

#7

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 4 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, July 05, 2021 11:30:40 AM
Last Modified: Monday, July 05, 2021 3:03:38 PM
Time Spent: 03:32:58
IP Address: 90.212.206.2

Page 1: Personal Details

Q1

Please Confirm your Full Name. Note: Submissions should be made by an individual person . Other household members should complete their own response.

Name **Mr Daniel Puttick**

Q2

Please confirm your Postcode.

NE24 3UQ

Q3

None of the above

Please tell us your reason(s) for participating in this survey. Select all that are applicable

Page 2

Q4

If you chose 'none of the above' please tell us why you are responding to this survey.

Born and raised in Hutton Rudby with family living there and with a view to returning to live in the village in the future.

Page 3: Vision & Objectives

Q5

Support

Do you support or oppose the vision statement?

Page 4

Q6

Respondent skipped this question

If you Oppose the Vision Statement, please tell us why. You can also use this comment box to make observations.

Page 5

Q7 **Neither Support or Oppose**
Do you support or oppose the Neighbourhood Plan objectives?

Page 6

Q8 **Respondent skipped this question**
If you Oppose the Neighbourhood Plan objectives, please tell us why. You can also use this comment box to make observations.

Page 7: Rudby Neighbourhood Plan Policies (RNP)

Q9 **Neither Support or Oppose**
RNP1 - Sustainable Development This policy positions the Neighbourhood Plan policies within the wider planning framework. If the Neighbourhood Plan is adopted, it will become part of the statutory development plan for the Parish, together with Hambleton's adopted Local Plan and national policies Do you Support or Oppose This Policy?

Page 8

Q10 **Respondent skipped this question**
If you Oppose this policy, please tell us why. You can also use this comment box to make observations.

Page 9

Q11 **Oppose**
RNP2 - Design Principles This policy sets out design requirements for development in the Parish which focus on local character, climate change, and 'lifetime homes'. Do you Support or Oppose this Policy?

Page 10

Q12

If you Oppose this policy, please tell us why. You can also use this comment box to make observations.

Whilst in principle I support the inclusion of general design-based criteria, those set out in policy RNP2 are too broad and fail to consider the impacts of new development on the amenity of existing and future residents, as is required under paragraph 127(f) of the NPPF. Part 2 of the policy does little to respond to the concerns of residents to address matters relating to climate change in a meaningful way. There is an opportunity to require all new residential developments to incorporate specific sustainability measures, and to exceed current Building Regulations by a set level, thereby positively contributing towards achieving high levels of sustainability rather than 'incorporating high standards', which is vague and generalised. The policy should also consider positive landscaping and greening to meet biodiversity enhancement and biodiversity net gain being brought forward at a national level. The policy fails to recognise the role landscaping and biodiversity can have in helping to reduce carbon emissions. Policy RNP11 considers landscaping separately from an ecological perspective, rather than recognising its potential to contribute towards meeting the challenges of climate change.

Page 11

Q13

Oppose

RNP3 - Housing Provision This policy proposes an allocation of land south of Paddocks End for the development of approximately 25 homes to meet Parish housing need. It sets out the location, scale, and key features for the development. Do you Support or Oppose this Policy?

Page 12

Q14

If you Oppose this policy, please tell us why. You can also use this comment box to make observations.

Whilst in principle I have no objections to this site as a housing allocation, the suggested density fails to make efficient use of land in accordance with paragraph 122 of the NPPF. This part is clear that planning policies should support development that makes efficient use of land. Whilst par (d) of paragraph 127 indicates that the desirability of maintaining an areas prevailing character and setting should be taken into account, the suggested density of 15 units per hectare fails to make an efficient use of this site. The site performs poorly on Hambleton's SHLAA and if development is brought forward through the neighbourhood plan for development any impact upon landscape character would be worsened by the short-sighted approach to delivering new housing at such low densities. The implication being that lower density is likely to drive housing prices up thereby compounding affordability issues for local people, and add pressure from elsewhere in the plan area to deliver housing to meet future need through speculative development of windfall sites. The lack of suitable or available infill sites within the settlement limits are likely to add to pressures to develop edge-of-settlement sites. Delivering at a greater density would justify the loss of this landscape-sensitive site and safeguard against the potential loss of others in the future by meeting and exceeding housing need. In doing so, delivery at a higher density would help contribute towards meeting the Government's ambitions of 'significantly boosting' the supply of new homes, which this allocation fails to take the opportunity to do. In practice, identifying a limit on the number of units on the site will naturally cause residents to object to any development proposing to deliver more housing which makes a more efficient use of the site.

Page 13

Q15

Oppose

RNP4 - Windfall Housing This policy sets out requirements for small scale developments whether as infill, on the edge of villages or in the open countryside. Do you Support or Oppose this Policy?

Page 14

Q16

If you Oppose this policy, please tell us why. You can also use this comment box to make observations.

Whilst in principle I am supportive of a policy which seeks to accommodate windfall housing developments, the wording and criteria against which any proposals would be assessed are overly restrictive. It is difficult to see how any infill sites will come forward within the village given the abundance of protected green spaces within and beyond the Conservation Area boundary.

Part 3 of the policy fails to reflect the ambitions of national government to significantly boost the supply of housing by failing to reflect the approach set out in paragraphs 78 and 79 of the NPPF which support the re-use of existing buildings in rural areas in certain cases. By requiring exceptional circumstances and for all examples/criteria in parts 1 and 2 to be met it becomes an overly restrictive policy which would have the effect of preventing potential schemes involving barn conversions, re-use of redundant or disused buildings or redevelopment of previously developed sites from coming forward. For example, the policy precludes development in open countryside unless the site is linked to the built form along at least 25% of its perimeter (criterion 2(b)) and unless most of the rest of the perimeter of the site is formed from existing strong defensible boundaries (criterion 2(c)). In reality there are unlikely to be any sites in open countryside capable of meeting the requirements of this policy, and even if there were the test of exceptional circumstances is misaligned with national and local planning policies, and may prejudice the safeguarding and future use of heritage assets such as traditional agricultural buildings which policy RNP2 seeks to protect.

Page 15

Q17

Oppose

RNP5 - Affordable Housing This policy sets out a requirement for local people to be given priority access to new affordable housing developed in the parish. Do you Support or Oppose this Policy?

Page 16

Q18

If you Oppose this policy, please tell us why. You can also use this comment box to make observations.

Whilst in principle I support the inclusion of this policy, it fails to reflect on the housing need and potential for changing housing needs for affordable housing in the plan area. Specifically, the policy misses an opportunity to ensure affordable housing provision is delivered in a way which meets identified affordable housing needs, including the provision of rented accommodation and discounted market housing. Housing needs survey identifies a number of households with a need for affordable rented accommodation. Whilst the policy will secure ongoing occupation by persons with links to the parish, there is a risk of housing need going unmet in the plan area and the neighbourhood plan provides an opportunity to ensure that housing need will be met appropriately.

Page 17

Q19

Oppose

RNP6 - Redevelopment of Redundant Buildings in the Countryside
This policy provides support for the conversion of redundant buildings to uses which will enhance the rural economy.
Do you Support or Oppose this Policy?

Page 18

Q20

If you Oppose this policy, please tell us why. You can also use this comment box to make observations.

See representations in respect of policy PNP4. Whilst in principle I am supportive of this policy, in combination with policies elsewhere in the plan it precludes other forms of development from coming forward on suitable sites, such as sites capable of delivering small-scale housing. The approach seems counter-productive when considered in context with policy PNP2, which seeks to facilitate employment patterns which involve reduced levels of travelling. Encouraging the re-use of buildings in the open countryside for small-scale business use will naturally involve the creation of employment patterns in areas which are not well-served by public transport, thereby maintaining reliance upon private cars. A proliferation of small-scale enterprises in the areas of open countryside within the plan area, whilst not the aim of the neighbourhood plan but one which is clearly encouraged, would fail to reflect objectives 4 and 6 of the plan. Additional services, facilities and businesses beyond the boundaries of settlements within the plan area will naturally prevent or discourage access for certain groups of the community, would fail to enhance local services within those communities and add pressure to services and facilities reliant upon the existing population within the settlements. For similar reasons, the adverse impacts of motor vehicles would fail to be mitigated and would fail to encourage safe alternatives to the use of private cars.

Page 19

Q21

Neither Support or Oppose

RNP7 -Safeguarding and Improvement of Community Facilities
This policy aims to secure the long-term future of facilities which are valued by the community.
Do you Support or Oppose this Policy?

Page 20

Q22

Respondent skipped this question

If you Oppose this policy, please tell us why. You can also use this comment box to make observations.

Page 21

Q23

Support

RNP8 - Communication Technology
This policy aims to ensure that new developments are suitably equipped to support domestic needs, home working, and the rural economy.
Do you Support or Oppose this Policy?

Page 22

Q24

Respondent skipped this question

If you Oppose the Neighbourhood Plan objectives, please tell us why. You can also use this comment box to make observations.

Page 23

Q25

Oppose

RNP9 - The Transport Network and Parking Provision
This policy seeks to minimise any adverse impacts from parking arising from new development (particularly in the Conservation Area), and to facilitate the transition to electric vehicles. Do you Support or Oppose this Policy?

Page 24

Q26

If you Oppose the Neighbourhood Plan objectives, please tell us why. You can also use this comment box to make observations.

Whilst supportive of the principle of this policy, concerns are raised in respect of the need for new development to make improvements to footpath and pavement connectivity. In particular, this concern relates to the housing allocation in policy RNP3 and the suggested provision of a footpath/cycleway connecting the site to Langbaugh Road. The resultant landscape impacts from the provision of a dedicated cycleway/footpath across open agricultural land requires consideration, as does the fact that the land is well-used by farmers and frequently accommodates livestock. Connectivity around the settlement is good compared with settlements elsewhere in the district and beyond, and any minimal benefits from this requirement in particular in relation to policy PNP3 needs to be carefully balanced against the wider landscape impacts.

Page 25

Q27

Support

RNP10 - Natural Environment and Landscape
This policy provides protection for areas and natural assets which are important to the setting and character of the Parish. Do you Support or Oppose this Policy?

Page 26

Q28

Respondent skipped this question

If you Oppose the Neighbourhood Plan objectives, please tell us why. You can also use this comment box to make observations.

Page 27

Q29

Support

RNP11 - Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure This policy sets out requirements for developments to protect and enhance biodiversity. Do you Support or Oppose this Policy?

Page 28

Q30

Respondent skipped this question

If you Oppose this policy, please tell us why. You can also use this comment box to make observations.

Page 29

Q31

Neither Support or Oppose

RNP12 - The Leven Valley This policy sets out requirements aimed at protecting the special character of the Leven Valley. Do you Support or Oppose this Policy?

Page 30

Q32

Respondent skipped this question

If you Oppose this policy, please tell us why. You can also use this comment box to make observations.

Page 31

Q33

Oppose

RNP13 - Local Green Space This policy provides protection for green spaces identified as being special to the community. Do you Support or Oppose this Policy?

Page 32

Q34

If you Oppose this policy, please tell us why. You can also use this comment box to make observations.

Whilst most of the open space allocations are logical and justified, I fail to comprehend the proposed allocation of part of Flagpole Field as an area of open space. This site has been the subject of a successful application for planning permission (ref 16/01771/FUL) to which no objections were raised by the Parish Council and which attracted no representations from members of the public. The principle of new housing on the site is entirely acceptable from a planning perspective and the local planning authority, in consultation with the local community, have found that its development would not compromise the character of the Hutton Rudby Conservation Area. The site has little to no public value or use and is within private ownership. It's allocation as local green space seems to seek to protect it from any potential additional development, however if development permitted under 16/02771/FUL were to be brought forward there would be very little if any meaningful contribution from this retained space towards the character of the area. I disagree with the assessment of the site within the evidence base that views across to the NYMNP are 'iconic' - views are obstructed from the public domain by virtue of the site's topography and boundary features. Any views of the moors beyond can only be from upper floors of properties immediately north of the site. In addition, the assessment concludes that the site is atypical of the landscape character area. This, coupled with the lack of objection to proposals to develop the site, would suggest that allocating this site as green space is not entirely within the public interests of the community which makes up the plan area. Allocating the site as green space may prejudice the delivery of housing beyond the plan period on a site which has previously been found to be acceptable. Moreover, the site's redevelopment will significantly alter the character of the area to such an extent that any benefits it provides in its currently undeveloped state would in my view be lost. Notwithstanding this, the remaining allocations are logical and made on a sound basis.

Page 33

Q35

Oppose

RNP14 - Significant Views
The policy seeks to safeguard views identified as being special to the community from being harmed by development.
Do you Support or Oppose this Policy?

Page 34

Q36

If you Oppose this policy, please tell us why. You can also use this comment box to make observations.

Whilst in principle I am supportive of this policy, the use of the term 'Significant Views' and provision of a list compiled as part of an Appendix to the plan narrows the scope and application of this policy and weakens the protection sought elsewhere to areas of open countryside around the settlement which are important and which contribute to its character. Significant Views identified are primarily those views out of the settlement, whereas views from outside the settlement into it are as equally important to local character. In addition, views of sporadic groups of or isolated buildings around the settlement on approach to it are equally important in defining its rural character, including the views of heritage assets (designated and non-designated) around the periphery of main settlements in the plan area.

The policy appears to protect public views within and around the settlement, which is justified, but requires the submission of a landscape assessment to support proposals. The criteria used to discount instances where landscape assessments are need are not clear and are subjective. Their application is likely to prove difficult to the local planning authority, members of the public, homeowners and developers to understand and apply consistently. Removing these criteria and providing greater scope to protect important landscape views into and out of the settlement would provide greater clarity and offer better protection of elements of the plan area's defining characteristics than the policy would as currently drafted.

Page 35

Q37

Oppose

RNP15 - Protection and Enhancement of the Conservation Area
This policy sets out requirements for development in the Conservation Area aimed at protecting and enhancing its character and appearance.
Do you Support or Oppose this Policy?

Page 36

Q38

If you Oppose this policy, please tell us why. You can also use this comment box to make observations.

Whilst supportive of the principle of this policy I have concerns regarding wording of certain elements. Part 3 is likely to impose unrealistic expectations on the community that all trees will be retained. There are examples of where healthy trees are needed to be removed in the interests of public safety or to address issues facing existing or future developments. This could be better worded along the lines of "The development does not result in the unnecessary removal of any healthy mature trees which are important in terms of local character and distinctiveness". Replacement planting at a greater number/density could be sought under policy RNP 11 to provide additional scope to secure adequate replacement of trees in instances where removal is justified.

On a more general note, very little reference is made to the plan area's numerous listed buildings and non-designated heritage assets which are important in defining the character of settlements within it and their wide landscape settings. Greater emphasis should be placed within this policy, or within a separate policy, on the community's aspirations for the protection and enhancement of the built and natural environment. As it stands, the wording of policy RNP15 in my view fails to give adequate protection through the plan to designated and non-designated heritage assets. In particular, whilst non-designated heritage assets are defined in the appendices to the plan there is no reference to there being any desire to protecting them and their setting within policy RNP15. Whilst there is a statutory duty imposed upon local authorities under Sections 16(2), 66(2) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended), and whilst policies in existing and emerging development plan documents at a District level afford some protection to listed buildings and other heritage assets, further protection through the neighbourhood plan, specifically through identifying and establishing ways of protecting non-designated heritage assets, could be achieved through revisions to policy RNP15.

There are clear benefits in adding to this part of the plan, not least the identification of important designated and non-designated buildings of architectural and historic interest within the village will deliver public benefit through understanding and engagement with the plan area's heritage. Hutton Rudby in particular currently lacks a Conservation Area Character Appraisal and in turn lacks a Conservation Area Management Plan. Decision making is therefore reliant upon local authority Officers in consultation with heritage specialists where available. In past and in practice, decisions have been made without input from Conservation specialists and the lack of information available has resulted in some poor decision making within the settlement. The provision of a list of listed and unlisted buildings is supported, but further provision could be made within the policy against which new development proposals will be assessed to ensure that these assets are afforded appropriate levels of protection, or are at least recognised with clear reference within the policy of their existence.

The identification of the area's character within Appendix E is positive, however it is important that this recognises the significant changes which the village has experienced in terms of its built, natural and cultural environments. A positive approach towards engaging with the community and the local planning authority to inform and prepare a Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan should be encouraged through the neighbourhood plan. Until such a time that these are in place decisions will be made against what I consider to be a weak policy RNP15 and outdated Village Design Statement, both of which do little to inform the public and decision making authority as to what elements of the village's built environment and wider setting within the plan area are particularly important and should be preserved.

Page 37: Other Comments

Q39

Do you have any comments or observations on the Neighbourhood Plan that you would like to make?

The consultation portal (Survey Monkey) precludes comments from being made to specific policies unless you opt to oppose them. As can be seen from many of the responses made to specific policies in the neighbourhood plan, I am supportive of them in principle and wish to make this clear. The portal could be improved by providing options to explain contributor's reasons for each, or by enabling general comments to be made in respect of each policy irrespective of whether the contributor opposes or supports it.
