

K Honeyman  
c/o the Honeyman Trust

REDACTED

Hutton Rudby  
Yarm TS150DA

Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group  
c/o Rudby Parish Council  
25 North Side  
Hutton Rudby  
Yarm  
TS150DA

31/08/21

Dear Mr Mortimer,

Thank you for your letter 8<sup>th</sup> July 2021 advising of the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) proposal to designate site GS016 as Local Green Space (LGS). The site GS016 is owned by the Honeyman Trust who object to the NP proposal because;

- 1) The landowners have not been consulted at an early stage in the process, both for ALT/S/073/016/G and now for site GS016. This is in breach of NPPF guidance.
- 2) The site ALT/S/073/016/G & GS016 LGS assessment is unsound and does not meet the NPPF criteria for such designation.
- 3) The LGS designation is not necessary over and above other existing protective policies.

#### Lack of Consultation with the Landowners

Prior to your letter dated the 8<sup>th</sup> July 2021 (3 days after the public consultation went live) there has been no attempt by either Hambleton District Council (HDC) or the Rudby Parish Council (RPC) to consult with the Honeyman Trust regarding the proposal for sites ALT/S/073/016/G or now GS016 to be designated LGS.

The Honeyman Trust have been given seemingly false assurances by HDC that site ALT/S/073/016/G would be removed from the Local Plan which has resulted in no further action taken by the Trust to demonstrate why the designation is unsound. This will be addressed directly with HDC but the point remains that there has been no early engagement and therefore no opportunity for the Trust to make adequate representation. Finger pointing between HDC and RPC have resulted in confusion and misdirection for the Trust and a lack of clarity over what is actually going on, to the benefit of the LP and NP proposals.

The public consultation workshops quoted within NP para 197 were run with no knowledge (by the Trust) that site ALT/S/073/016/G was being designated LGS because nobody had contacted the Trust. It is not fair to state that Landowners have had opportunity to engage on something they had

not been informed of. Clearly the Trust would have participated if we had been told about it. This is in breach of the Planning Practice Guidance which states that landowners should be contacted at an early stage about proposals to designate.

#### Review of the assessment outcome for the site ALT/S/073/016/G & GS016

Honeymans field portion of ALT/S/073/016/G is agricultural land which could be reinstated at any time with roaming livestock. This is not mentioned or considered in the LGS assessment. Significantly, this means that the proposed LGS may not endure for the life of the plan period which is at odds with NPPF paragraph 99.

The LGS assessments are stated to cover both LP proposed site ALT/S/073/016/G and NP site GS016 however the sites are very different and as such should be assessed separately and not as a coherent whole. As stated above the ALT/S/073/016/G site is agricultural land whereas the GS016 site is dense banked woodland down to the river. The same distinction can be made for the Honeymans field portion of ALT/S/073/016/G when compared to the rest of the proposed LGS site, hence it would make more sense to split the sites and assess them separately.

The following items from the LGS assessment are recorded as incorrect for site GS016 when considered separately from ALT/S/073/016/G;

The assessment proforma section 2.3 asks 'Is the site local in character?' and the response states 'The site is situated within the residential areas of Hutton Rudby. It is generally well connected by footpaths across the site so feels physically and visually connected to its local context'.

Site GS016 is not situated within the residential area and is separated from it by agricultural grazing land ALT/S/073/016/G. The site cannot be seen from the local residential housing due to trees and sloping landscape and there is currently no public footpaths across it or access to it.

The assessment proforma section 3.3 asks 'Are there any barriers to access by the community?' And the response states 'NO' and that 'PROWs cross the site' which as explained above is not correct for GS016.

The assessment proforma section 6.2 asks ARE THE PUBLIC ABLE TO PHYSICALLY ACCESS THE SITE?' and the assessment response states 'YES' and that 'PRoW across the site' which again is not correct.

Also asked by the assessment 'IS THE SITE USED FOR INFORMAL RECREATION?' and the assessment response states 'YES' and that 'Walking / dog walking' take place which again is not true as there is no public access to the site. No Walking or Dog walking take place on site GS016.

The above errors reflect that both sites have been assessed incorrectly for LGS and therefor the basis for LGS designation is unsound.

As a final observation / inconsistency it is also questionable why the land directly North of GS016, which is essentially the same as GS016, has not been designated whereas GS016 has?

#### Other Plan policies which obviate the need for LGS designation

Policy RNP12 'The Leven Valley' and RNP15 'Protection and Enhancement of the Conservation Area' have been put forward which will provide an ample level of protection for the site ALT/S/073/016/G & GS016 without the need for a further layer of LGS designation.

It is our understanding that Trees within Conservation Areas are afforded a separate protection under the provisions of section 211 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Again this policy

would already safeguard the qualities of the site without the need for further layer of LGS designation.

### Conclusion

Based on the above it is formally requested that the Rudby NP (Pre-Submission Draft) is updated to remove site GS006 from Policy RNP13 and from the corresponding Hutton Rudby Local Green Space Map (Figure 10).

Tim Honeyman

Peter Honeyman

Kelly Honeyman

Steve Honeyman

David Honeyman

Alan Honeyman

Vanessa Bennison