity space. It is accepted that additional housing will increase traffic movements but that is considered to be acceptable.</p> <p>Discussions are underway with Beyond on what (if any) procedures can be in place to afford Parish residents, either first choice or preference on open market house purchases.</p> <p>A housing policy setting out the Affordable Housing allocation system has been added as an Appendix.</p> <p>Following the 21/11/19 Open Evening, interest has been registered for 19 affordable and 4 open market purchases.</p>	<p>Parish residents with priority on Open Market purchases.</p>
181.	P1	24	R63	<p>Y 18 homes are far too many. A development of this size will increase traffic on the High Street which is underdeveloped</p>	<p>#Duplicated earlier at ??</p>	

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

				<p>with respect to pavements and should remain so.</p> <p>Reduce number of dwellings in the development. Some of the open market homes will undoubtedly be bought as an investment for rental income. Legally restrict sale of open market houses to owner occupier only.</p> <p>There is no assurance that the Affordable Homes will be allocated to people from the local area. Ensure that the Housing Association only allocates Affordable Homes to people from the local area.</p> <p>Whilst the development is designed to address the needs indicated by the survey of 2016, it cannot be certain that those needs are still current nearly four years later. Re-check the individual requirements that determined the overall size of the development and, if necessary, carry out another survey.</p> <p>The needs indicated in the surveys have no personal commitment and we may be providing a development to match needs that are never taken up by those who indicated them on the survey. Obtain some form of personal commitment from individuals that indicated their needs on the survey.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

182.	P4	26	R63		Quarter Houses are not appropriate to the form and character of the settlement. Provide cottage style houses to satisfy the one bedroom hose requirement.. The housing density for the available area is far too high and not in keeping with the rest of the village. Reduce the number of dwellings in the development and consider an alternative location for the remainder if required.	Provision of cottages would take up more space and make the properties more expensive. There is no comparable provision of smaller houses within the Parish and the proposed development would not be "visible" in the same manner as the rest of the Parish housing	No Change
183.	P1	24	R64		We support this development as it is already within the village envelope and reuses an empty site.		No Change
184.	P2	25	R64		We support this principle in an ageing population.		No Change
185.	P3	25	R64		We support this principle in order to retain younger people in the community. The Parish Council has shown this need through their admirable and diligent canvassing of the need within the village.		No Change
186.	P4	26	R64		We support this principle. It should be common to all development.		No Change
187.	P5	27	R64		We support this principle, especially as the Coast to Coast Walk passes through the village.		No Change
188.	P6	28	R64		We support this principle - the village is on the National Park boundary and every effort		No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

					should be made to encourage a car-free street scene		
189.	P2	25	R66		Y Good Housing mix. Design of houses needs a bit more thought. Build property aimed at elderly people nearer the Main Street for easier access.	The design and layout is to be considered at the planning application stage. To avoid confusion, the block plan is to be replaced with a layout plan.	An OS plan has been added with the allocated area shown in red. The indicative plan has been updated.
190.	P3	25	R66		Affordable Housing. Will there be a cap on pricing increase if, and/or when they are sold on? Otherwise they may become unaffordable.	This is to be determined by the affordable housing provider in consultation with the LPA and with reference to the local housing needs survey to ensure provision is compliant with the requirements of the plan	No Change
191.	P4	26	R66		Parking/garages. Not all properties have garages. Would permission be possible to build one where space is available, or extend existing garages?	The appropriateness of extensions will be a matter for the LPA to consider. The community will, however, have the opportunity to comment on a planning application.	Beyond Housing's updated indicative plan shows that access is provided.
192.	CAP RI	30	R66		Will there be access to the Recreation ground via the right of way from the bottom of the site?	This will be a consideration of any future planning application.	No Change
193.	P1	24	R65		We support this development as it is already within the village envelope and reuses an empty site.		No Change
194.	P2	25	R65		We support this principle in an ageing population.		No Change
195.	P3	25	R65		We support this principle in order to retain younger people in the community. The Parish Council has shown this need through their admirable and diligent canvassing of the need within the village.		No Change
196.	P4	26	R65		We support this principle. It should be common to all development.		No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

197.	P5	27	R65		We support this principle, especially as the Coast to Coast Walk passes through the village.		No Change
198.	P6	28	R65		We support this principle - the village is on the National Park boundary and every effort should be made to encourage a car-free street scene		No Change
199.	P4	26	North Yorkshire Police		There are no specific policies in the plan relating to Designing Out Crime. It is accepted that any planning application would be subject of policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Local Authority Plans, which include Hambleton and North Yorkshire Moors (NYM), and these include policies around the prevention of crime and disorder and ensuring that any new developments are safe for all users. It is noted that the Ingleby Arncliffe pre-submission plan does make reference to both paragraph 91 and 127 of the NPPF, which are relevant in terms of Designing Out Crime. This does not preclude the Neighbourhood Plan from containing a policy in relation to Designing Out Crime and therefore consideration could be given to including such a policy or incorporating wording into an existing policy, such as Policy P4: Key Guiding Principles for Development. An example of suitable wording would be: "Proposals will be expected to demonstrate how the design has been influenced	In addition, the Police Liaison Officer would have the opportunity to comment on a planning application.	Policy P4 has been amended

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

					by the need to plan positively to reduce crime and the fear of crime and how this will be achieved. The advice should be sought of a Police Designing out Crime representative for all developments of 10 or more dwellings."		
200.	General		NYMPA		<p>Our main point is that the policies need to be expressed with the end user in mind. This is principally Hambleton DC. It is mainly this District Council that will be deciding planning applications against policies in this Plan. Policies therefore should need to set out the circumstances under which development would (and would not) be permitted.</p> <p>Supporting text to Policy P1 states that the policy indicates the circumstances under which the Parish Council would support development – however the Plan will eventually become part of the development Plan of the two Authorities who will be responsible for making decisions based on it.</p> <p>I would therefore advise that some revisions may need to some policies so that they can be used in decision making on planning applications. <u>One initial suggestion would be for policies to use the phrase 'will only be permitted' rather than 'will be supported' (My underlining not NYMPA)</u></p>	Whilst the Parish Council would be happy to take on board the proposed amendment, the PC is not the decision making body so it is considered appropriate to simply express support for development.	No Change
201.		19	NYMPA		The NYMNP Core Strategy and Development Policies will almost certainly be superseded	Reference to the respective plans to be updated throughout NP.	The wording has been updated accordingly

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

					by the new Local Plan by the time the Neighbourhood Plan is 'made' (we are anticipating adoption in June 2020). References should refer to the North York Moors Local Plan only.		
202.		19	NYMPA		<p>This states that 'NYMNPA's planning policy will not allow the development of the Grain Store site' which implies some sort of 'blanket ban' on development, whereas the Plan then goes on to state on page 54 that in NYMNPA's view the site could be considered as an exception site or as a mix of affordable and local occupancy units. Planning policy is only one of the considerations when deciding a planning application (although it is the primary one).</p> <p>The Authority shares the Parish Council's view that a mix of local needs and affordable housing would be beneficial to the village - the issue is more one of viability once these tenures are introduced. Policy conformity could also change over the life of the Plan (as Community Action Point N1 indicates could be the case). I would suggest 'NYMNPA's <i>planning policy focusses on delivery housing schemes to meet local and affordable housing needs, which has implications for whether the site can be viably developed (see page 54).</i>'</p>	Agreed	Update the wording of the plan accordingly

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

203.		22	NYMPA		The NYMNPA Core Strategy and Development Policies will almost certainly be superseded by the new Local Plan by the time the Neighbourhood Plan is 'made' (we are anticipating adoption in June 2020). References should refer to the North York Moors Local Plan only.	The plan needs to reflect the policy context at the time of drafting and so presumptions cannot be made in respect of the stage either local plan will have reached. As such, the wording of the plan is being updated as the process progresses.	Update references within the plan to ensure it remains up to date.
204.		22	NYMPA	When adopted the Plan and the accompanying Proposals Map will be a statutory planning document.....	Refers to an 'accompanying Proposals Map' becoming a statutory planning document. There is also no proposals map in the Plan (i.e. a map of the whole neighbourhood plan area indicating where plan policies will change areas) – are you intending to include one at the next stage? There's no requirement for a neighbourhood plan to include a Policies Map. However, on adoption of the Neighbourhood Plan there will be a single 'Policies Map' for both HDC and the NYMNPA which forms part of the development plan and which would include any allocations made by the Neighbourhood Plan. I would suggest deleting 'and the accompanying Proposals Map' or including a Policies Map on an Ordnance Survey base which can then be incorporated to the Policies Map of each authority.	The NP includes a map of the designated area and then Appendix C has been updated with a red line location plan.	An OS red line plan of the area allocated has been included..
205.		23	NYMPA		The NYMNPA Core Strategy and Development Policies will almost certainly be superseded by the new Local Plan by the time the Neighbourhood Plan is	Agreed	General references to the two local plans to be updated so as to reflect the current status of the plans.

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

					'made' (we are anticipating adoption in June 2020). References should refer to the North York Moors Local Plan only		
206.		23	NYMPA		A minor point, but text states that the purpose of National Park designation is to conserve and enhance... This is the first of two statutory purposes; hence I would suggest adding 'first' before 'purpose'. The same point applies at the bottom of Page 24.	Agreed	Update as requested
207.		24	NYMPA		The NYMNP Core Strategy and Development Policies will almost certainly be superseded by the new Local Plan by the time the Neighbourhood Plan is 'made' (we are anticipating adoption in June 2020). References should refer to the North York Moors Local Plan only	Agreed	General references to the two local plans to be updated so as to reflect the current status of the plans.
208.		24	NYMPA		A minor point, but text states that the purpose of National Park designation is to conserve and enhance... This is the first of two statutory purposes; hence I would suggest adding 'first' before 'purpose'. The same point applies at the bottom of Page 24.	Agreed	Update as suggested.
209.		26	NYMPA		The NYMNP Core Strategy and Development Policies will almost certainly be superseded by the new Local Plan by the time the Neighbourhood Plan is 'made' (we are anticipating adoption in June 2020). References should refer to the North York Moors Local Plan only.	Agreed	General references to the two local plans to be updated so as to reflect the current status of the plans.

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

210.	P4	26	NYMPA		Paragraph 3 and 4 are issues covered by building regulations rather than planning policy. Whilst we support the aim the issue is how the decision maker would understand the circumstances under which failure to comply would warrant refusal of a planning application (or how an applicant would know how to comply with this policy). As background local planning authorities are generally discouraged from adopting energy/ carbon standards in excessive building regulation standards and also have to provide evidence of need and viability if they wish to adopt higher optional technical standards on accessibility and adaptability of new housing. I would advise either removing these two criteria or including more information on the standards that would need to be applied and the evidence justifying them.	Agreed	General references to the two local plans to be updated so as to reflect the current status of the plans.
211.		27	NYMPA		The NYMNP Core Strategy and Development Policies will almost certainly be superseded by the new Local Plan by the time the Neighbourhood Plan is 'made' (we are anticipating adoption in June 2020). References should refer to the North York Moors Local Plan only.	Agreed	General references to the two local plans to be updated so as to reflect the current status of the plans.
212.	CAP N1	29	NYMPA		Hambleton's DC's response suggest you check the wording with us. Our new local plan does include a couple of site specific "Environmental Enhancement	Understood	No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

					<p>Sites" and the plan is required to be reviewed every 5 years so it may be an option to consider the Grain Store site under this policy in a future review. You will understand we cannot commit to this at this early stage as future plans need to go through extensive consultation and issues of viability of the site may remain if the site is to be for housing to meet local needs.</p>		
213.		6	NYMPA	As above	<p>On a similar point, it is not clear as to whether the whole document is the neighbourhood plan or whether the intention is to separate out the neighbourhood plan 'policies' section and submit that for referendum. At the moment the document contains the community plan and a wealth of background information that would not be relevant when it comes to deciding planning applications.</p> <p>The text does state that only the policies directly relating to the development and the use of land will be the subject of the referendum vote, however the legislation treats a neighbourhood plan as a single legal entity and the question arises of how the Examiner would treat any comments made on other parts should they be made.</p> <p>My suggestion would be to separate the 'planning policies' part of the document and include the rest of the plan as supporting</p>	NP wording to be updated to make clear the whole document is the plan that is to be adopted	Update wording on Policy P4 accordingly.

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

					evidence or background. I would also agree with Hambleton BC that it is the 'whole' of the neighbourhood plan (including the supporting text) that has to go to referendum, and not just the policies.		
214.	P1	24	R67		Y If space provide garages.	At this stage the layout plan is only indicative and HDC will need to be satisfied development meets necessary standards when an application is submitted.	No Change
215.		17	R68		<p>Y 18 homes are far too many. A development of this size will increase traffic on the High Street which is underdeveloped with respect to pavements and should remain so.</p> <p>Reduce number of dwellings in the development. Some of the open market homes will undoubtedly be bought as an investment for rental income. Legally restrict sale of open market houses to owner occupier only.</p> <p>There is no assurance that the Affordable Homes will be allocated to people from the local area. Ensure that the Housing Association only allocates Affordable Homes to people from the local area.</p> <p>Whilst the development is designed to address the needs indicated by the survey of 2016, it cannot be certain that those needs are still current nearly four years later. Re-check the individual requirements that determined the overall size of</p>	<p>The housing numbers are determined by the 2016 housing needs survey. The houses themselves are sized in accordance with national housing sizes criteria and allow for the appropriate amount of amenity space.</p> <p>It is accepted that additional housing will increase traffic movements but that is considered to be acceptable.</p> <p>Discussions are underway with Beyond on what (if any) procedures can be in place to afford Parish residents, either first choice or preference on open market house purchases.</p> <p>Following the 21/11/19 Open Evening, interest has been registered for 19 affordable and 4 open market purchases.</p>	No Change

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

					<p>the development and, if necessary , carry out another survey.</p> <p>The needs indicated in the surveys have no personal commitment and we may be providing a development to match needs that are never taken up by those who indicated them on the survey. Obtain some form of personal commitment from individuals that indicated their needs on the survey.</p>		
216.	P1	24	R68		<p>Y 18 homes are far too many. A development of this size will increase traffic on the High Street which is underdeveloped with respect to pavements and should remain so.</p> <p>Reduce number of dwellings in the development. Some of the open market homes will undoubtedly be bought as an investment for rental income. Legally restrict sale of open market houses to owner occupier only.</p> <p>There is no assurance that the Affordable Homes will be allocated to people from the local area. Ensure that the Housing Association only allocates Affordable Homes to people from the local area.</p> <p>Whilst the development is designed to address the needs indicated by the survey of 2016, it cannot be certain that those needs are still current nearly four years later. Re-check the individual requirements that</p>	<p><i>Duplicated at ref ? CHECK NUMBER?</i></p>	

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group’s responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

					<p>determined the overall size of the development and, if necessary , carry out another survey.</p> <p>The needs indicated in the surveys have no personal commitment and we may be providing a development to match needs that are never taken up by those who indicated them on the survey. Obtain some form of personal commitment from individuals that indicated their needs on the survey.</p>		
217.	P4	26	R68		<p>Quarter Houses are not appropriate to the form and character of the settlement. Provide cottage style houses to satisfy the one bedroom hose requirement.</p> <p>The housing density for the available area is far too high and not in keeping with the rest of the village. Reduce the number of dwellings in the development and consider an alternative location for the remainder if required.</p>	<p>There is no comparable provision of smaller houses within the Parish and the proposed development would not be “visible” in the same manner as the rest of the Parish housing</p>	No change
218.			Natural England	<p>Your plan or order can offer exciting opportunities to enhance your local environment. If you are setting out policies on new development or proposing sites for development, you may wish to consider identifying what environmental features you want to be retained or enhanced or new features you would like to see created</p>		Response considered	Policy P4 changed

Appendix 6: Summary of Responses to the Pre-Submission draft plan and statement of Steering Group's responses and changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan

				as part of any new development.			
--	--	--	--	---------------------------------	--	--	--

/