

Agenda for meeting of the Steering Group of Ingleby Parish Neighbourhood Plan with representatives of Hambleton DC., NYMNPA, and landowners.

Date; Wednesday 14th March at 3pm in the village hall, Ingleby Cross.

PROPOSED AGENDA.

Item 1. **Background** to the Neighbourhood Plan.

Brief presentations explaining the demand for new housing in the parish. Stg. Grp.

Item 2. Explanations of why the two sites offered by parish landowners are suitable or unsuitable for the property development, proposed.

a. The "Far Field." Sue W-T

b. The "Grain Store". Paul F

Item 3. In the event of one or both sites being considered **unsuitable**, a village "Walkabout" to identify potential, additional sites. All invited.

Item 4. Summary of findings. Return to village hall.

- To reach a clear conclusion on the way forward for the Neighbourhood Plan, with particular reference to the two sites needed for stage 1 and 2, of new properties.
- To agree "Cross Boundary" relationships if the selection of sites creates the problem.

Opening remarks for meeting of Stg grp with HDC & NYMNPA on Wed. 14th Mar 2018

Introductions: As there are two new faces here today, let me make some introductions.

On my R or L we have 5 members of our N Plan Stg Grp and 5 members of our Parish Council. Name them

We have the main landowner of the village here and that is Lady Venetia Bell. Welcome Venetia.

From NYMNPA we have Paul Fellows, Head of Strategic Policy for the NY authority.

From Hambleton we have Sue Walters -Thompson, --a new face to us. Sue is the Planning Policy and Housing Manager, and we have --

And James Campbell, -another new face, and James is the Planning Policy Manager.

And our old friend Amanda, Rural Housing enabler who has helped us a lot over the past 4 years.

Last but not least our friend David Hugill --our Hambleton District Councillor.

Welcome one and all.

For Sue and John let me give you some important background to our N Plan.

I called this meeting because we, as a Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group feel we are going around in ever decreasing circles on the subject of agreeing a site or sites, to build much needed new houses for this community. I hope today we can face up to this problem, make progress and allow this team to get back to completing the N. Plan. Not resolving the problem of sites means we (this team) will have to stand back and decide whether we are prepared to continue putting a lot of our time and effort into a project that to date has been like pushing treacle uphill. **BUT** Giving up the Neighbourhood Plan would be extremely damaging to this community and the consequences would be far reaching.

Naively we thought that coming along with a project **to build houses**, a project fully backed by the community, would be met with help, encouragement and progress. What we are proposing is in stark contrast with the many communities putting their effort into **stopping the building of houses in their community**. Also Our project is just what the government has been advocating, so why is it meeting with such difficulties.???

PAUSE.

The reason we have a need for new housing is blatantly obvious. There have been no new houses built in this parish for over 40 years,---and one of the main reasons for this is the existence of a Development Boundary , drawn so tightly around the existing building line there isn't even space to build a dog kennel.

The urgency of this situation came to light in 2013 when we were preparing a Community Plan. WE asked everyone in the parish to list what **they valued** in the village, but more

importantly what they considered needed to be done to improve their lives . From the replies (over 70% response)we had 27 issues to face. Of the 27, we tackled 26 satisfactorily but one problem remained unsolved and that was the demand for new and different housing to those that already existed in the village.

The demand was threefold: it was for-

1. Bungalows for the elderly to downsize into---and to release their 4 bed houses onto the market,
2. Small affordable homes for the youth of the parish , and
3. "2/3 bed reasonable cost homes for young families, who like the youth of the parish had been forced to find homes outside the village they had been brought up in, and where they wanted to make their home.

During the 40 year period of housing stagnation we have not only lost the youth of the parish, but we've lost the young families with children, who should have been going to our village school. WE all know the result of this loss of families,---we have now lost our much loved village school,---and several other amenities and services needed by the community.

SO This housing stagnation of over40 years has caused serious damage to this community.

What we need to do is to bring our young people back to this village and stop the current trend of the village turning into a retirement home for the over 65's.

SO --THAT IS THE PURPOSE OF OUR NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN—

To build the homes that have been asked for by our community,--but we've been unable to build, and to get both the elderly and the younger folk into the homes they need and deserve.

Stopping this from happening is not an option. We need to think outside the box, to pull together, and to get these homes built. The only unsolved problem is WHERE, and that's the main issue of today.

But to complete the background to our N Plan. What have WE and this community been doing since the Community Plan of 2013??

At the end of 2013 our Parish Council approved the preparation of a N Plan—realising it was probably the only way of challenging the restrictions imposed by a Development Boundary.

SO In June 2014 we informed Hambleton of our intentions to produce a Plan and by the end of 2014 we had our Area of Designation approved.

Early in 2015 at a meeting with Hambleton, we were told that the Strategic Housing Assessment was to be revised, and so too was the Local Plan. Both revues were expected to impact on our N Plan so we were strongly advised to postpone our N Plan and await the outcome of the reviews. The reviews were expected to relax the regulations governing new

housing schemes and we were told they may render the N Plan unnecessary. Work Stopped on the N Plan.

BUT After more than 1 year of doing nothing and seeing no new Local Plan we got fed up of waiting and decided to re-establish the Steering Grp. That was early 2016.

Since then we have repeated several housing surveys and established a clear picture of the number and type of houses need to get the village out of its state of stagnation.

WE have also involved all our parish landowners to offer sites for the new housing.

The sites offered by our landowners were submitted to Hambleton as part of the "Search for sites" exercise. Your report of this exercise was very negative to the sites offered by our landowners and the term "Not a preferred site" was applied to all but one of our sites. And that site will only become available in 10 years time. So not at all helpful.

WE objected to your site categorisation in writing and offered suggestions for improvement. You never replied to our suggestions. And now I believe you are finalising the sites for future development, which will appear in the long awaited Local Plan ---and we haven't even been involved in your deliberations----in spite of it having such a profound effect on our future plans and the deliverability of our Neighbourhood Plan

WE have continued to have discussions with both Hambleton and NYMNPA on the 2 sites offered for early use--- the Far Field and the Grain Store and we oscillate from encouragement to crack on with the N Plan, to dismay with each correspondence. Its One step forward and one back.

In summary, we as a team are becoming disillusioned with this lack of progress. Our N Plan is in Limbo and in jeopardy, and our community are losing patience. Something has to change. We simply need to identify a 2 acre site to build 18 to 20 new homes to meet the urgent need of our community and at least one more site for a future development.

This is hardly brain surgery or a project to get men on the moon. So lets open our minds and think outside the box. Progress to date has been pathetic. This is a simple problem which I suspect is hidebound by regulations drawn up years ago and I would suggest are in serious need of revision to bring them into the present time. So lets find a solution and get this N Plan completed.

I'll now ask Ruth to explain the problems with our current housing stock in the village,

Then Clive will summarise the results of at least 4 housing surveys, that have enabled us to draw up a clear picture of the housing needed, which is the scheme we are proposing.

Then we'll concentrate on SITES.

Meeting of Ingleby Arncliffe Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group with Representatives of Hambleton District Council, North York Moors National Park - held on 14th March 2018.

Present:

James Campbell - HDC Planning Policy Manager

Sue Walters-Thompson - HDC Housing and Planning Policy Manager

Amanda Madden - HDC Rural Housing Officer

Paul Fellows - Head of Strategic Policy, North York Moors National Park

George Hunter, Clive Walley, Ken Jones, Ruth Eastham, Hazel Warhurst - Ingleby Arncliffe Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Lady Venetia Bell - Landowner

George welcomed the visitors and opened the meeting with a comprehensive account of our progress to date and our frustration at the obstacles preventing identifying an acceptable site for development.

Brief presentations were given explaining the current demand for new housing in the parish -18 houses in a mixed development.

At this stage we need to know if planning applications for the two sites offered to us, would be looked upon favourably. We would welcome advice on general conformity with the two planning authorities **before** the examiner looks at the Neighbourhood Plan. So far we have had no response to our specific questions asking why neither of the sites offered to us are "preferred" sites.

Consideration of the Sites:

The Far field is not a preferred site and nothing will change that. It does not fit with the HDC Local Plan:

- too remote from the existing housing and beyond the building line.
- too much infrastructure for access to site.
- high building costs as basic services not available.

The Grain Store has NYMNP conditions rendering our proposed development unworkable:

- National Park hierarchy regulations only allow five affordable houses.
- Principle residency restrictions control any open market development.
- Rules mean we couldn't deliver the mixed housing we need.
- The land value for only affordable housing renders the scheme economically unviable.

Paul Fellowes admitted that if the site had been a "brownfield site" there might have been some room for manoeuvre, but it was not classed as such, and never would be even - if the existing buildings were demolished.

The School Site has some limitations:

- on its own is too small for the number of houses we need.
- no guarantee that the Diocese of York will sell to our builder.

However in its favour:

- it is accessible and within the building line boundary.
- it has services readily available.
- minimal impact on other residents.

James Campbell suggested we were being too generous with the area of land proposed for our development. For the types of housing needed they could be closer together.

The Council representatives went for a walk around the village looking at the sites and for any possible alternatives. Feedback on their return seemed more positive.

Sue Walters-Thompson asked if we had considered a split site to accommodate the 18 dwelling development.

This might be between:

- The Wright's field - behind The Old School, School House and bungalows. (Access was thought not to be a problem, however we know the land has not been put forward in the recent "Call for sites.")
- The school site.

The negative aspect of this proposal is the anticipated opposition from residents living near the Wright's field.

Amanda Madden will approach James and Julian Wright again. If their field is definitely no longer available she will speak to North Yorkshire County Council representatives, requesting a portion of the school playing field be sold for part of our development. The County Council may be interested as it would open up access to the school field for future development. At present the whole of their field is locked in behind the school.

Note: Although the school field land would be outside the existing boundary - is Amanda thinking of treating it as an "exception site" for our affordable houses? The advantage being that we could achieve what we want and ensure our affordable houses are included on the same site and not isolated in another part of the village.

Conclusions:

We felt the new people at Hambleton seemed very approachable and keen to assist.

Sue and James said our housing choices fitted their requirements for the types of housing in the Local Plan. We felt this was a positive comment from the meeting. James has previously had some experience with Neighbourhood Plans in another area of the country which might be useful.

We accept that the Grain Store is unlikely to get through an examination of our Neighbourhood Plan.

Amanda has a track record of successfully making things happen in housing and has useful networking contacts to bring things to fruition. She has given us a lot of help in the past and was thanked by George for this earlier in meeting.

Homes England, the new National Housing Agency, working in conjunction with Broadacres, may help us to achieve our goal.

We now wait for Amanda to get in touch about the split site proposal.

Hazel Warhurst and Ruth Eastham
17.03.2018