

This consultation is not an opportunity to provide further information, but instead it presents the opportunity to comment on whether the Local Plan is "sound", "legally compliant" and whether it complies with the "Duty to Cooperate". This consultation is therefore seeking comments on:

- **Legal Compliance** - does the Plan meet the legal and procedural requirements?
- **Soundness** - has the Plan been positively prepared, justified, effective, and consistent with national policy?
- **Duty to Cooperate** - has the Council worked and engaged effectively with both neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies?

- Selby District Council

Hambleton Parish Council draft response...

Hambleton Parish Council do not agree that the Local Plan meets the above criteria for Legal Compliance, Soundness or Duty to Cooperate and will explain its reasoning below.

HAMB-F

- "HAMB-F" in the Local Plan Site Assessment Report from January 2021 was **REJECTED** as a suitable 'preferred option' and therefore not included in the Preferred Options Consultation
- "HAMB-F" in the Local Plan Site Assessment Report had included an area which already had planning approval for 115 dwellings, now complete; it is labelled "Hambleton-18" in the Pre-Submission Publication
- "Hambleton-18" was then identified in the Preferred Options Consultation as a site with planning approval in place. This permission was granted by default because of the lack of identified 5 year land supply in the SDC region, not because it was appropriate development of the area
- The remaining area of "HAMB-F" in the Local Plan Site Assessment Report was not in the Preferred Options Consultation
- "HAMB-F" was rejected by Selby District Council itself following the January 2021 Site Assessment Report because of the negative impact it would have on the character and form of Hambleton village, but developers might assume "HAMBLETON-18" has set a precedent for building.

Reasons for complaint: Legal Compliance, Soundness & Duty to Co-operate

- The site referred to as "HAMB-F" in the Pre-Submission Publication has not been open to public consultation.
- Proposing a 'preferred option' that more than doubles the size of a development, that was only permitted by default, without a public consultation is not 'engaging effectively', 'positively prepared' or justified
- Changing the village development limits (which are designed to protect villages against this problem specifically) at last minute without consultation, to accommodate such development is not 'engaging effectively', 'positively prepared' or justified

The site "HAMB-F" was rejected because of the negative impact on surroundings, any development will STILL have a negative impact on surroundings and it will be much more significant. This site could

potentially be more appropriate for development than “HAMB-N” because it is more accessible by vehicle but the two halves of the village, the north side growing rapidly, are still cut off from facilities on the other side with no safe place to cross on foot. The Parish Council would also still expect to see a public consultation to allow everyone’s opinions and concerns to be heard. Identifying that the site could be more appropriate for development does not mean the Parish Council or the village would support it and certainly would NOT suggest this site is appropriate *in addition* to “HAMB-N”.

HAMB-N

- In the Preferred Options Consultation, site “HAMB-N” was consulted on, BUT the shape and size of what is being referred to as “HAMB-N” in the Pre-Submission Publication has significantly changed in comparison.
 - “HAMB-N” in the Pre-Submission Publication has increased in size to include an area that was REJECTED as a preferred option by Selby District Council in the Jan 2021 Site Assessment Report because of the negative effect it would have on the character and form of the settlement.
-

Reasons for complaint: Legal Compliance, Soundness & Duty to Co-operate

- The site referred to as “HAMB-N” in the Pre-Submission Publication has not been open to public consultation.
- The Parish Council was not in support of the initial “HAMB-N” area that was identified because of the dangers associated with vehicular movements and access on Gateforth Lane, these valid and serious concerns affect many residents in Hambleton, not just those on Gateforth Lane and the fact that the site has been left in the Plan does not show any consideration or cooperation from the District Council on this matter.

The table below has been taken from a recent planning application for a large development in the same vicinity as “HAMB-N”. Using this data from the TRICS database we can assume that the “HAMB-N” development would result in approximately 152 additional vehicle movements during the peak AM and PM times noted.

Time		Vehicle Trip Rates Trips per Dwelling		
		Arr.	Dep.	Total
Weekday AM Peak	07:00-08:00	0.075	0.297	0.372
	08:00-09:00	0.151	0.392	0.543
	09:00-10:00	0.140	0.178	0.318
Weekday PM Peak	16:00-17:00	0.286	0.171	0.457
	17:00-18:00	0.375	0.183	0.558
	18:00-19:00	0.289	0.178	0.467

AM and PM peak are particularly busy on Gateforth Lane, the main access to site “HAMB-N”, due to there being a primary school, two childcare facilities and an afterschool child care provision. Gateforth Lane and Gateforth Court have cars parked on every available area at these times with the roads being reduced to single lane traffic and often standing traffic as motorists have to give way to oncoming

vehicles. This increase in vehicle movements will undoubtedly pose an increased danger to pedestrians and road users.

Gateforth Court itself would be inappropriate to use as an access onto the proposed site because of the congestion already faced by residents at peak times.

In addition, a further housing development in this position would lead to more cars on our local roads such as Westcroft, Bar Lane, Chapel Street and Field Lane as motorists seek to find a route home that avoids the Gateforth Lane/Main Road junction.

Development Limits

Reasons for complaint: Legal Compliance, Soundness & Duty to Co-operate

The Parish Council support Development Limits as a way to avoid excessive development and sprawl across the countryside, but they have no worth if the existing development limits can simply be moved to accommodate another development.

The Development Limits of Hambleton village will change significantly if this Pre Submission Publication is approved. The change allows for the aforementioned 'preferred sites' that have not been properly consulted on to be classed as 'within the development limits'.

Again, there has been no public consultation or opportunity for residents to put their view across which is not consistent with a sound plan or in any way co-operative. There has been no discussion.

In the last 5 years alone Hambleton has had

- 115 Taylor Wimpey homes built; these were outside the development limits and permitted by default
- 2 homes on St Mary's Approach;
- 5 homes on Richardson Court; a site outside of the development limits that was initially allocated to 'affordable' homes that the PC approved of but ended up being developed by a private company and sold for maximum profit which was extremely disappointing, especially as the highways aspect is still unfinished
- 4 homes on Main Road, under construction;
- 70 homes at Thorpe Meadows (within the Hambleton Parish boundary) which are Rent to Buy or Shared Ownership, under construction; this site is so far detached from the Hambleton parish Development Limits that it is often mistaken for Thorpe Willoughby parish

A further 21 dwellings at Bar Farm (mostly within the existing development limits) and 3 on Station Road (SDC properties) have approval.

It is fair to say that Hambleton parish has had its fair share of new homes without the existing development limits needing to be moved to shoehorn further development in. With an over-subscribed school that has recently had to have a classroom extension, the village also lacks amenities such as a doctors, chemist, post office or even an ATM. The bus links to major towns and cities are insufficient and unreliable with no service at all on a Sunday.

On a side note, the Publication Version Local Plan Policies Map needs updating to include the recent Taylor Wimpey residential development north of Main Road and the additional bungalows built to the East of Richardson Court (the layouts of these development are shown on the SDLP 2005 map but not this latest Publication Version).

THRP-W

Reasons for complaint: Legal Compliance, Soundness & Duty to Co-operate

- This site is identified as residential development within Thorpe Willoughby but it is actually within the Hambleton Parish boundary, this is misleading and does not show the true picture of how much development is taking place in Hambleton.

THRP-V

Reasons for complaint: Legal Compliance, Soundness & Duty to Co-operate

- This site is currently in the Hambleton Parish and again, misleading as to the number of proposals of development in Hambleton parish itself

Boundary Changes

Reasons for complaint: Legal Compliance, Soundness & Duty to Co-operate

When identifying the proposed site referred to as “THRP-V” it was noted that the Hambleton/Thorpe Willoughby boundary had been altered in the Pre-Submission document to locate “THRP-V” wholly within the Thorpe Willoughby boundary. This major alteration had not been consulted on and this would have a significant impact on both villages.

In conclusion

For all preferred option sites it is assumed that sufficient consultation has taken place; that is not the case with the Hambleton sites. In this Pre Submission Publication, the public are seeing this land as a ‘preferred option’ for residential development for the first time. The last-minute changes and additions to the proposed ‘preferred options’ in Hambleton suggest either panic or seemingly underhand strategies to meet targets with the least resistance.

Any development in Hambleton or the surrounding villages will have a massive impact on the traffic along the A63. Building houses where the main link to major cities and towns is by private vehicle goes against the National Planning Policy Framework which states that development must be sustainable. Leaving residents with no choice but to use private vehicles to get to work because there is no bus to get them home, is not *sustainable*. Hambleton does NOT have sufficient public transport links.

The North Yorkshire Transport Plan (2016-2045) seeks to encourage “healthier travel such as walking and cycling”, and in return this is meant to reduce some of the “negative effects of transport, such as air pollution”. Selby has been identified as an area which exceeds air quality limits. Building more homes in rural communities with few local amenities and little or no public transport will only

encourage more private vehicles on the roads as people have to travel to get what they need. This is why development adjacent to the towns and cities that already have this infrastructure and these facilities must happen before proposing to double the size of the rural surrounding villages.

The A63 through Hambleton sees over 150,000 vehicles pass through each month (VAS data June 2022), with over 70% of those vehicles travelling faster than the speed limit. There is still no pedestrian crossing. Main Road (A63) itself in Hambleton is subsiding with the frequency and weight of the traffic following work done to build site "Hambleton-18". Presumably, cars accessing the proposed site "HAMB-F" would also use this entrance.

The people responsible for developing the district cannot ignore the detrimental effects of overdeveloping small villages just because they feel there is enough room. The local infrastructure is simply not built to accommodate such large numbers, the drainage is insufficient with residents in new builds such as Cherwell Croft having foul drainage issues and unpleasant smells. There are often power cuts in Hambleton, as recently as spring 2022 the whole village lost power for weeks and standalone generators had to be placed throughout the village. Hambleton is already at full capacity.

Hambleton Parish Council does support the idea of a new settlement which offers easily accessible public transport links to centres for employment and leisure, this supports sustainable development and environmental targets. New developments themselves should be more sustainable also, using renewable energy sources and technologies that will reduce the effect on our climate wherever possible, developers must be made to take responsibility for designing out the inefficient old technologies; our society's future depends on it.