

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
	B1	DL6 3NG 3	Internet – not all retiree/elderly are computer literate, it cannot be assumed that everyone is using the internet, to shop on line etc. Although we do need a good broadband connection for those in business.	Noted no change to Page 5 Parish Economy. Change made to CAP B1 to note that not all residents use the internet.
	BS1	DL6 3LR 13	I consider the maintenance and enhancement of the bus service to be of critical importance to the village, and I strongly support BS1 in the Community Action Points.	No change to CAP BS1
	IC1	DL6 3NG 1	Parking – more cars being parked in Ingleby Cross due to more usage of the village hall and coffee shop. Off road parking should be a priority.	No change to CAP IC1
	N1	DL6 3NG 3	Boundary of NYMPA should stay as it is, Ingleby Cross villagers should be consulted about this and their comments taken into account.	Change made to CAP N1. The approach would be to seek a change in the planning regime relating to site 4 in the first instance, only if that was unsuccessful would efforts be made to change the boundary.
	NI	DL6 3ND 15	The objective is to free the Grain Store site of NYMPA planning restrictions, so the policy could have that as its first objective, with a boundary move as the second part.	As above
	NI	DL6 3NG 1	Do not agree for the boundary to be moved. Ingleby Cross villager's comments should be taken into consideration.	Change made to CAP N1. The approach would be to seek a change in the planning regime relating to site 4 in the first instance, only if that was unsuccessful would efforts be made to change the boundary.
	P1	DL6 3ND 15	The introduction of additional housing to make a new housing development viable is too "open-ended" and needs definition and limits. Is it to be a maximum percentage of the needs or a maximum number of houses.	In view of comments made and most responses to question 4a, a definition of the term viability (P1 and objectives Page 20) will be

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
			What tenures, types and sizes of houses would be required. The definition of viability for example cannot depend on unreasonable demands of developers and/or land owners	included in the Plan for the resident's further consideration.
	P2	DL6 3ND 15	The policy appears to suggest that further development on that site (4) beyond the initial 18 will be part of the NDP, Is that correct?	The Plan will clarify that the only playing field land used will be that to accommodate the proposed build of 18 houses.
	P2	DL6 3ND 15	Here the site is definition is not consistent with that of site 4 – "Former Primary School and Adjacent Land" compared to "Land at the Former Primary School" There should be consistency of definition.	The Plan will define site 6 (site 4 reference in the response is the wrong reference) as school building land and school playing field.
1	P3	DL6 3LN 5	Bungalows should have wheelchair wide doorways and wet rooms.	Policy P3 makes the reference already to older resident needs. The Policy has been amended to better reflect resident's comments.
2	P3	DL6 3LT 4	in general agree, however stone / brick façade is not economically viable for future needs, timber framed are more environmentally friendly and can achieve better U values with reduced energy needs	The build detail will be determined by the developer's costing and viability assessment subject to the Plan's proposed policies (P3 & P4).
3	P3	DL6 3LY 1	People come here for peace and quiet.	Noted but considered covered by the Plan's vision statement.
4	P3	DL6 3NB 1	Agree with policy, but consider more housing for families to have a healthy mixed community for the future, and growth for local business.	The housing need in terms of house sizes and tenures will be determined by the results of housing needs surveys.
5	P3	DL6 3ND 1	Smaller houses no large executive homes	Noted and reflected in the proposed housing mix.
8	P3	DL6 3ND 11 & 12 & 13	Agree, priority young & old	The housing need in terms of house sizes and tenures will be determined by the results of housing needs surveys.
9	P3	DL6 3NW 1	Instead of new housing maybe some larger properties could be adopted into or converted into flats e.g. assisted living option	The Plan could not deliver the option rather it could only propose restricting changes to existing

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
				properties. It's a decision of individual residents to modify their houses which would be considered on their merits as part of the planning application process.
10	P3	DL6 3NW 1	There are not enough parking (off-road) at present and new housing would make this even more crowded and difficult to manoeuvre.	Policy P4 is considered to cover this comment.
11	P3	DL6 ELN 6	New homes should be designed from scratch to be appropriate for older people, e.g. wheelchairs, access, lack of steps, door widths, rather than capable of adaption. Especially applies to bungalows.	Policy P3 makes the reference already to older resident needs. The Policy has been amended to better reflect resident's comments.
1	P4	DL6 3LT 4	Agree to the principals, however footpaths and roads outside the development area are a greater concern as adopted roads / footpaths are increasingly neglected due to fiscal pressures on council funds	Noted but this is a county wide issue the responsibility of N.Y.C.C.
4	P4	DL6 3ND 11 & 12 & 13	Agree " " for above. Above refers to young and old. "" not clear on the word.	Comment not too clear?
5	P4	DL6 3NG 3	I agree to a N Plan to avoid developers spoiling our village.	Noted
6	P4	DL6 3NW 1	The roads are not wide enough for passing traffic as it is.	The revision to the Plan has withdrawn its proposal (Page 20, under Site Selection and Recommended Sites) to recommend any other sites for housing development other than Site (4). So whilst the comment is noted, the proposed site 4 is considered not in itself sufficient to materially impact on traffic levels.
7	P5	DL6 3LR 16	We use the amenities as frequently as we can. Parking can be limited. However if the amenity managers have responsible attitudes and appropriate parking signs	Noted, considered covered by CAP IC1 and P5

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
			showing where it is/is not possible to park are appropriately erected the need for land upon which to park could be unnecessary, saving money and all the problems which surround car park issues.	
8	P5	DL6 3LT 4	Its not just Ingleby cross that is being squeezed, car use is unavoidable, the number of vehicles per house is not going to reduce, off street parking is vital otherwise footpaths will be impacted as will road width - just look at any new development in surrounding areas - there are too many cars, access roads are not wide enough etc	Noted considered covered by P4
9	P5	DL6 3NG 1	Off road parking should be a priority for the businesses in Ingleby Cross especially the coffee shop which has increased traffic.	Noted considered covered by P4 and CAP IC1
10	P5	DL6 3NG 3	Off road parking for Ingleby Cross must be a priority	Noted considered covered by P4 and CAP IC1
11	P5	DL6 3NW1	There are not enough parking (off road) at present and new housing would make this even more crowded and difficult to manoeuvre.	Noted but considered recognised by P4
	1	DL6 3NG 3	If houses have to be built but prefer the village to stay as it is.	Noted, desire of residents recognised in Vision.
	2	DL6 3LR 16	I find that the objectives stated seem to be written in stone and as we know things can change. Any land available for development now I'm sure would be kept in mind without making a formal allocation which could not include new possible sites. As changes do occur I feel it a little strong to expect the parish council to make a hard and fast commitment when it would appear no time scale is given to this commitment.	The revision to the Plan has withdrawn its proposal (Page 20, under Site Selection and Recommended Sites) to recommend any other sites for housing development other than Site (4).
	2	DL6 3NG 3	To A N Plan	No Comment

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
	3	DL6 3NG 1	Came to the village for peace and quiet	Noted, desire of residents recognised in Vision.
	3	DL6 3NG 3	But if houses are to be built, preferred site would be school land.	Noted no change required.
	3	DL6 3NW 1	Any new development must remain in the present boundary. Everywhere in the Hambleton & Teesside & Redcar Cleveland area had to endure a huge influx of new housing developments without the consideration of the existing infrastructures, building of schools, surgeries & social amenities. Systems of drainage are not capable of coping with the impact of this huge increase of housing, the flood plains are reduced, the green belts around villages destroyed. There is little prospect of industrial jobs and this restricts automatically the settling of younger people. The hospitals are not able to cope short term with all the newcomers to this area. Even though 18 developments appear a small number but in relation to the present houses in Ingleby Arncliffe this is a considerable influx of traffic, noise and impact on the present community. People have chosen to live here for the very reason that is a relatively quiet area to live in harmony with nature.	Noted but the housing needs survey supports more houses than can be built within the present development boundary, but the revisions to the Plan are intended to restrict development to only that required by the outcome of the housing needs survey. Concern noted and the Plan seeks to find an accommodation between the housing needs of some residents, and those who are willing to support limited development whilst appreciating the need of other residents who rightly place considerable value of the rural peace and quiet of the community.
	4	DL6 3LS 4	Very small number of private houses on school site. 18 units sounds too many on such a central site. I feel that the village character would be spoilt.	Noted the developer's scheme will be presented to the community for their comment.
	4	DL6 3LS 5	Private houses development on school site.	A private housing development would not match the needs of the community.
	4	DL6 3ND 3	More houses could be built if necessary but there must be a limit on the number.	Noted and the revision limits the number to 18.

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
	4	DL6 3ND 3	If the school site is not possible, 2 smaller sites could be considered in the future.	The revision to the Plan has withdrawn its proposal (Page 20, under Site Selection and Recommended Sites) to recommend any other sites for housing development other than Site (4).
	4c	DL6 3ND 11 & 12 & 13	As 4a. by using land for redevelopment before new development. To ensure no vacant under used redundant sites.	School site would be considered a brown field site, so meets the comment. No change to the Plan
	5	DL6 3LN 1	Should include potentially more mixed houses than "needed" – as they may help enliven the demographics – but should have a cap on the total number so not overwhelmed.	Noted but P1 policy unchanged. No change to Plan
No	5	DL6 3LN 9	Preferably a garage at each property	Details of houses will depend upon the developer's viability assessment. In any event affordable houses are not built with garages.
	5	DL6 3LR 1	Built from traditional stone	Build of houses will depend on developer's viability assessment, subject to proposed policies P3 and P4. Housing plans, scheme and layouts will be presented to the community for their comment.
	5	DL6 3LR 15	A bus service is essential to enable residents without or who are unable to use their own transport, to attend appointments, especially medical and to retain their independence.	CAP BS1 wording amended to reflect the comment.
	5	DL6 3NG 1	Only ticked if houses are to be built	No comment required.
	5	DL6 3NX 1	I feel there is already too much development on greenfield sites within the Hambleton and Teesside districts, that any development in Ingleby Arncliffe must remain within the present boundary.	The Plan will clarify that the only playing field land used will be that to accommodate the proposed build of 18 houses, albeit that the playing field lies outside the

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
				development boundary. It is equally understood that the school's closure makes that site a "brownfield" site and in those circumstances N.Y.C.C. would look to develop their playing field site in some way.
	5	DL6 END 3	Adequate planning for council bins so there are not too many around small houses	Noted will be considered as part of the developer's specification and layout.
	5C	DL6 3LR 16	I feel expecting each property to have 2 off road parking places could impinge on the space available, one space definitely should be provided.	No change to Plan, policy P4 considered adequate.
	5D	DL6 3JA 1	Buildings should reflect the nature and character of the village	No change to Plan, policy P3 considered adequate.
	5D	DL6 3LR 17	consideration to be given to increased traffic on main ia village road ...already parked cars are hazardous	Revision to the Plan has removed its previous position on selecting and naming future development on sites 2a, 2b, 3a and 3b.
	5D	DL6 3LT 4	it is vital the "village" maintains a small is beautiful approach, any new housing is appropriate to needs and keeps all age groups in the area, whilst catering for each individual persons needs with the key element being affordability. Any new homes must fit in with the environment and be carbon neutral. There are too many "family homes" occupied by 1-2 people as there is limited small homes available, and limited young families can afford the 4 bedroom houses. Any new development would likely be built by a developer wanting to maximise returns, the loss of the school is catastrophic.	No change to plan, plan is considered to address these comments.
	5D	DL6 3NB 1	Consider each of development all of 5 points should apply.	No change required.

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
	5D	DL6 3NQ 4	energy efficient and eco friendly houses. use of solar panels. trees planted	No change to Plan, Policy P3 considered adequate.
	Page 5	DL6 3LR 8	"Children can safely use the village streets to meet friends". The streets are NOT SAFE, whoever made that comment should look at the speed, standard of driving not just of visiting vehicles but residents as well.	Comment was on Page 5 under Parish Economy and has been revised.
1	6	DL6 3LN 1	But I don't understand why Wright's field was abandoned – looks like a good site to me.	Plan revised and will no longer recommend additional housing sites other than Site (6).
2	6	DL6 3LR 1	If we build affordable houses, we may need school again	No change to Plan. The impact of additional housing was put forward by the Parish Council at the time the school's closure was being considered. 18 additional houses would not have changed the decision to close the school.
3	6	DL6 3LR 16	I had hoped that the development would enable more easy access to the hub of the village amenities; pub, coffee shop, village hall, bus stop. Being able to visit these places without negotiating Cross Lane Bank (not very steep but affects the lungs in cold weather and has no footpath) therefore - on a site in Ingleby Cross.	Plan revised and will no longer recommend additional housing sites other than Site (6). Plan will expand on CAP N1 to re-examine the Grain store site (4) in Ingleby Cross.
4	6	DL6 3LR 18	Site too small	No change to Plan, developer's site plan will be presented to the community in due course.
5	6	DL6 3LR 5	Maybe – Slight concern about traffic to and from the former school site. Grain store site has easier access to main road.	Plan revised and will no longer recommend additional housing sites other than Site (6).
6	6	DL6 3LT 4	Whilst the loss of the school site is catastrophic, in reality it is one of the best sites to utilise, any developer needs to be compliant with the development plans, the village has already had experience of over	No change to Plan but references to Grain Store have been taken on with a change to CAP N1.

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
			development which was not compliant with the planning. The grain store could be a great choice as it is within the development boundary and could be made into a discrete development. Furthermore there is land available to the rear / west of the former abattoir site, but has a development clause in place	
7	6	DL6 3LY 1	More peace and quiet. Use the outskirts of existing towns e.g. Northallerton	Noted, no change to Plan, considered addressed by Vision statement, page 20.
8	6	DL6 3ND 6	The Grain Store	Plan revised and will no longer recommend additional housing sites other than Site (6).
9	6	DL6 3NW 1	There is enough building projects in Hambleton District and Teesside at present.	No change to Plan, its intention is to provide for additional housing within the Parish based on the housing needs of Parish residents.
10	6	DL6 3NX 1	Any development of the school site should not go onto adjacent land. The adjacent land is outside the present boundary.	No change to Plan. 18 houses is the number supported by the Parish's housing needs survey and that will require some playing field land.
11	6	DL6 3PA 1	As long as this will be a mixed housing development.	No change to Plan, mixed housing scheme is the Plan's proposal.
12	6	DL6 3PA 2	On the assumption this will be a mixed housing development.	No change to Plan, mixed housing scheme is the Plan's proposal.
1	7	DL6 3LS 4	Would prefer open market housing. Small bungalows and, or, bungalows would be acceptable.	No change to Plan, affordable housing need was evidenced by the Parish's housing needs survey.
2	7	DL6 3LS 5	Private housing development preferred	No change to Plan, affordable housing need was evidenced by the Parish's housing needs survey.
3	7	DL6 3LT 2	Best kept separate	No change to Plan, a mixed housing site is considered the preferred solution.
4	7	DL6 3LT 4	Developers have one aim in mind, profit. A mixed development would be ideal but does	No change to Plan, the interested developer is a housing association

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
			not work in practice as buyers are put off buying a £400k house next to a £100k house. Properties need to be functional to the needs - family houses require space for parking off street, gardens to enjoy, and decent size bedrooms (families are staying home longer today)	which has conducted its own acceptable financial assessment of the site's viability.
5	7	DL6 3NG 1	Only ticked "yes" if houses are to be built.	No change to Plan
6	7	DL6 3NG 3	If houses have to be built	No change to Plan
7	7	DL6 3NQ 3	Affordable only	No change to Plan, the interested developer is a housing association which has conducted its own acceptable financial assessment of the site's viability and it requires a mixed housing development of open market and affordable housing.
8	7	DL6 3NW 1	I don't see the need of any new development for the foreseeable future	No change to Plan, Parish housing need survey supports a need now.
0	7	DL6 3NW 2	Affordable housing should be built on a separate site. Very much like Osmotherley and Swainby. I don't think mixing affordable and open market houses is a good idea.	No change to Plan, mixed housing development is the desired choice and, in any event, additional sites to allow a split development are not available.
10	7	DL6 3PD 1	Have enough open market houses. Because of open market houses this is the reason no youngsters can afford to live in this village. Affordable houses will hopefully bring new people to live here – why do the snobs in the village object to affordable homes?	No change to Plan, open market houses are necessary for the site's financial viability
11	7	DL6 3LY 1	See Question 5	No change required to Plan
12	7	DL6 3PD 3	Enough private houses not selling	No change to Plan, open market houses are necessary for the site's financial viability
2	8	DL6 3LN 10 & 11	The only way to make it feasible.	

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
3	8	DL6 3LN 6	Affordable housing should be an integral part of the development, not an "add-on" separate from the rest.	No change to Plan.
4	8	DL6 3LS	Would prefer open market housing. Small bungalows and, or, bungalows would be acceptable.	No change to Plan, the interested developer is a housing association which has conducted its own acceptable financial assessment of the site's viability and it supports a mixed housing development of open market and affordable housing. Affordable housing provision is a key objective of the Plan.
5	8	DL6 3LS 5	Private housing development preferred	No change to Plan, the interested developer is a housing association which has conducted its own acceptable financial assessment of the site's viability and it supports a mixed housing development of open market and affordable housing. Affordable housing provision is a key objective of the Plan.
6	8	DL6 3LS 6	seems to be a need for small and cheap houses - so many existing small houses in the village have been extended and improved - perhaps these new ones should have conditions imposed so that they cannot be altered	No change to Plan whilst the comment has merits, any imposition of future planning restrictions on the new houses could adversely affect their financial viability.
7	8	DL6 3LT 4	Refer to answer to Q7. More properties should be rental as it makes the property affordable and becomes realistic when considering family employment security or lack thereof. What employment is there locally, most are either retired or work away from the area - local employment is predominately farming (where housing is	No change to plan, mix of housing tenures is part of the financial viability assessment.

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
			already well catered for), small businesses are vital but need footfall to be viable and competitive, self employed trades need business locally.	
8	8	DL6 3NB 1	More family homes to secure growth in the community ?	No change to Plan. House sizes determined by P1
9	8	DL6 3ND1	Smaller houses. No large executive homes	No change to Plan. House sizes determined by P1
10	8	DL6 3ND 11 & 12 & 13	Starter homes as affordable & eco-friendly as possible.	No change to Plan. House sizes, tenures and environmental standards determined subject to P1, P3 and P4.
11	8	DL6 3NG 2	We feel stone houses at the front would better fit into the character of the village with bungalows facing west. Apartments would make better use of site rather than 1-bedroom houses. Reference the 5 years or less Needs Survey Figures. 2-bedroom dwellings intermingled with 1- or 2-bedroom apartments.	No change to Plan, house sizes determined by P1.
12	8	DL6 3NQ 3	Do not agree with mixed.	No change to Plan. Vision is based on achieving a mixed housing development.
13	8	DL6 3NW 4	More 1/2 bed bungalows needed	No change in Plan, house types and sizes determined by P1
1	12	DL6 3LN 9	That all vehicles are parked within the property boundary where possible.	No change required to Plan, policy P4 considered adequate.
2	12	DL6 3LR 1	A terraced row of stone cottages would look in keeping.	No change to Plan, Policy P3 and P4 considered adequate and we cannot be prescriptive on exact what materials will be used in the construction since this impacts on the financial viability of the development.
3	12	DL6 3LT 4	Rental is more viable for young families, but its essential the housing is good quality, robust, suitable and environmentally	Tenure of any new homes will be based on the evidence from a Parish housing needs survey. On

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
			friendly. The development needs to be controlled as it will impact village life through the construction phase. There are a number of schemes which would well with high density residential developments, but not with low density as	build and design, policy P3 is considered adequate.
6	12	DL6 3ND 11 & 12 & 13	A unit of 4 single person units with common space for dining, food preparation. Like student hall units available for low rental.	No change to plan, proposal is for one quarter house. Occupiers would be likely to cover a range of ages and circumstances which may well not be suitable or appropriate for communal style living.
7	12	DL6 3ND1	Focus on affordable homes	Tenure of any new homes will be based on the evidence from a Parish housing needs survey, the ratio of affordable homes to open market homes has a marked effect on the financial viability of any new development.
8	12	DL6 3NQ4	As response to Q5 Open space should be included. All houses should have at least two parking spaces. Energy efficient and eco friendly house, use of solar panels and trees planted.	No change to Plan, policies P3 and P4 considered adequate.
9	12	DL6 3NW 2	In my opinion the Grain Store site is the site for affordable houses being in the National Park. The conditions they imply only local people and those having connections with the National Park would be allowed to live there. The school site would make another development similar to Priory Way over the period of several years.	No change to Plan other than the amendment to CAP N1. Vision statement on page 20 makes it clear that the objective is for the creation of a mixed housing development.
11	12	DL6 3LN 10 & 11	The Wright field development is a very good idea. The lane down to the filling station wants to be one way only. No traffic from village to A19 Junction, this is a step forward to the safety of people and as I	Plan's wording on Site (5) has been changed to accept the need for furthermore detailed consideration of that site.

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
			anticipate the closing of the centre of the A19 junction, since too many accidents have occurred in the past. The Tontine bridge is there to use, is only 5 minutes difference if that and a 100 times more sensible.	
1	13	DL6 3LN 9	Single or 2 storey dwellings especially where they overlook existing dwellings.	Policy P3 considered adequate.
2	13	DL6 3LR 13	The existing NYMPA boundary along the old A172 subjects' part of our community to completely inappropriate planning policies. I strongly support the campaign to relocate the boundary to the A172's current route.	CAP N1 covers this comment.
5	13	DL6 3ND 11 & 12 & 13	Avoidance of building on fresh land if redevelopments is possible in the village.	School site (6) is a brown field site.
6	13	DL6 3NQ 4	AS Q5. , open space should be included, all houses should have at least two parking spaces.	Policy P4 considered adequate
7	13	DL6 3LY1	See Question 5 response, open space should be included, all houses should have at least two parking spaces.	Policy P4 considered adequate.
8	13	DL6 3NW 2	In my opinion the Grain Store site is the site for affordable houses being in the National Park. The conditions they imply only local people and those having connections with the National Park would be allowed to live there. The school site would make another development similar to Priory Way over the period of several years.	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing. CAP NI has been changed to accept that more work should be undertaken to explore its future potential for housing.
1	14	DL6 3JA 1	Wright Field because it does not stretch the village envelope	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing.

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
2	14	DL6 3LN 7	Grain Store Ingleby Cross. Large open space easy access. Stop farm tractors crossing A19.	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing. CAP NI has been changed to accept that more work should be undertaken to explore its future potential for housing.
3	14	DL6 3LN 8	Grain Store Ingleby Cross. Large open space easy access. Stop farm tractors crossing A19.	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing. CAP NI has been changed to accept that more work should be undertaken to explore its future potential for housing.
4	14	DL6 3LP 1	Wright's Field	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing.
5	14	DL6 3LR 13	I consider that the Grain Store (Site 4) remains far and away the best location for the proposed housing development. It would remove a significant eye-sore, would have minimal impact on existing residents and would help to redress the existing imbalance between the two parts of our community (Ingleby Arncliffe and Ingleby Cross)	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing. CAP NI has been changed to accept that more work should be undertaken to explore its future potential for housing.

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
6	14	DL6 3LR 14	I support development of school site and/or Atkinsons (2A &2b) but none of the other sites	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing.
7	14	DL6 3LR 16	The Grain Store site. This would enable closer contact with the village hub. Would encourage greater numbers to use the bus service (if we have one). It was mentioned a couple of years ago that a parcel of land along the old A172 westbound was available for development this is not mentioned here.	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing. CAP NI has been changed to accept that more work should be undertaken to explore its future potential for housing.
8	14	DL6 3LR 17	2a &2b development of Atkinson site would be my preferred option - have some concerns about the development of Chapmans Field	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing. CAP NI has been changed to accept that more work should be undertaken to explore its future potential for housing.
9	14	DL6 3LR 18	Atkinson Site	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing.
10	14	DL6 3LR 5	Grain Store	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
				site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing. CAP NI has been changed to accept that more work should be undertaken to explore its future potential for housing.
11	14	DL6 3LR 7	The school site will be developed even if our Neighbourhood Plan is not accepted. I would like to see a development on the Grain Store site one day, as this would help to balance the population of the Parish and has easy access to existing roads. In the short term, my preference for an alternative to the school site would be the Far Field if it could be economically viable.	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing. CAP NI has been changed to accept that more work should be undertaken to explore its future potential for housing.
13	14	DL6 3LS 3 & DL6 3LS 3A	Our first preference is the Grain Store (and the other land belonging to Bells as previously mentioned in their response under 16), then Far Field or Wrights field and again separately either The School, Chapman's field, or Atkinson's.	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing. CAP NI has been changed to accept that more work should be undertaken to explore its future potential for housing.
14	14	DL6 3LT 3	Atkinsons – less intrusive on village	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing. CAP NI has been changed to accept that more work should be undertaken to explore its future potential for housing.

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
15	14	DL6 3LT 4	Refer answers already provided, the grain silo is a good alternative and is the potential for development adjacent to the old abattoir site	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing. CAP NI has been changed to accept that more work should be undertaken to explore its future potential for housing.
16	14	DL6 3LX 5	Grain Store, Ingleby Cross	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing. CAP NI has been changed to accept that more work should be undertaken to explore its future potential for housing.
17	14	DL6 3ND 1	Grain Store	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing. CAP NI has been changed to accept that more work should be undertaken to explore its future potential for housing.
20	14	DL6 3ND 11 & 12 & 13	Grain Store Ingleby Cross with one way access in & out of the site.	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing.

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
				CAP NI has been changed to accept that more work should be undertaken to explore its future potential for housing.
21	14	DL6 3ND 15	18 houses will add around 30% to the total number of houses beyond the school. If any of sites 2a to 3b are developed in addition, one is looking at potentially doubling the houses in that area. The main street would simply change its character in that situation and become both unsafe and loose what the community in that area values. The Grain Store should be looked at again with the possibility of a small car park at the top combined with a largely affordable development on the site. The vexed question of viability could perhaps be addressed by a Homes England grant for the site and by the development of open market housing on other sites that the Bells may put forward, perhaps following on their previous proposals.	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing.
22	14	DL6 3ND 3	Grain Store	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing. CAP NI has been changed to accept that more work should be undertaken to explore its future potential for housing.
23	14	DL6 3ND 4	Chapman Field	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
				considered at the time of any future proposal for housing. CAP NI has been changed to accept that more work should be undertaken to explore its future potential for housing.
24	14	DL6 3ND 5	There was a blinkered view from some village residents when this discussion first started with reference to the site on the Grain Store. There has since been an even more " " view taken by the national park. The site fulfils many of the criteria needed by a housing development (i.e. access, " " etc). Perhaps if this had gone ahead, we would not be in this position now – even the school may not have closed! (" " cannot make out the words)	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing. CAP NI has been changed to accept that more work should be undertaken to explore its future potential for housing.
25	14	DL6 3ND 6	The grain store seems the best fit for new housing as it has all the requisites for development such as access. " " it would improve the visual impact of the village and national park in replacing the grain store with sympathy housing. If houses were built on the site, it would help keep open the possibility of re-opening the school (surely an expression of the village needs to encourage families to the area??). The other options are developing greenfield sites which seems highly unnecessary destruction of the rural environment we live in.	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing. CAP NI has been changed to accept that more work should be undertaken to explore its future potential for housing.
26	14	DL6 3ND 8	Chapmans Field	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing.

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
				CAP NI has been changed to accept that more work should be undertaken to explore its future potential for housing.
27	14	DL6 3NG 1	2 A/B or 3A/B definitely not the grain store site. NYMPA Boundary to stay. Ingleby Cross villager's comments should be taken into consideration.	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing. CAP NI has been changed to accept that more work should be undertaken to explore its future potential for housing.
28	14	DL6 3NG 3	2A/B OR 3A/B would prefer no housing development at the grain store. Grain store – wildlife – bats, squirrels, large variety of birds some of which are in decline. Ingleby Cross has flooded a few times in the past.	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing. CAP NI has been changed to accept that more work should be undertaken to explore its future potential for housing.
29	14	DL6 3NQ 3	School site only	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing.
30	14	DL6 3NQ 4	any except Grain Store as any houses built here would not fit in with the older part of the parish however sympathetically built. Modern development would be better suited in Ingleby Arncliffe	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing.

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
				CAP NI has been changed to accept that more work should be undertaken to explore its future potential for housing.
31	14	DL6 3NQ 5	Site 3a	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing.
32	14	DL6 3NW 3	2a + 2b	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing.
33	14	DL6 3NW 4	1) 3a + 3b 2) 2a+2b	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be considered at the time of any future proposal for housing.
34	14	DL6 3LR 8	The Grain Store site should be pursued more vigorously. It is nearer to local facilities e.g. bus shelter, Blue Bell and Coffee Shop. In respect of developer surely more than one developer should be contacted/approached and not just take a decision based on one developer. Others should be contacted.	CAP NI has been changed to accept that more work should be undertaken to explore its future potential for housing.
35	14	DL6 3LN 10 & 11	The Wright field development is a very good idea. The lane down to the filling station wants to be one way only. No traffic from village to A19 Junction, this is a step forward to the safety of people and as I	Change to Plan, in that the next draft will not seek to select what if any sites should be built on after site 6. The sites would be

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
			anticipate the closing of the centre of the A19 junction, since too many accidents have occurred in the past. The Tontine bridge is there to use, is only 5 minutes difference if that and a 100 times more sensible.	considered at the time of any future proposal for housing. Wording on site 5 has been changed.
36	14	DL6 3LY 1	See response to Q6 – No more peace and quiet. Use the outskirts of existing towns e.g. Northallerton.	Noted but Policy P1 only supports new housing as evidenced by the Parish.
37	14	DL6 3LZ 2	Grain Store	CAP NI has been changed to accept that more work should be undertaken to explore its future potential for housing.
1	15	DL6 3LR 1	Cross Lane traffic speeds down to 20 mph not 30mph urgently	No change to CAP S1
2	15	DL6 3LR 16	The NYMNPA should be encouraged to relinquish the area of land between old and new A172. This is an integral part of our villages and there seems to be no obvious reason for it not to be under the governance of the Parish Council.	No change to CAP N1
3	15	DL6 3LR 9	Very unlikely that speed limit will be reduced alternative to allow a safe pedestrian route rather than using Cross Lane. Footpath from bottom of Parklands to the Cross is made into a better path with solar lighting.	No change to CAP S1
4	15	DL6 3LT 3	Grain Store – presently unsightly.	Comment noted but no change required to Plan
5	15	DL6 3LX 5	Would not support installation of flashing speed limit sign. This would have potential to distract the attention of drivers on an already hazardous road.	No change to CAP S1
6	15	DL6 3ND 1	Bus Service a Priority	No change to Plan, supportive of CAP BS1
7	15	DL6 3ND 1	20mph on Cross Lane	No specific change to Plan will be considered as part of CAP S1

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
10	15	DL6 3ND 11 & 12 & 13	Solar powered, led powered advisory speed signs should be a priority on Cross Lane with a footpath.	No specific change to Plan will be considered as part of CAP S1
11	15	DL6 3NG 1	I do not agree for the boundary to be moved.	CAP N1 changed to emphasise the need to change Site's 4 planning regime rather than move the boundary, as the first course of action.
12	15	DL6 3NG 3	Do not agree with N1 (NYMPA boundary to stay)	CAP N1 changed to emphasise the need to change Site's 4 planning regime rather than move the boundary, as the first course of action.
13	15	DL6 3NQ 1	I am happy with all points	
14	15	DL6 3PA 1	Maintaining local bus service is a high priority.	No change to Plan, supportive of CAP BS1
15	15	DL6 3PA 2	Maintaining bus service is very important.	No change to Plan, supportive of CAP BS1
16	15	DL6 3LY 1	See response to Q6 No more peace and quiet	
2	16	DL6 3LN 10 & 11	Is the sewerage system capable of servicing new development?	No change to Plan, Yorkshire Water contacted on the subject.
3	16	DL6 3LN 9	Footpaths (rights of way) to be kept at 2 metres of field edge. 1 metre field paths & replaced within required time when ploughed up.	No change to Plan, CAP C2 considered adequate.
No change	16	DL6 3LR 10	Only concern would be if school site "spiked" an amount of traffic trying to cross A19 could raise issues. Also would help of significant expansion of village additional amenities " " considered not just housing. (" " words not too clear).	No change to Plan. Considered necessary.
5	16	DL6 3LR 13	The potential for the creation of an Ingleby Cross to Swainby cycle route (originally identified by the Stokesley Cycleway Project) still exists at a relatively low cost. I hope that this possibility can be kept on the agenda for	Position is that the cycle route from Stokesley to Great Ayton is taking priority.

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
			possible future action if funding becomes available.	
6	16	DL6 3LR 15	With the anticipated increase in traffic in the village, e.g. deliveries of goods purchased via the internet and the additional residents, better maintenance of our lanes and roads is needed and also off street parking for any new developments.	Road maintenance is a county council responsibility.
7	16	DL6 3LR 16	The school site is in close proximity to Atkinson's fields. The development of one could have an effect on the other. I strongly disagree with the notion of children being able to use the village streets safely. We have no safe walkways, parked cars prevent children from being seen by moving traffic. At times Main Street in Ingleby Arncliffe is a hazard for children unless accompanied by an adult (at night it is a hazard for adults also).	The wording on page 5 on "children can safety..." has been amended.
8	16	DL6 3LR 8	What consideration has been given to the following in respect of any development irrespective of where located: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. The provision of a good supply of mains water bearing in mind the loss of pressure feed into the villages; B. Good sewerage mains to cope with increased volume of both sewerage and surface water; C. The supply of electricity to be underground to reduce the chance of outages caused by overhead cable failures; D. Ensuring that the local Telecom exchange can accommodate the needed telephone lines to provide both telephone and internet 	All relevant and appropriate statutory consultees were contacted, and their replies are detailed below or in the attachments.

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
			connections to the proposed houses. Internet facilities are now as essential when dealing with both central and local Government departments – it's not just shopping.	
9	16	DL6 3LR 9	The Blue Bell inn should be ring-fenced during the period of the plan i.e. remains as a pub, without local amenities there will be no need for additional housing.	Change to CAP H1 to accept that any material changes to the facilitates provided by The Blue Bell and the Village Hall to the community may result in an application for Community asset registration.
11	16	DL6 3LS 3 & DL6 3LS 3A	I am of the understanding that there was more land put forward other than just the Grain Store by Lady Bell. In my opinion the Steering Group was only established due to the proposals first put forward by Lady Bell, because these also included land which was in very close proximity to members of the steering groups' own personal property. This was the only land actually offered by a land owner at the time however because it was not of preference to these members it has been completely excluded from the Plan which is misleading and doesn't represent full transparency to the parishioners. In general I find the plan very coercive. Looking beyond this, I believe this land (from Town End Farm to the sewerage works, and from the Orchard along the old road, beyond Mr Hunters property) would be ideal for new development. Together with the proposal of the Grain Store these three areas may have created a viable option to suit the needs of the NYMNPA, HDC and the Bell family, whilst delivering the communities requirements.	A change to the PLAN has been made in that other than site (6), no specific recommendation on future sites and their order of priority will be included. CAP N1 has been amended to include for further endeavours to facilitate the development of the Grain Store, site (4). It is not accurate to state that more or different land was offered by the Arncliffe estate in the Call for Sites process.

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
			<p>The Steering Group have proposed that the 'recommended' options for development are: The School, Atkinson's, and Chapman's Fields. In reference to my earlier point about coercion, I notice that these sites aren't necessarily currently available; Atkinson's and Chapman's aren't available for another 10 years and the school is open to offers. Meanwhile the other available and offered sites have been dismissed (and not reconsidered) due to technical reasons/the results of a 'desktop exercise'. Whilst I don't disagree with housing being developed on any one of these sites, it is detrimental to the Steering Groups vision of enhancing the village if all three were to be developed. That part of the village (from The School down to Chapman's Field) is already narrow enough with the current traffic load, and with a potential increase of 10 properties on each site (as a rough example) this would see an additional (approx) 60 cars accessing that one road. Additionally, developing these three sites would see an even bigger necessity for footpaths along that stretch, for which there is simply not enough road width. I strongly feel the sites should be more evenly distributed throughout the village to avoid any detriment to a single area, with access being the main issue as the village was not built for this kind of concentrated traffic.</p> <p>With this in mind, I believe it would also be a massive enhancement to the village to close the road to the A19 / Exelby Services. I appreciate it is used by many villagers, however it is also used heavily by non-residents cutting through from the A172 to the A19 and vice-versa. Its closure would mean a minor deviation for the residents in return for a quieter and safer place to live.</p>	

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
			Extending my view to future sites, this then opens Wrights field as another good option for development.	
12	16	DL6 3LS 6	Keep all the trees on the school site and build round them. Many are mature and beautiful (in a village rather lacking in large trees) and many were planted by the pupils so should be retained and cared for as the heritage items they were intended to be and as a mark of the site's history.	Most of the trees at the front of the site are protected by TPOs.
13	16	DL6 3ND 1	Support closure of the cross over for traffic on A19 opposite Exelby Services	No change to Plan
14	16	DL6 3ND 2	Investigate means to reduce pollution from the A19 which is only likely to increase.	Will be raised with the developer of site (6)
15	16	DL6 3ND 2	Improve the visual impact of the grain store at Ingleby Cross	No change to Plan
16	16	DL6 3ND 2	Support the closure of the cross over on the A19 at Exelby Services	No change to Plan.
17	16	DL6 3ND 3	Road Safety crossing A172- remarking give way lines, lighting at crossroads	CAP C1 changed to recognise concerns over the crossroads safety.
18	16	DL6 3ND 3	Parking land by old Byre. When lots of cars come due to a rambling group arriving. Cars could be encouraged to park nose or boot in so that more cars could be accommodated. A polite notice explains that?	No change to Plan. The option has already been examined by the Parish Council and would be opposed by Highways.
19	16	DL6 3ND 3	I would recommend the A172 is crossed by using the left-hand side by the Grain Store. It's a shorter distance, the slip road on the other side is approached by fast cars and one is slightly further way from cars coming off the A19.	No change to Plan in terms of giving advice on where to cross the A172, but CAP C1 has been changed to note the need to improve the safety at the crossroads.
20	16	DL6 3ND 4	Bus Shelter	No change to Plan.
21	16	DL6 3NG 3	Came to village for peace and quiet any more houses will spoil this. Plenty of houses have	No change to Plan. The Plan's vision notes the need to respect the rural feel of the Parish. The

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
			been built in Northallerton and Stokesley. There already a strain on sewerage.	housing need is evidenced from a Parish housing needs survey. Yorkshire Water have been contacted on the sewerage capacity question.
22	16	DL6 3NG 3	More houses will create more traffic in the village. The coffee shop has created more coming and goings of vehicles on Cross Lane etc. No facilities for families in the village. Bus service poor and doesn't run to time for anyone working within the area, so families need to have at least one car. Extra light pollution will be caused with more houses.	No change to Plan. Parking points are addressed by P5 and CAP IC1.
23	16	DL6 3NQ 3	Between the devil and the deep blue sea. Neighbourhood Plan or No Neighbourhood Plan?? Very much like Brexit Deal or No Deal choice. I have heard that the response rate to the consultation has been low? This could explain why* * I am guessing a lot of people will be thinking what's the point. I do <u>not</u> agree that there is a need for more housing within the parish other than affordable housing. Preferably old peoples bungalows. I am strongly in favour of using the old school site for the above purposes or alternatively for assisted living units/flats; also conversion to a residential care home. If I understand correctly, going ahead with the Plan is the least worst option (i.e. Deal)? If so then we will need to push forward with it – preferably with “amendments”. I am in an agreement with the Community Action Points.	No change to Plan, Parish housing need survey supports the need for additional housing.
	Page 19	DL6 3LN 10 & 11	Why can't National Park and local council have a different approach to planning where there are joining boundaries. Compromise is a better solution than stalemate.	Change will be made to CAP N1

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
	Page 19	DL6 3ND 15	Whilst the Highways position is stated there is no conclusion on its implications and no evidence provided that the community has been consulted on the road's closure.	Comments on site (5) have been amended
	Page 20	DL6 3ND 15	Is it the intention to zone areas 2a, 2b, 3a and 3b for housing development and if so in what order?	Revision to plan will not choose any other sites than (6).
		Statutory Consultees		
	Post	British Gas	No reply	
	Email	Civil Aviation Authority	No reply	
	Post	BT	No reply	
	Email	East Harlsey Parish Council		
	Email	Environment Agency	No reply	
	Email	Environment Agency	No reply	
	Email	Hambleton Richmondshire and Whitby Clinical Commissioning Group	No reply	
	Email	Highways England	No reply	
	Email	Historic England	Reply attached	
	Email	Homes & Communities Agency (HCA)	No reply	
	Post	Member of Parliament – Richmondshire M.P.	No reply	
	Post	Member of Parliament – Mr J. Howell M.P.	George decided not to send, waiting to send a "final" version.	
	Email	National Grid c/o Amec		
	Email	Natural England	Reply received Pointing out that if there is the potential for environmental impacts, strategic environmental assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment screening exercises may need to be undertaken Reply attached.	

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
	Email	NHS Hambleton, Richmondshire and Whitby CCG		
	Email	North York Moors National Park Authority N.Y.M.P.A.	Reply Received attached	
	Email	Northumbrian Water Ltd	Wright Field has a water main running parallel to the road, running from north to south. If developed suitable protection methods and easements would need to be considered	
	Post	Northern Powergrid	No Action Required	
	Email	Osmotherley Area Parish Council		
	Post	Planning Inspectorate		
	Email	Potto Parish Council		
	Email	The Coal Authority	No Action Required	
	Email	The Gardens Trust		
	Email	The Rountons Parish Council		
	Email	Whorlton Parish Council	Their Jan. meeting cancelled, will revert	
	Email	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Reply received – attached.	
	Email	Hambleton District Council	Their comments are below but do relate to the earlier draft of the Policy Intentions Consultation draft.	
	Email	Yorkshire Water – Sewerage	Reply still awaited	
	Email	N.Y.C.C.		
	Email	Diocese of York School Services	Reply received – Attached.	
	Hambleton District Council – All their comments below relate to an earlier draft of the Policy Intentions	<u>Hambleton District Council Comments</u>		

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
Consultation Document				
Initial section of text about the stage of neighbourhood plan production and the consultation	<p>While the content here is accurate the language used is rather formal. Rewording is suggested to aid clarity and understanding.</p> <p>We would suggest that the deadline for comments is made more prominent.</p> <p>Formatting: suggest that you do not place text over images as it can make it hard to read.</p> <p>Relevant guidance/ basic conditions: NPPG: Preparing a neighbourhood plan - https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2#preparing-a-neighbourhood-plan-or-order, Consulting - https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2#consulting-on-and-publicising-a-neighbourhood-plan-or-order</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Noted and Policy Intentions Consultation draft amended.</p> <p>Noted and Policy Intentions Consultation draft amended.</p> <p>Noted and Policy Intentions Consultation draft amended.</p>	
Table of contents	It may be worth considering the level of detail included both in terms of the length of titles and the levels included, for example is it necessary to include all of the sites under 'Search for available sites' in the TOC?	Agreed	Noted and Policy Intentions Consultation draft amended.	
Summary	<p>We would suggest changing the title as the content is more background about how the plan came to be being prepared and what has happened so far, something like 'Background' might be more reflective of the content.</p> <p>The last sentence of the first paragraph seems out of order.</p> <p>The last two main paragraphs dealing with sites and the process could be left to the Parish</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	Noted and Policy Intentions Consultation draft amended.	

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
	Housing chapter and initial section respectively.			
Vision	<p>The first paragraph is generally clear and succinct. We would suggest thinking about how to develop the vision to expand on what Ingleby Arncliffe will be like as a result of the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>We would suggest changing 'by building a "Mixed Housing Development" of different property types...' to 'by building housing of different property types...' as this will aid clarity and is more flexible.</p> <p>We would suggest changing 'housing needs requested' by omitting 'requested' as the current wording would seem to be conflating 'need' and 'demand'.</p> <p>We would also suggest that you consider using the bullet points as objectives, rather than as part of the vision.</p> <p>The wording of the first bullet point doesn't seem to make sense. You could add to this by saying that young adults and families would be able to move into the parish and older residents would be able to downsize whilst staying in the parish.</p> <p>We would suggest changing the second bullet point by omitting 'Making it a planning policy to' and 'future housing need surveys' to 'evidence of housing need'. These changes would retain the aim of this bullet point but would be more flexible.</p>		Noted and Policy Intentions Consultation draft amended where considered appropriate.	

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
	<p>The third bullet point is not clear and could be interpreted in different ways. We would suggest rewording or even omitting this bullet point.</p> <p>The fourth bullet point while being clear would benefit from being reworded, for example 'Ensuring that housing development is built to agreed standards... ..and respects the character of existing properties and the character of the villages'. This will mean that the aim is focused on the desired outcome (well designed housing development) rather than on a policy that seeks that outcome.</p> <p>The first part of the last bullet point should be omitted as the plan will once adopted be part of the development plan and will therefore be a significant factor in determining planning applications.</p> <p>The second part could benefit from being reworded, for example 'Support the achievement of identified community aspirations'. This would be more flexible as it would not be tied to the aspirations identified in the plan. You could also maybe expand the last bullet or provide further explanation.</p> <p>Formatting: When finalising the draft plan please look at where sections start and add page breaks as necessary.</p>			
Local Planning Authorities	<p>The third paragraph here should be amended; HDC does not currently have a Local Plan.</p> <p>To be clear this paragraph should identify that the HDC development plan is made up of a</p>		Title changed to Local Development Framework	

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
	<p>number of documents, the main part of which is the Core Strategy, and includes the Development Policies DPD and the Allocations DPD.</p> <p>Also the emerging Local Plan has not been published in any kind of complete draft so as it stands it is inaccurate to say that no new housing development is proposed.</p>			
Community consultation	<p>While we have no doubt that the contents of this section are accurate the tone is somewhat formal, particularly the first paragraph in bold, and you may want to review.</p> <p>The type of content in this section is fine for the pre-submission draft but would be better placed in the consultation statement for submission, with a reference in the plan if you think it is necessary.</p>		Statement of Consultation will be prepared for the Pre Submission Plan	
Next Stages in the Process	<p>As with the 'Community Consultation' section the type of content contained here is probably best left out of the submission version of the plan.</p> <p>There are a number of minor points of clarification for the content of this section which we would suggest changing the text to reflect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the first paragraph 'pre-consultation' should be changed to 'pre-submission'. • There is some repetition in the second paragraph. • Technically the district council makes the decision about who to appoint as 	Agreed	<p>As above excluded from the Policy Intentions consultation</p> <p>Changed</p>	

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
	<p>the examiner, although we would discuss the decision with you (second paragraph after the bullet points).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The examiner will make recommendations for changes to the district council and we have the responsibility for making the changes. The whole plan including any community aspirations will be subject to the referendum vote, however only the planning policies and supporting text will be part of the development plan once adopted. <p>While you are free to propose a monitoring schedule that suits your purposes we would advise only undertaking to do this on an annual basis.</p>	Agreed	Changed	
Background to the need for a NDP in the parish	The table could benefit from including some additional explanatory text, for example the line on tourism notice boards could be interpreted as having been completed but the text following the table indicates that actions that have been achieved are not included in the table.	Agreed	Changed	
Parish Housing and Demographics	<p>There are no comments on the content in the first part, although please note that we will provide data for homes built, rather than houses.</p> <p>Background – similarly no comments on this content although it may be worth explaining ‘..and an unwelcome and low proportion of under 30s.’</p>		Section revised.	

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
	<p>Also the development plan was the LDF in 2012 when the housing needs survey was completed.</p> <p>We would suggest adding in additional subheadings to break up this section of text.</p>			
Parish Property Sizes	We would suggest turning the content around so you set out what the make up of the housing in the parish is at present then what the need is.		Revised as considered appropriate	
House Prices	The reference to the affordability ratio for Hambleton from the SHMA is out of date. Reference should be made to the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) which has a ratio of 8.9. There is no update of the national figure.		Changed	
Parish Age Profiles	We would suggest including references for where the information in the table comes from; 2001 and 2011 will be national census but 2018 will be from another source. The position of table here should be looked at.	Agreed	Changed	
LPA Boundaries and Development Boundaries – Impact on housing development	<p>We would suggest moving the map later in the plan as it shows a number of different things.</p> <p>We would suggest reviewing the text for this section to provide more of an introduction to the subjects being addressed.</p> <p>You should also review the wording with regards to the NYMNPA – housing development opportunities are limited to rural exception.</p> <p>We would suggest splitting this section and moving the second part relating to current planning policies to after Parish Housing</p> <p>Text relating to the current HDC planning policy should be clear that the IPGN is not part</p>		Section revised.	

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
	<p>of the development plan, as such it may be worth providing more explanation of what it is and when it was introduced.</p> <p>We would also suggest rewording the last paragraph of this section – the current planning policies do not provide the necessary scope for a development that would meet the identified needs of some 20 homes with a mix of both market and affordable units.</p>			
Parish Housing	<p>Housing Needs Established and Defined: We would suggest reviewing this section to ensure that the information being conveyed is clear and that there is a clear distinction made between 'need' and 'demand'.</p> <p>A table with the need identified by each survey may help.</p> <p>Housing Build Numbers/ Types and Tenures: This seems to be clear but the '5 year view' in the table could be explained.</p>		<p>Revised as considered appropriate.</p> <p>Provided on web site</p>	
Search for Available Sites	<p>We would suggest reviewing this section. National guidance about how to go about site selection sets out a sequence of identifying sites, determining whether they are available and suitable for development and what their capacity is and then comparing the total capacity with existing need. Such a process takes account of the different character and capacity of sites and whether that meets needs rather than considering the amount of land as the density of development for different sites will depend on the particular characteristics and circumstances for each. The approach you have set out seems to have assumed the</p>		<p>Revised as considered appropriate.</p>	

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
	<p>development density will be the same regardless of site circumstances. You have also extrapolated the need for future 5 year periods; while we can understand why you would do this we would suggest caution as future need should not be assumed to necessarily follow the same trends. Instead we would suggest setting out here the parameters and method for how you went about identifying sites and whether they could be considered suitable for development.</p> <p>Point to clarify – was NYMNPA involved in the call for sites?</p> <p>Detail about what land owners were advised to do and what site were submitted the HDC seems unnecessary and confuses the message about who considered sites and who did the further search.</p> <p>We would suggest talking to Laura Malkin about producing a map, that would be better placed in the next section.</p>			
<p>Sites arising as part of the “call for sites” and the sg’s initial search/ Sites arising subsequent to the “call for sites”</p>	<p>We would suggest a more structured approach to setting out the information about each site, possible in the form of a table for each site, which is clear about whether and when the site is available, whether it is achievable, whether it is suitable (including what its capacity is) and the conclusion about whether it is a preferred site or not.</p> <p>While it is reasonable to have information about all sites assessed as part of the plan at this stage the submission plan should have all</p>		<p>Table added to web site.</p>	

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
	<p>alternatives sites considered but not selected removed.</p> <p>Please consider our general advice about photos. Please also try to make sure that the detail that photos are there to show is actually visible.</p>			
Site selection criteria and recommended site(s)	<p>While it is clear which site is preferred it is not clear whether you are proposing to allocate the site for development.</p> <p>Similarly it is not clear whether you want to allocate other sites.</p> <p>If you are allocating or identifying sites for future development you should include a policy for each site which sets out what form the development should take and any particular requirements that should be satisfied. You can see examples of site allocations in the current LDF allocations document - https://www.hambleton.gov.uk/downloads/file/761/allocations_dpd.</p> <p>If you are including land for future development the policies for them should say how and when further details/ requirements would be set out.</p>		Following responses on the Policy Intentions Consultation, the allocation of future sites will be excluded.	
Heritage assets	<p>This section seems somewhat limited. We would suggest considering the aims and objectives of the plan and feedback from consultation to inform how this section could be developed in order to help achieve them. There is potential for inclusion of a map identifying the heritage assets.</p>		Comments will be considered in the context of those from Historic England and the ones provided by HDC.	

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
	You could also consider settlement character assessments - link to areas of opportunity, design considerations - links to design policies.			
Social amenities, leisure, social and tourism	<p>We would suggest considering the aims and objectives of the plan and feedback from consultation to inform how this section could be developed in order to help achieve them.</p> <p>You could also consider identifying Local Green Spaces. NPPG Local Green Space designation - https://www.gov.uk/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space#Local-Green-Space-designation</p>		Section revised.	
Parish economy	This section seems somewhat limited. We would suggest considering the aims and objectives of the plan and feedback from consultation to inform how this section could be developed in order to help achieve them.		Section expanded	
Countryside, green spaces and footpaths	<p>We would suggest considering the aims and objectives of the plan and feedback from consultation to inform how this section could be developed in order to help achieve them.</p> <p>You could consider identifying priorities for spending any CIL monies to the parish.</p> <p>Also a link could be made to the earlier mention of cycle ways, etc. and improving access to Coast to Coast/Cleveland Way.</p>		<p>Section revised.</p> <p>Discussion has taken place on how the funding would be spent.</p>	
Sustainability appraisal	We would suggest reading the NPPF with regards to the sustainability objectives (paragraph 8) to ensure that you clearly reflect		Not pursued at this time, NP consultant will complete at the appropriate time.	

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
	<p>the economic, social and environmental aspects to sustainability.</p> <p>The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) is clear that full sustainability appraisal is not required for neighbourhood plans but the plan does need to promote sustainable development which is a basic condition.</p> <p>The content about the basic conditions statement could potentially make more sense if it were moved to the 'Next stages in the NDP process' section.</p> <p>The last paragraph should refer to the Strategic Environmental Assessment screening that is a requirement for the plan and identify that there may be a requirement for a full assessment.</p> <p>It should also refer to the Habitats Regulations Assessment screening and similarly identify the possibility of having to do a full assessment, which is often referred to as Appropriate Assessment (Note – the screening and full assessment is sometimes referred to as Appropriate Assessment but this is wrong)</p> <p>The separate Sustainability Appraisal that you have sent through could benefit from setting out how the sustainability objectives were decided upon and how they relate to the three aspects of sustainability. Relevant guidance/ basic conditions: NPPF8, NPPG, Basic conditions – contributing to the achievement of sustainable development https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-</p>			

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
	planning--2#basic-conditions-for-neighbourhood-plan-to-referendum			
Housing policies and community objectives	Please refer to our general advice about policies and about the use of terminology. Please ensure that your reference numbering is clear.		Policies revised with clear labelling	
H1 New Housing Development (P1)	<p>Please check the wording makes sense (looks like 'omit' should be deleted).</p> <p>The supporting text does not seem to relate directly with the requirements of the policy in that the first paragraph seems to suggest that the principal of housing development needs to be justified through a housing needs survey, whereas the policy relates to the makeup of the development (based on the existing survey).</p> <p>The justification text should refer to present local need survey findings and the information/assessment that has been completed on house types/ sizes.</p>		Policy Revised	
H2 New Housing Design and Environmental Standards (P2)	<p>As it stands the requirements of this policy are not clear.</p> <p>There is scope here for you to really make the plan locally specific, link to local character and distinctiveness, the earlier identification of historic assets, green spaces etc; as it stands there is no supporting text to explain what is considered to be high quality design.</p> <p>The current wording of the policy is unlikely to add value as it replicates policy requirements in existing LDF policies.</p>		Policy Revised	

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
	<p>The exception to this is the requirement to meet environmental standards, however this requires clarification as it does not specify what standards only that they are environmental. National policy is clear that plans should not set or require their own housing standards and that only nationally defined standards are used, perhaps provide a link to the SPD on size, type and tenure of new homes for reference to space standards. Additionally requirements in plans should not place unreasonable burdens on development such that a willing landowner and a willing developer can't make a reasonable profit from development. This makes sense as a developer is not going to consider developing as site if the requirements of development would be more than what they would get for the site once developed and so development would not take place.</p> <p>As it stands this policy therefore is unlikely to meet basic conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National policy: plan positively to support local development • National policy: practical framework for decision-making • Complementary to national planning policies and local plan policies 			
H2 New Housing Design and Environmental Standards (P3)	<p>Generally the requirements of this policy are clearer than P2, but it seems to add little value as it seems to replicate policy requirements in existing LDF policies.</p> <p>We would suggest considering a different form of words so that this relates more to the specific circumstances such as narrow roads that are unsuitable for on-street parking.</p>		Policy revised.	

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
	<p>As it stands this policy therefore unlikely to meet basic conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National policy: plan positively to support local development • National policy: practical framework for decision-making • Complementary to national planning policies and local plan policies 			
Orange box following P3	See NI below		Amended.	
H3 Streets and street scene	No policy here, possibly due to formatting issues		Policy revised.	
Community objectives	<p>Please note that we are not going to comment on all content in this section.</p> <p>We would suggest considering how community objectives could be combined with or used to support policies, for example IC1 Ingleby Cross Parking and P3, or potentially used to create additional policies, for example HI.</p> <p>N1 Campaign to move the NYMNPA boundary: While we understand the desire to change the NYMNPA boundary it should be recognised that this is extremely unlikely to happen.</p> <p>The neighbourhood plan is an opportunity to come up with local policies that address local needs and aspirations. (The formatting needs attention – we would suggest using single cell tables for policies etc rather than text boxes to ensure the content stays with related content)</p> <p>Please look at the wording of 'HI HERITAGE ASSETS, SOCIAL AMENITIES AND GREEN SPACES PROTECTION' as it seems to suggest</p>		Section revised and retermed.	

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

	Question Ref or Comment	Post Code	Respondent's Comment	Response to Comment and noting any change made to the Policy Intentions Consultation Document
	that the register of assets will be protected, presumably it is the assets that you think should be protected.			
Evidence and appendices	<p>Please check that all identified evidence is available in the public domain or can be disclosed (Financial Appraisal of School Site (Site 6)).</p> <p>Where possible we would advise providing direct links to all evidence documents individually and that all documents have their full correct titles.</p> <p>Currently there are no appendices so we would suggest changing the section title if this remains so.</p>		Supporting website page introduced.	
List of abbreviations	<p>Please see our general advice about drafting neighbourhood plans and try to limit the number of abbreviations used.</p> <p>In addition to the list we would advise including a glossary.</p>		Glossary suggestion taken up.	

Attachments

Historic England Reply

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

Mr. Clive Walley,
C/O Parish Clerk,
2 Arncliffe Hall Cottages,
Ingleby Cross,
DL6 3PD

Our ref: PL00517787
Your ref:
Telephone 01904 601 879
Mobile 0755 719 0988

14 January 2019

Dear Mr. Walley,

Draft Neighbourhood Plan for the Parish of Ingleby Arncliffe

Thank you for contacting Historic England to seek our advice on the draft Neighbourhood Plan for Ingleby Arncliffe Parish.

Ingleby Arncliffe Parish contains 1 grade I, 3 grade II* and 12 grade II listed buildings, together with a grade II registered historic garden.

We note that policy P3 requires “new housing developments to demonstrate high quality design...and respect the scale and character of the existing buildings within the vicinity”. If the character of the village has not been defined, this may prove too loose a requirement and fail to deliver the outcomes you intend. We would therefore suggest the Neighbourhood Plan includes a short character assessment using the “[Placecheck](#)” approach to gain an understanding of what is special about Ingleby Arncliffe.

We note that policy H1 refers to a register heritage assets and historic assets; the register should be included, with a map as an appendix to the Neighbourhood Plan, and should set out those assets which are designated, and those which are “Local Heritage Assets” (these can include buildings, structures, places and landscapes). We suggest that Historic England Advice Note 7 “[Local Heritage Listing](#)” is cited, to explain how “Local Heritage Assets” were selected.

We hope the above advice is helpful and are happy to discuss them in detail if required.

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan



Yours sincerely

Craig Broadwith

Historic Places Adviser

E-mail: Craig.Broadwith@HistoricEngland.org.uk

Natural England Reply

Dear Clive

Thank you for your consultation regarding the Ingleby Arncliffe Draft Neighbourhood Plan dated 6th December 2018.

Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals.

We have reviewed the attached plan however **Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.**

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

If the Neighbourhood Plan changes and there is the potential for environmental impacts, Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) screening exercises may need to be undertaken.

Yours sincerely

Jacqui Salt

Consultations Team

Natural England

Hornbeam House, Electra Way

Crewe, Cheshire, CW1 6GJ

Enquiries line: 0300 060 3900

Email: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk

www.gov.uk/natural-england

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

Yorkshire Wildlife Trust

Many thanks for consulting Yorkshire Wildlife Trust on the Ingleby Arncliffe Neighbourhood Plan.

Ingleby Arncliffe is in an area which will be valuable for wildlife, taking in a part of the National Park and also the upper reaches of the River Wiske. The Trust has been involved with projects on the Upper Wiske to improve water quality by stabilising river banks by planting trees. Lower reaches of the Wiske have poor water quality due to a number of factors such as invasive species, agricultural runoff etc. The plan could contain an ambition to support projects to improve the River Wiske and reduce downstream flooding. There is also Ancient Woodland within the plan area which will be particularly valuable for wildlife and there may be opportunities to protect this in the plan. The MAGIC website <https://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx> shows the detail of the woodland in the area. Wildlife species data can be obtained from the North and East Yorkshire Ecological Data Centre and this might be a useful addition to the background of the plan <http://www.neyedc.org.uk/home/general-interest/>. It is possible that water vole or otter are using the river corridor, and Ancient Woodland is very important for bat species, and there will also be a wide variety of birds present. Knowledge of what habitats and species are present will aid the design and management green spaces in the plan area.

We support the proposals to retain local green spaces where possible and would encourage the provision of retained and enhanced green infrastructure within developments. The Trust would like to see policies to incorporate ecological features within all areas of open and green space and to encourage the creation of linked up green spaces across the area. These can be achieved through for example, varying mowing regimes within areas of amenity grassland which could also include the planting of wildflower seed with a single annual mow along field margins of playing fields. The Trust would be happy to provide advice on suitable schemes as and when appropriate. Encouragement for developers to utilise native species for ornamental planting and areas of open space would also be greatly encouraged as many non-native invasive species are often favoured by developers.

Furthermore, whilst we have no objection to the proposals, we feel they could be further strengthened in order to meet the national aims set out within the NPPF to achieve a net gain in biodiversity. We would recommend that the plan has a policy that puts a responsibility on all development to seek a 'net gain in biodiversity' evidenced through the utilisation of metrics (DEFRA recommended). We would be happy to advise further should it be considered necessary.

Best wishes

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

Sara Robin

Conservation Officer (Planning)

Yorkshire Wildlife Trust

Tel: 01904 659570

Email: sara.robin@ywt.org.uk

Website: www.ywt.org.uk

North York Moors National Park reply

North York Moors National Park Authority

The Old Vicarage, Bondgate, Helmsley, York YO62 5BP
Tel: 01439 772700
Email: general@northyorkmoors.org.uk
Planning enquiries: planning@northyorkmoors.org.uk
www.northyorkmoors.org.uk



Andy Wilson
Chief Executive

Your ref:

Our ref: NYM/2019/3055/1/PF

Date: 21 January 2019

Dear Clive

Ingleby Arncliffe Draft Neighbourhood Plan

I am writing to confirm that this Authority does not have any comments to make regarding the Ingleby Arncliffe draft Neighbourhood Plan. I note that at this stage this the draft is intended as a 'policy intentions' document at that further consultation on final draft policies will take place.

I wish you every success in completing the plan. If you do have any further questions or need to know more please give me a ring on 01439 772700.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Paul Fellows'.

Paul Fellows
Head of Strategic Policy

e-mail: p.fellows@northyorkmoors.org.uk

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

Diocese of York Reply reference Site (6)

REPRESENTATION STATEMENT

CONSULTATION DOCUMENT: PARISH OF INGLEBY ARNCLIFFE DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN (2018 – 2035)

Client: York Diocese

Site: Ingleby Arncliffe C of E Primary School, High Street, Ingleby Arncliffe, DL6 3NA

Our Ref: HN/19/001

Date: January 2019

Preliminary Matters

1. These representations on the Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan for Ingleby Arncliffe (2018 – 2035) (DNDP) are made on behalf of the York Diocese and relate to the proposed use of land in their ownership at the former Ingleby Arncliffe C of E Primary School for residential purposes. The representations relate mainly to policy **P2) Land at the Former Primary School** but also to **P1) New Housing Development**.
2. The Diocese recognise their responsibility in working with the Parish to achieve a comprehensive scheme with the adjacent land, under separate ownership, where if it is to be developed for housing, access would need to be taken through their land. However, in delivering housing they wish to ensure the land they own within the village is not unduly restricted by emerging plan policy.
3. They take this opportunity to offer to meet with the Parish Council to agree a comprehensive deliverable and sustainable scheme that would meet the objectives of both parties.

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

4. The DNDP in page 11 identifies that to build 18 dwellings needed outside the development limits would require the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan. The DNDP identified six sites from an initial search for housing land. Five of these sites are shown on a plan included within the DNDP. The sixth which is referred to as the Former Primary School and Adjacent Land is not shown on the plan in the document that we have. To that extent the term “Adjacent Land” is not defined. We assume that the definition of the land “Former Primary School and Adjacent Land” refers to the land on which the school has been built and which is owned by the Diocese, together with the land for the school playing field owned by North Yorkshire County Council and the adjoining vicarage garden land behind Orchard House and the Former Wesleyan Chapel, owned also by the Diocese. Of these three areas only the school building site is located within the present development limits of the village.

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

5. Of the six sites under consideration, the DNDP preference is for the Former Primary School and Adjacent Land. Further sites for housing developments that have been identified are: - Atkinson's Field and Chapman's Field to the north of the school playing field.
6. The Diocese has taken professional advice on the likely extent, scale and form of development of their land. The Chartered Surveyors instructed concluded that between 2 to 4 houses would be appropriate on their land. The site is constrained by the character and appearance of the area, access requirements and trees subject to TPO's.
7. The Diocese is pleased that the DNDP confirms that reasonable endeavours have been made to find a continued educational or alternative community use for the site but this prospect has now been ruled out.

The Site and Its Surroundings

8. The site owned by the Diocese within the development limits is about 0.28 hectares (0.7 acres) in size. It comprises the land on which the School has been built. The former school field to the rear is about 0.52 hectares (1.3 acres) and under the ownership of the North Yorkshire County Council. The Diocese land is within the village development limits the school field is outside it.
9. Within the vicinity of the school, fields run in broad bands north-west to south-east defined by mature hedges. The school occupies one of these bands. It faces the village main street to the south west. To the north-west the school field is bounded by a children's playground. A metalled track runs along the north-eastern boundary linking the main street with the children's play area. Mature hedges contain the land to the north-east and south west. This has been supplanted by a new hedge and a small newly planted copse on the northwest boundary to the children's play area. We attach a plan showing the land in the ownership of the Diocese and the land owned by North Yorkshire County Council.
10. The school was built in about 1972 and closed in December 2017. It is a single storey building with a hipped roof of typical 1970s design which sits well back from the road with playground and car parking to the front. Neither the school nor the playing field to the rear has been recently maintained. Immediately to the south-west of the site is the former Ingleby Arncliffe Methodist Church, a small Victorian/Edwardian building of character that has been converted into a dwelling. Immediately to the north-east is a more recent stone-built two-storey dwelling built in the local vernacular. Both are substantive dwellings.
11. The Interactive Map for Tree Preservation Orders identifies 9 trees to the front of the school site that are covered by Tree Preservation Orders.

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

12. Ingleby Arncliffe (inc Ingleby Cross) is an attractive well maintained village. It contains a parish church built around the 19th century to replace an earlier church, a public house, a cafe/shop and the village hall from which a variety of social activities are provided. It also contains a cricket club. There is obvious local pride in the village. It comprises two small

York Diocese – HN/19/001

2

Stove!! & Millwater Ltd

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

settlements:- Ingleby Arncliffe and Ingleby Cross that have merged over the years to become one settlement. We refer to it as Ingleby Arncliffe for convenience. The village has a long history, being referred to in the Domesday Book. It developed to support the surrounding farming businesses at a convenient point in the local road network close to principle north-south roads, now referred to as the A19 and A172.

13. Ingleby Arncliffe is one of a string of villages that are located at the base of the North Yorkshire Moors developed to support local agricultural. The North Yorkshire Moors Boundary runs along its eastern boundary. The Coast to Coast Walk, runs through the village. Access to services is convenient with Northallerton about five miles to the south and from Stokesley about seven miles to the north. The Teesside conurbation is within easy reach along the A19. The presence of the coast to coast walk running through the village means that there is an active tourist trade that supports the pub, cafe, hotel and holiday accommodation within the village.
14. Ingleby Arncliffe and Ingleby Cross are linked by Cross Lane. The village is characterised by reasonably substantial dwellings set back from the village roads, generally two-storey stone built houses, with some rendered. More recent dwellings are generally, two storey built in brick, interspersed between the older two storey houses. The village has a pleasant Arcadian feel with dwellings set well back from the road behind generous front gardens.
15. Although not a conservation area the village includes a number of interesting buildings of historic and architectural value as one would expect in a village of such an age. The character of the village is strongly influenced by the substantial 2 storey dwellings set back from the road, on High Street. This includes the stretch in which the school is located.

Housing Need

16. A future housing needs survey undertaken by the Parish in 2012 identified a demand of 24 dwellings. The tenure ranged from affordable housing to open market purchase. A further housing needs survey in 2016 came to the same conclusion on numbers needed over the next 5 years and a similar one on housing tenure. Following discussions with the District Council the total need figure was modified to 18 dwellings over the next 5 years. The housing numbers, mix and tenure were established prior to the school closing. It is not known whether this would influence the type of demand identified by the 2016 survey, although this might be anticipated.

Comments on Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan (DNDP)

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

17. The DNDP is an early stage in the preparation of the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). The document amongst other things sets out the nature of the policies and proposals that it believes presently reflects community planning concerns and seeks to invite comments on their emphasis. The DNDP is primarily concerned with consultation on 5 policies four of which relate to housing. The Diocese is concerned over how two policies; P1 and P2 are taken forward and how they could affect their land. The two policies are: -

York Diocese – HN/19/001

3

Stove!! & Mi!!water Ltd

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

P1 New Housing Developments

Policy will require, as a minimum that any new housing development will provide an appropriate mix of dwelling types and affordability to address the local housing needs of Parish residents, as identified by the most recent housing market assessment and/or local needs survey. Development beyond that required to deliver local housing needs will only be supported where it facilitates the necessary new homes to be delivered by ensuring the overall development is viable.

P2 Land at the Former Primary School

Policy will support development of land at the Former Primary School where it delivers at least 18 new homes of an appropriate mix to address identified local housing need. Additional development will only be supported to ensure overall development is viable and deliverable. Any development beyond the level required to deliver the community's aspirations will not be supported until such time as further development is required for identified future local housing need beyond the current 5 year requirement. This is in order to ensure the future delivery of new homes for local housing needs is not prejudiced.

Policy will expect development of the site to be in accordance with the other policies within the Neighbourhood Plan.

18. Policies **P1: New Housing Development** and **P2: Land at the former Primary School** are policies our clients feel could affect the possibility of residential development on their land. The Diocese wishes the site, occupied by the school buildings and included within the village development limits, to be viewed as a normal infill site for about 3 dwellings whose development would be determined by normal material considerations that would apply to any infill residential site, and separate from consideration of adjacent land outside present development limits. They wish the site to be excluded from any allocation under the Emerging Policy P2 that could limit the type of housing that the site could accommodate. They feel that Policy P1 should relate to housing developments above a certain number and not relevant to infill sites for a few dwellings.
19. Whilst they are prepared to co-operate with the Parish Council to enable a comprehensive scheme to be achieved (subject to agreements with other parties) they do not feel that this should be used to disadvantage the Diocese in how it markets its land. This can be developed separately now and should be viewed separately in the emerging NDP.
20. The two organisations that own the school site; the Diocese and the County Council have separate disposal arrangements. One operates under the auspices of the Charity Commission; the other is a public body. The two sites at present have a separate planning status. The timescale of marketing is different. The Diocese wishes to seek to market the site immediately and the County Council land might not be available for some time. In any event both

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

would need to be marketed separately. The Diocese does not want limitations that could be applied to the County Council land which is outside the development limits to be applied to their site which is within the limits.

York Diocese – HN/19/001

4

Stovell & Millwater Ltd

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

21. The redevelopment of our clients part of the school site would be influenced by normal planning considerations for a site within the village. This would include the character and appearance of the streetscene, trees, access and living conditions of the occupiers of adjoining premises as well as those who would occupy the new dwellings. The adjoining properties and the street generally are substantial, two-storey buildings. It follows that any development of the site would normally be expected to be of a similar size and presence. Our clients consider that policies should not be brought forward that could prevent this arrangement. Any development is also limited by the presence of trees and subject to agreement, the need to provide an access to the adjacent land. This limits available space for development. Consideration also needs to be given to the adjacent existing dwellings that would overlook the site. For a site that could only contain a few dwellings these should be the only issues to be considered. We do not feel that there is justification to specify the particular type of housing for the land.
22. We have been asked to stress that our clients understand the overall thrust of the Parish Council's policy direction for further housing in the village and have no objection to it. Indeed they are willing to co-operate with the Parish to seek to facilitate it. They are seeking to ensure that this would not result in an overly prescriptive policy that would compromise the delivery of housing on the school site within the developments limits.

Conclusion

23. The Diocese would be pleased to co-operate with the Parish Council to agree the best way to achieve a deliverable and sustainable development that would meet the needs identified by the Parish. However, we hope the above has demonstrated why the Diocese does not wish its land within the development limits of the village to be further constrained by policy that could be brought forward by P2 of the Neighbourhood Plan. We have suggested that its land is excluded from policy P2 as it relates to housing mix, type, size and tenure. The DNDP appears to assume that the 18 dwellings needed would be outside the development limits boundary and our clients would support this.
24. Our client's site is modest and constrained. It would be suitable for between 2 to 4 dwellings. We have explained why our clients land needs to be considered separately from adjacent land under different ownership which we invite you to understand and accept. To provide a scheme for 18 dwellings the adjacent land presently outside development limits need to be included. For this to occur, access would need to be taken through our clients land. As we have stated the Diocese would be pleased to enter into discussions with the Parish on a comprehensive scheme but their position regarding access to adjacent land needs to be acknowledged as part of a sensible approach to delivery.
25. Under policy P1 we have suggested a minimum number should be established for any development that would need to have an "appropriate mix of dwelling types" (we suggest 9). If our clients land on which the school building is located is considered separately from the "adjacent land" outside development limits then policy P1 would not be applicable.

Schedule of All Responses Received (Residents and Statutory) & Respond of the Steering Group and Noting any changes to the Plan

York Diocese – HN/19/001

5

Stove!! & Millwater Ltd

Schedule GENERAL NOTES

All dimensions and in mm unless otherwise stated
All details and dimensions to be confirmed on site prior to works commencing
This drawing should be read in conjunction with other relevant drawings and/or specification notes

Children's Play Area

Track

N

KEY

- FORMER SCHOOL LAND
- FORMER SCHOOL LAND YORK DIOCESE
- VICARAGE GARDEN LAND YORK DIOCESE
- DEVELOPMENT LIMITS
- TREES COVERED BY TPO'S

Ingleby Arncliffe Church of England (voluntary aided) Primary School

Gara

Solar Panels

Respon