

To the Parish Councillors, Rudby Parish Council

03 September 2021

I have lived in Hutton Rudby since 1971 - 50 years this year. I wondered if all Parish Councillors know that Hambleton District Plan does not advocate any further development in Hutton Rudby as all needs are currently met. If we allow more housing than is needed, social or otherwise, then these properties will probably be filled by people from nearby urban areas rather than by village residents. I understand that this has already happened in Goldie Hill.

Hutton Rudby's Neighbourhood plan should be in accordance with the emerging Hambleton local plan.

The proposed plan is not, for the following reasons:

- a. Policy S2 of the emerging local plan identifies that at least 6,615 new homes, made up of both market and affordable, need to be provided over the plan period. **Paragraph 3.15 reports that the council has identified sufficient land to meet the assessed needs for both affordable and market value housing from their strategic and existing land allocations.**
- b. Policy S4 of the emerging local plan provides that "there is no requirement for housing development to be allocated in neighbourhood plans to meet identified district level requirements.
- c. The Council will expect communities preparing neighbourhood plans to identify local development requirements, and to address them in their plans where possible, reflecting the overall strategy set out in this plan for the pattern and scale of development and any allocations." **Accordingly any site allocated within the neighbourhood plan should be of a size to only provide for the needs of the village itself.**
- d. The development at Paddocks End was specifically justified on the basis of providing the affordable housing needs of the village.
- e. The Neighbourhood Plan itself accepts that Policy S4 is the basis on which any housing allocation should be made.
- f. Paragraph 91 of the Neighbourhood Plan states that it "seeks to direct windfall development towards the most suitable locations and to deliver a mix more in line with Parish housing needs." This statement is utterly self-contradictory. If a site is "windfall" then it is not, by definition, a planned site. This assertion undermines the whole basis on which the

Neighbourhood Plan is based. Although later paragraphs seek to justify this statement, they appear to be based on a premise that windfall sites cannot be delivered in the village except in an edge of development location. No justification is provided for such a bold assumption.

- g. The two housing needs assessments for the village which have been carried out suggested that between 46 and 51 houses would be needed in the parish. The currently allocated sites provide 40 units already. No allowance is then made for windfall sites, although these are reported as being 15 over the past three years, so some allowance would be justified. These sites alone therefore provide the full requirement for the village, even more if one considers that the recently lapsed planning permission was not included within the list of extant planning permissions. It would be quite conceivable that this would be resurrected at a future date.
- h. Despite a quite consistent attempt to hide the fact, the Neighbourhood Plan proposes a significant over-supply of both affordable and market housing in the parish. This is not in accordance with the emerging local plan.
- i. Further the Neighbourhood Plan talks about providing a footpath from their proposed new development to Langbaugh Road, but such a path would cross land not included within the proposed release and which the developers would be unable to guarantee. The inclusion of this path is, at best, a red herring to make the site appear more attractive.
- j. The Neighbourhood Plan does not demonstrate how the proposed development site achieves any of the aims of the community as set out in Appendix B of the document.
- k. The site selection process itself seems to have been applied in a very arbitrary manner. For instance, the proposed new site is rated green for accessibility to local facilities as it is close to the shop. This is correct, (although it should be noted that the shop is the one facility in the village that has dedicated car parking and is a commercial venture over which we have no control). However, no account has been taken of the fact that it is about as far from the doctors/churches/public houses and village green in Hutton Rudby as it is possible to get. The criteria appear to have been applied in an extremely selective way to justify the result that the authors of the plan wanted to reach, rather than the evidence guiding the decision as to which would be the most appropriate site for development should one be needed.

For all of these reasons the proposals in the Neighbourhood Plan are flawed and should be rejected by the council. Also, for environmental reasons, the best way for this land is to leave it as the historic field that it is.

Kath Watts