

# Hovingham with Scackleton Parish Council

## Consultee Response to Ryedale Plan Distribution of Development

The Parish Council have looked at and discussed the sites included for the Communities of Hovingham and Scackleton, which we represent, and we have the following comments and observations:

- a) Each proposed site would have an impact on the existing infrastructure of the villages (roads, water, sewage, water run-off, electricity, traffic, parking and environment) where demands are already exceeding capacity and reliability. Detailed assessments will be necessary on the detailed planning proposal and their combined impact to ensure there is adequate provision to support the development and occupation of the site.
- b) Parking and traffic speed are chronic problems in the village of Hovingham; the impact of each proposal must be determined both independently and combined.
- c) The capacity of existing water, electric and sewage infrastructure is currently limited and will need upgrading and investment prior to any new significant development.
- d) Affordable housing is essential so that those employed, or live, in the area can stay in the area.
- e) The large Worsley Arms development (sites 185, 188, 204 and 288) would have a considerable impact on several strategic businesses including a hotel, farm and GP surgery, and focus new traffic where the village is least able to cope both during the development and when occupied. The hotel is the main meeting place in the village, providing a restaurant, bar, accommodation and meeting facilities, any proposal must protect existing assets.
- f) The Brookside development (site 177) would most likely be larger than the "New Pasture Lane" development of 26 homes. Any development must manage the impact both during the development and subsequent occupation, with financial bonds for tidying up the site, road and pavement surfacing, landscaping and other work undertaken on completion of the development. All additional road traffic must be carefully routed onto the Helmsley Road, ideally outside the village boundary. Lessons must be learnt from the "New Pasture Lane" development and the mistakes not repeated here.
- g) The Greenfield sites in Hovingham (site 288) and Scackleton (sites 277 and 278) are all productive farmland. Likewise, the farm buildings are in use as part of a "whole" farm. Therefore, they should not be considered as redundant or brownfield. They're obviously not. Their function is immediately obvious and any change of use of the buildings would be a redevelopment not a development. A viable farm would be partly decommissioned, or make an economic farm uneconomic, to be replaced by housing so the 'opportunity' should be considered on that basis.
- h) The width and capacity of access roads and those on which the houses are built must be sufficient to cope with normal day-to-day access, visitors, delivery and service vehicles. This is a serious problem in "New Pasture Lane" where the road is just not wide enough.
- i) The developments including but not limited to sites 193, 194, 198 and 202 are in-fill sites. The continual removal of open space for development over the past 10 years is beginning affecting the historic character of the village. Careful consideration therefore has to be taken not to urbanise Hovingham through further loss of open space. The future move to carbon-neutrality, and a cleaner environment, must be included in any site or development appraisal and provision included to significantly increase electric capacity and reliability.
- j) Hovingham currently lacks reliable cell phone coverage, and a reliable network which nowadays is assumed to be available, reliable and high-speed. This is a fundamental building block for future growth of the village.

We oppose any development on:

- Worsley Arms development sites 185, 188, 204 and 288
- In-fill development sites 193, 194, 197 and 202
- Productive farmland greenfield development Hovingham site 288, Scackleton sites 277 and 278

Without detail of each of the proposed developments it is not possible for the Parish Council to support any of the proposed sites.

Yours faithfully

Phil Chapman, Chair

On behalf of the Hovingham with Scackleton Parish Council and unanimously supported by all Councillors

3<sup>rd</sup> March 2021