

Background

Bishop Monkton Parish Council has studied the consultation document relating to the new North Yorkshire Local Plan. We appreciate the opportunity to comment and have attached our comments to the relevant sections of the document below.

Context

Bishop Monkton is a Small Settlement with a population of c.605 people and c. 300 houses, situated in a rural area south of Ripon. Two major developments are likely in the next 2-3 years (one has planning permission and the other an allocated site with a full application pending) which will add a further c.80 dwelling houses – an increase of 27%.

The Village has limited services with no shop and a limited public transport service (7 buses per day M-F, 6 on Saturdays and none on Sundays) in each direction on a slow service between Ripon and Knaresborough.

There are four road routes out of the village, all designated as minor roads. They have no footpaths beyond the 30mph village limit. Each has significant narrowing and in places is not wide enough for cars to pass in each direction. The main route out of the village is to the A61 to the West, where cars must turn onto the busy A61, which has a poor accident record.

Other key constraints that should be acknowledged and safeguarded are:

- the vulnerability and frequency of the village to experience flooding events;
- the lack of infrastructure capacity in the drainage system to deal with surface water and foul water; and
- the heritage asset and protecting their setting within the village and the immediate surrounding area.

It should also be acknowledged that we are currently investigating the feasibility of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan that would seek to guidance and control the future vision of our village.



Specific Comments

4.	Delivering Sustainable	Growth
----	------------------------	--------

4.2 We acknowledge the policy objective for increase housing provision in the County. However, we request that in rural settlements where significant development (measured by a high percentage increase in housing stock) is already planned and will be delivered in the period 2025-2030, as will happen in our village, that the Local Plan recognises that only when such development is complete will the actual consequences of this development (positive and negative) be known. We therefore recommend that a policy should be introduced to protect potentially vulnerable rural settlements that are currently experiencing significant growth and changes to prevent further expansion until such time as the cumulative impact of existing planned developments is understood fully.

We also believe that as part of the evidence base required to support and justify the emerging Plan utility companies provide evidence of sufficient capacity of settlements to accommodate future developments, given that it has previously been reported as part of decision making process for the two proposed housing schemes in our village that it is up to communities to prove that the infrastructure is insufficient for demand if they have a concern – and clearly we do not have the relevant information.

In our view, new housing only supports economic growth where the housing is in an area of high, or potentially high, growth – which in general is close to major conurbations, Universities and business parks. Development in remote rural communities does not in itself support economic growth without growth in employment – it simply creates unsustainable commuter villages, putting further pressure on the road networks and public transport where / if it exists.

For the record, we also do not consider it is sound planning practice to direct employment provision to remote rural villages such as Bishop Monkton.

4.6 We support the statement that development should be prioritised in

We support the statement that development should be prioritised in settlements which already provide a range of supporting services



	and facilities. If this does not happen, more pressure is put on remote services which often are out of reach for many residents in smaller communities due to poor public transport.
	Additionally, development should not be permitted where there is evidence of a constraint in infrastructure such as sewerage treatment, storm water "overtopping" and electricity supplies unless such constraints are addressed in advance.
	Where a development does not provide access to sustainable transport, it should be recognised that in many cases the need to increase private car use may either be constrained (due to highway capacity) or may discriminate against the disabled and a generally ageing population. Young people who buy new houses eventually grow old!
4.12	Question: New Settlements. The ranking you request is as follows: 1. Provide a range of supporting infrastructure and key services, e.g. schools, healthcare, shops, access to green spaces, other community facilities, etc. 2. Provide land for the creation of employment opportunities 3. Provide a genuine choice in transport options, Equal "4": Provide the highest standards of design Deliver buildings that are highly energy efficient Meet energy needs through low-carbon and renewable technologies
4.17	Development Limits: We are not against the concept of defining development limits, but we prefer the use of locally-agreed Neighbourhood Plan which is a democratic process reflecting local needs to determine these limits rather than the use of centrally-imposed Development Limits. A Neighbourhood Plan is an excellent signpost to developers about the wishes of local residents.
4.28	Question: Growth Options We can see merit in selecting from the following: a. Prioritising growth in and around main urban areas b. Achieving a greater proportion of development in larger villages with a good range of supporting services and infrastructure



- d. Growing locations that are well-served by existing and/or new high-quality sustainable transport links
- e. Developing entirely new settlements / communities

Option c: "Dispersing development across a broader range of settlements, including smaller villages" in our view conflicts your aims of achieving Sustainable Growth – smaller villages simply don't have the infrastructure to support the associated need for economic growth. This option would simply create larger "dormitory villages" and significantly increase car journeys and congestion, as smaller villages are rarely if ever served by good public transport.

In general, housing growth should align with areas of local employment growth.

5. Tackl	ing Climate Change and Flood Risk	
5.4	Your data shows 29% of North Yorkshire's carbon footprint relates t	
	transport. One way to reduce this is to locate housing close to	
	employment, to reduce car mileage and make zero carbon	
	commuting (cycling and walking) a credible option.	
5.6	Flood risk is increasing due to the higher frequency of extreme	
	rainfall events, which is of particular concern to communities in river	
	basins. New developments should not be allowed to increase this	
	risk, and must employ suitable mitigation measures. A related	
	issue, not referred to in your document, is river pollution caused by	
	storm water overwhelming foul drains. The capacity of such	
	systems should be considered in planning decisions, with utility	
	providers being accountable for providing the information to	
	demonstrate this.	
	Question : Adapting to the effects of Climate Change	
	(3) We have a specific concern in Bishop Monkton where flooding is	
	a regular occurrence, as is foul water systems being overwhelmed in	
	storms. This concern should be given high priority in preparing the	
	policy framework to ensure your overall planning strategy can adapt	
	to Climate Change.	
	We support the other objectives in the draft plan.	



6. Creating Healthy and Sustainable Communities

We have no specific comments but support the broad draft policy statements and objectives.

7. Achieving Natural Environmental Resilience

Question: Pollution and ground conditions

- Our greatest concern is pollution of the River Ure by the inability of our local sewerage treatment plant to deal with (a) normal demand and (b) storm water, resulting in raw sewerage being discharged into the River Ure – and indeed being deposited on our streets.
- 4. Through the evidence-based work you are preparing for the emerging Plan we believe that the planning framework should require Yorkshire Water & the EA to back up statements of sufficient capacity in planning consultations with their own data showing that their treatment plants and networks are operationally capable now and during the Plan period. We have evidence of the contrary with YW declaring the local system to have capacity to planners when publicly available data shows regular consent breaches with untreated sewerage being discharged into the river. This is an important issue and we consider the planning system, through the Local Plan process, should be the right vehicle to resolve these discrepancies.

8. Meeting Specific Housing Needs

Question: Affordable Housing

We welcome the delivery of affordable housing as a reasonable percentage of any major market housing scheme as this will lead to a diverse and mixed community to the benefit of main settlements

9. Creating A Prosperous Economy

We have no specific comments but support the broad draft policy statements and objectives.



10. Creating Resilient Centres

We have no specific comments but support the broad draft policy statements and objectives.

11. Ensuring Sustainable Transport and Accessibility

We believe that the availability and growth of sustainable and safe transport links, where possible not relying on cars, should be at the heart of planning decisions.

Remote and smaller communities are near-impossible to connect to public transport corridors with rapid, high frequency and short duration bus services. The economics simply do not work – meaning that car journeys are used (for example) to travel to railway stations.

A high frequency bus service or rail travel are the only services which work for commuters in today's flexible workplace. Seven buses a day may be fine for shoppers, but are not generally useful for workers, especially if they do not operate early and late in the day.

12. Securing Infrastructure to Support Growth

We firmly believe that inadequate local infrastructure should preclude new development in small rural villages. Simply adding Houses to the current situation in our village, for example, will add misery to existing householders and disappoint new inhabitants. Our infrastructure is at capacity in the case of surface and foul water, our roads are narrow and weight restricted, on street parking is a significant problem.

As we mentioned in our response to paragraph 4.2, our village has already been subject to high level of committed housing growth and it is important to understand how this will impacts cumulatively on key infrastructure provision and local services before we consider any further development.

We strongly believe that infrastructure development should precede housing development



13. Achieving High Quality Design

We support the broad draft policy statements and objectives.

Design should be in keeping with the heritage of the community / settlement, with a blend of styles and be in accordance with local design codes that should be produced.

14. Safeguarding the Historic Environment

We support the broad draft policy statements and objectives.

Consideration should be given to protect the landscape generally including agricultural land, woodland, wildlife habitats, the historic sites including designated and non-designated heritage assets and the key views.

15. Delivering the Local Plan

We have no comments.



16.Our Village

Bishop Monkton is a beautiful village which has benefitted from sympathetic and limited development in recent years.

This development has however stretched existing infrastructure – specifically roads, sewerage and storm water drainage – to an extent where real problems are visible. A further circa 80 houses are expected to be built in the next 2-3 years and residents are concerned about the impact these will have on already stretched infrastructure.

We feel strongly that further development can only be considered once these homes have been built and the data shows where we do, and don't, have headroom for further development.

Furthermore, we expect that consideration of further development takes into account our comments about resisting spatial option (C): "Dispersing development across a broader range of settlements, including smaller villages" as well as ensuring that the landscape generally including agricultural land, woodland, wildlife habitats, the historic sites including designated and non-designated heritage assets and the key views are protected.

Bishop Monkton Parish Council