

Results from the Grosmont Community Consultation Open Day held on the 28th of June 2024 at Hazelwood Tea Rooms.

**86 people attended the event with 45 comment forms completed.
(2 forms were returned after the event)**

The aim of the community consultation was to gain the views and comments of the community in relation to the proposed affordable housing project. The red line exercise showed the piece of land off Front Street which is being considered to accommodate 8-10 homes with priority for local people from Grosmont parish to meet the need as identified in the housing need survey. Below are all the comments which people wrote on the form:

1. Do you have any immediate concerns or worries regarding the proposed development?

7 people just wrote the word Yes with 3 just putting No. These are all the comments from the other forms relating to this question.:

- Access and devaluation of existing properties.
- The inadequate drainage system at the moment is not sufficient and the vehicle entrance is not suitable.
- The bad reviews from Karbon Homes on Trustpilot is a concern and there isn't a need for affordable housing in the village.
- Yes – it seems unnecessary, and the road access is a problem.
- This is a dangerous access. No need proven for housing and lack of open space.
- Yes – access, disruption, wildlife preservation, lack of facilities, work or schools.
- An eyesore. Access onto the road will be dangerous. Not good public transport and nothing for young children to do.
- Conscious about access, flooding from fields and an influx of residents from other towns.
- Drainage/sewage could cause a problem on this site. The drains cannot cope now in heavy rain with sewers overflowing from the manhole covers near the field after regular storms. Access is a problem.
- Seems too good to be true.
- Yes – Grosmont infrastructure cannot cope with building any more houses.
- Not the infrastructure to deal with builders and many others.
- Crowding on Front Street, traffic from additional vehicles and suitability of site access.
- Access to road.
- Rather than providing much-needed homes, they might end up cycling down through successive owners into landlord ownership.
- Access concerns due to poor visibility from side streets onto Front Street.
- What is the housing need? Need a survey, referred to the above? The local demographic is over 50 so would be interested to see where the need has arisen.
- I worry about the criteria for affordable housing and who will the 'affordable' housing be for?

- The red line site is far too big and may negatively affect opinion. The scale/site should be small so as not to dominate the area. Vehicular access will need careful handling and direction of pedestrians to Ings Terrace will be key.
- Outsiders!
- Not people from this area.
- No – providing access/parking is adequately provided.
- Ensure going to local people. Infrastructure and drainage etc.
- Access from the main road and surface water.
- Problems could be being built on the hill, drainage systems and access to the proposed site as well as on a blind bend.
- I am concerned about the reputation of the chosen develop. per. 85% of 102 reviews currently on Trustpilot are negative. I am concerned about the selection process involved in choosing the developer. Surely other developers should have been approached and residents given advantages/disadvantages of each developer. I am also concerned that the land in question belongs to a member of the Parish Council. I feel this hampers the Parish Council's ability to act for/advise residents impartially. I am concerned that the 'ethical tone' of the project has kicked off 'on the wrong foot' and this does not bode well for future decision making.
- No – I think this is necessary for the lifeblood of Grosmont.
- Problem could be narrow entrance onto Front Street with poor visibility.
- Access to site is poor and cannot see how big lorries, fire engines and ambulances would be able to access safely.
- No – needs to be high quality design/materials.

2. Do you think the proposed development will fit in with the local community?

5 people just wrote the word Yes with 11 just putting No. These are all the comments from the other forms relating to this question.:

- Absolutely not
- Not easily
- No, it will be difficult to blend in, especially visible from the road from Egton.
- No! from people local nobody I've spoken to wants this field developed.
- Not really. Brick built modern housing will be inconsistent with housing stock in the area.
- No, wrong place.
- No, It's a small village with a lot of tourists that visit. A lot of houses are also holiday homes and there are already enough houses in the village. There are no amenities for more houses.
- Not at the moment unless it's guaranteed for local people.
- No – no specific local needs.
- It is close to the existing core so that is good. Pedestrian links through to Ings Terrace will assist integration. Care to be taken with the design of the scheme including the architecture and relationship with rear of Ings Terrace.
- I struggle with what you mean with 'fit in'! Architecturally or taking up a greenfield or social meaning extra numbers in a small rural community?
- I don't know as haven't seen any plans yet. If it's for local people then they already fit in.
- More information required about the number of houses, size etc.
- Don't know.
- Hard to say without seeing particular plans.

- Dependent on scale, form, mass and materials.
- Possibly satisfy the need for affordable housing for employees of the local railway and for local youngsters.
- Hopefully provide some housing for youngsters who were born here but can't afford houses due to second homes and holiday cottages.
- I hope it will fit in but fear that those who've retired here have and have holiday homes will object.
- I am sure well-designed properties will fit in tastefully if a reputable and climate change aware (low carbon footprint) developer is in charge.
- Yes, provided the build quality and design is no worse than the other properties in Grosmont.
- Yes, if it's local houses for local people absolutely. Get the young ones who live here currently and work in Grosmont and surrounding area affordable housing.
- Yes, if it's for local people.
- Yes, if the housing goes to local people.
- Yes, but not seen design specific. Design needs to compliment.

3. Are there any other factors that need to be considered which may not be important to you but may benefit other people in the local community?

- Understanding the different types of affordable housing.
- Can the sewage works cope with the extra waste from the development?
- A play area for the children of the new housing would be good since the village does not have a play area (plenty of NYMR passengers look for a play area for their children. This would need to be dealt with carefully. Currently the cricket field and tennis court are for Grosmont residents only so such a play area might need similar restrictions). NB. The housing must have allocated parking. The village is critically short of parking. NB. I am in favour of affordable housing for the youngsters who work in/want to commute from the village, but the developer/future management company has to be dedicated to the best interests of their tenants. They have to be trustworthy and quick to respond to problems.
- Access to schools.
- If houses aren't available for Grosmont residents, then move it out to the local community.
- I would prefer bungalows as this would benefit local people that want to downsize.
- Accessibility or ease to adapt. Sustainable. EV charging.
- More use of the shop and pub.
- Sustaining local schools.
- I see absolutely no benefit.
- People with genuine links to the village would prefer to be able to purchase and not rent, even partial.
- No amenities.
- No demand – no school – no village community – no village hall.
- Who carried out 'Housing Need Survey'? When was it carried out? Who was survey for?
- Bungalows for retired people who want to downsize but stay in the village.
- Sewers, visual, access.
- I have listed factors/concerns in 'further comments' which I think should concern, or at least be of interest to local residents.
- Don't understand the question, no benefit to the local community.

- Yes – but they do not change the view that it is not the right time or outweighs the bad.
- If permanent occupiers are guaranteed it may contribute to the local economy – MIGHT!
- When other houses come up for rent, they do not give locals first choice.

4. Can you identify any further opportunities that may arise from the proposed redevelopment that could benefit the local community?

16 people just wrote the word No or None. These are all the comments from the other forms relating to this question:

- Growth for the village and stop becoming a place for retirement. Holiday homes leaving a ghost village like Runswick Bay and pricing everyone out of the market.
- The shop, pub, church, railway and bus service ought to benefit from the housing. All need more local support.
- More local people moving out of privately rented accommodation into affordable homes.
- Improved transport links.
- Play area within the village.
- Community spirit back in the village.
- Play-park.
- I hope it would prevent the loss of community by keeping young families in the village.
- Absolutely not
- Priory Park site would be more practical.
- Only beneficial to the railway.
- No – this is a negative decision.
- Improvement of facilities.
- No – just increased traffic on a dangerous junction coming out of the proposed development.
- It might bring more of the younger generation into the village.

ANY OTHER COMMENTS

- I have concern that this is too good to be true. I do not trust Karbon Homes. Now is not the right time. No to new homes, for now!
- Concern about builders using roads that aren't sufficient for the quantity of road users now. Not the local provision for current residents of the village especially to have more. No local jobs for the new residents of these houses and current employers are struggling. The houses will still be too expensive for those working locally as most young people in the village earn a minimum wage or close to that. Local people would still not own their homes as Karbon will keep 20%. Local people may not want to buy a house they don't own at the end.
- There is limited access to the site and no plans to look at i.e., style, sizes of houses etc. There will be an influx of additional people which will put more strain on the current infrastructure i.e., jobs, schools etc. Loss of village character. Concern that 8 to 10 homes will be the thin edge of the wedge. Watch the numbers increase. Loss of quiet enjoyment to my property due to extra cars, vans and people. There has been no consideration given to environmental concerns such as: use of existing properties (3000 across Yorkshire), use of brownfield sites which are usually in towns so

therefore more schools and doctors nearby etc. Increased traffic means increased emissions. How affordable will the properties be? What has determined the description 'much needed'? How have Karbon Homes managed to gather such a poor reputation and how can they assure villagers this would be an improvement? The process is already flawed - 4 days' notice! No 'out of hours' opportunity and no contact details. No flyers to some residents and the claim to be 'in partnership' with the Parish Council is outrageous!

- Sewers cannot cope with the volume created by the existing houses. Any additional houses would make the system overflow. Access is not ideal. Too much traffic volume in the village already. Dangerous roads. Unable to add porches/conservatories to existing properties as not in keeping with the village, however, the Nat Park deem it acceptable to build new houses.
- What happens when the right to buy kicks in?
- I am concerned about who will live in these houses and the noise from them as noise carries around the village as it's in a valley. I'm concerned about the drainage that runs off the hills down into the field. Where will the water go? I don't think the housing will be for locals. It will be offered to people from anywhere such as Scarborough and Middlesbrough so why not build more houses nearer the towns and cities? There are no amenities for the people that live here already and the doctors, dentists etc in the surrounding areas are at full capacity. According to the reviews for Karbon Homes, there is a lot of crime and noise in the developments they have already built. This is a low crime area, so this concerns me.
- I am very concerned about this proposal. There appears to be ecological problems. I also have concerns about access and sewerage. I formally object to this proposal. Is there a need for these houses?
- Not everybody in the village has been consulted. Many homes have not received notification or leaflets.
- The field should be turned into a community woodland for people to enjoy walking in not a load of ugly houses spoiling the beautiful view from Egton. We should be helping nature. Any houses should be closer to amenities, shops, playgrounds for kids.
- Full against it.
- The Council need to be looking into redeveloping a village community. This is lost due to too many second homes. No school and no play area. There was a property that has previously been built for Grosmont residents – no longer have that clause attached so are now housed by people from out of the area, even though someone who had Grosmont connections who wanted one of these properties wasn't given it. The two old peoples' homes on Priory Park again are housed by people from out of the area.
- Grosmont now consists of up to 50% second homes and holiday lets. Would these end up the same?
- Low-cost housing could benefit youngsters wanting to remain in the village, but others will find a way to bypass the system. Rental properties could be located in the field on the way to Priory Park. Rejection as a flood risk is wrong as it has never flooded in my lifetime. On Ings Terrace we have water running through our garden every time we have heavy rain, all from the proposed field. It is a very dangerous access from the road and near the junction.
- I'd like to see a few bungalows to allow older residents to downsize and free up their family homes to younger people would be advantageous.
- Huge concerns relative to: Evidence of need – none proffered to date, age of survey (10 years +) in support of need and out of date, selection of partner (no evidence of tender process, Trustpilot reviews, lack of customer service for tenants or local community evident in responses), lack of detail in consultation process, access to site – narrow, poor view merging into tourist traffic which is a hazard. No schools, doctor,

dentist to support increased population. Unsold houses in the village negating needs evident – these are affordable. Pedestrian access backs to private property – sought permission? Site is for grazing from Defra – good hunting site for owls/bats – are these being protected? Lack of local support is clear. Conflict of interest in Parish Council needs additional scrutiny. Noise and anti-social behaviour evident in Karbon reviews. Ongoing support from Karbon in perpetuity – lack of assurance. Not currently supportive.

- Mention of high ECP rating: air source heat pumps, solar etc. Village of Grosmont is already electric power short – rural with old infrastructure. How are you going to provide extra amps + power for EVs and heat pumps?
- From what I've heard, this scheme sounds to be a very good one. It would provide low-cost housing for young families and young people in particular. This is so important in a village like Grosmont whose demographic is mostly 60+ age group. The ecological credentials seem high which is another important factor. I'm all for it if it doesn't negatively affect other houses in the area.
- Is there a genuine demand for these houses in Grosmont? Drainage will need to be adequate for all residents.
- The drains in the village flood when it rains. No locals can afford the rent.
- I have not found any online point of access where we can follow the project development. I have heard several concerns regarding the transparency of the process. An online webpage/site would help to dispel these concerns.
- There is a need for affordable housing so long as it remains affordable in the long term. Concerns: access to the site proposed, traffic, need for community services i.e., GP, medical, shops, construction traffic, drainage/flooding issues.
- Local people need local housing, but this is not the correct site due to the following: steep hills, risk of flooding, lack of infrastructure in the village, using farmland for building, we need farmland for feeding ourselves, use a brownfield site instead of agricultural land.
- My main concerns are around access and site suitability. The houses Park Villa and the White House in particular will be facing increases in traffic and noise. Local priority for current residents is important for me. Seeing the style and size of the proposed buildings fit into the current style of the village is also important to me.
- Will there be local builders/contractors building the houses? Will the houses be built using local materials? Will the housing welcome the disabled and those with pets? Will the houses have their own car parking spaces and gardens?
- Grosmont is a difficult village to establish a suitable site due to landscape and the river. This appears to be the most suitable site providing access can be designed appropriately.
- Please ensure the houses are not turned into second holiday homes.
- I currently rent a farm that's over £3K a month. Only 3 families with school children because it's not affordable to rent. Very much for the scheme.
- I live on Ings Terrace and my wife suffers from bi-polar and I don't want buildings with views over our garden.
- Please ensure that this development does not become a target for Trust Pilot and others complaining about poor management, failure to maintain properties, lack of co-operation between tenants and Karbon Homes.
- Additional buildings in the village need to be in keeping with the rest of the houses. We need quality long-term housing not rabbit hutches!
- The local community will be heavily impacted from the outset by the heavy lorries required to facilitate the building of these houses in and out of the access way which is not at all suitable for the size of the development.

- I would like to see people live there who at least went to the local schools. The village needs new permanent families not weekenders. If the houses are anything like the photos, they will enhance the village.
- This is much needed in Grosmont. If this is rejected, I fear for the future of young people in Grosmont. My own daughter and partner both live in the village and work locally to help sustain the local community. They have to rent privately as they can't afford any properties that come up in Grosmont. The village was born through its industry and workforce, and we should be looking to the future.

MAIN FINDINGS

- **In total 45 Comments Forms were completed.**
- **15 people showed support for the proposal and the site.**
- **18 thought the site wasn't suitable and were opposed to the proposal.**
- **12 were undecided.**
- **5 households said they were in need of an affordable home on the day and registered their interest: 1 family, 2 couples and 2 single people.**

Main Concerns:

- **Access: poor visibility and a dangerous steep road**
- **Inadequate drainage system**
- **Concerns about evidence of housing need**
- **Flooding from fields**
- **Infrastructure can't cope with extra homes.**
- **Worried about construction affecting roads.**
- **No amenities in Grosmont**
- **Conflict of interest in Parish Council**
- **Bad reviews for Karbon on Trust Pilot**
- **Site not suitable for development.**
- **Concerns that the homes won't go to local people**

**Colin Huby
North Yorkshire Rural Housing Enabler
August 2024**

