



Ryedale District Council

REPORT TO: Policy & Resources Committee

DATE: 6th December 2007

REPORTING OFFICER: Forward Planning & Economic Development
Manager: Julian Rudd

SUBJECT: **Ryedale Local Development Framework (LDF):
Core Strategy Consultation**

WARDS AFFECTED: All

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To outline the comments received as part of the latest LDF Core Strategy consultation and to agree to take account of these in further work on the Ryedale LDF. Issues raised in the consultation affect the strategic approach to the Ryedale LDF and this report is intrinsically linked to the Ryedale LDF & Local Development Scheme (LDS) report that is also on this agenda. The two reports will be presented together as the issues raised in this report are amongst the factors that influence the future approach to the Ryedale LDF and LDS.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION

That Members note the comments received through the LDF Consultation and take account of these at relevant stages in the production of the Ryedale LDF.

3.0 REASONS SUPPORTING THE DECISION

3.1 To ensure that comments are acknowledged and that they taken account of in future work to take the LDF forward.

4.0 BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

4.1 Members will recall that during July and August, the Council undertook consultation to help inform the production of a revised Core Strategy.

4.2 The consultation was undertaken at a time when it appeared that the LDF Core Strategy could be resubmitted for examination relatively quickly.

Policy and Resources Committee

6th December 2007

- 4.3 A separate report (Ryedale LDF & Local Development Scheme) on this agenda proposes, for a number of reasons, that the Council reconsiders the way in which it delivers the Local Development Framework (LDF). Against this background, this report only seeks to inform members of the responses received during the consultation and does not set out specific policy responses. The comments received will then be used in conjunction with the finalised RSS and responses to future detailed site-specific consultation, to inform revisions to the strategy at a later stage.

5.0 REPORT

- 5.1 The consultation generated a good response, with 68 people/organisations submitting comments. Annex 1 contains summaries of all of the comments received. A larger document summarising the comments made by individuals/organisations is available in the Members Lounge or electronically, on request. The key issues arising from the consultation are outlined below, together with officer comments where appropriate:

Levels of Development

- 5.2 A key role of the Core Strategy is to outline the level of new development that will be accommodated in Ryedale over the plan period. The consultation document outlined levels of housing suggested in the draft Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and in the RSS Panel Report, and employment land requirements that reflected the outcomes of the Ryedale Employment Land Review.
- 5.3 A number of respondents have expressed concerns that the level of new housing will increase migration into Ryedale, although no one has specifically suggested that the level of new housing is too high and that it should be lowered. The majority either agree with the levels proposed or think that the level of new housing should be increased further, primarily to address affordable housing need. The point has also been made in consultation responses that the level of new housing will be settled through the RSS process and that this will lead a revised Core Strategy.
- 5.4 The proposed level of employment land generated few comments. One respondent agrees that it is appropriate that it reflects the outcomes of the Employment Land Review and the Government Office has reminded the Council that the revised Core Strategy will need to take account of any updated regional employment land forecasts in the finalised RSS.

Location and distribution of new development

- 5.5 The consultation document provided an opportunity to reiterate the Settlement Hierarchy, which was agreed for the initial Core Strategy and to seek views on whether it remained an appropriate way in which to locate new development throughout Ryedale.

- 5.6 It is clear from the responses received that the majority support the settlement hierarchy on the basis that it looks to focus the majority of development in the Market Towns. The position/classification of the Market Towns in the settlement hierarchy is broadly supported. The majority of people (responding to a specific question) agreed that Malton/Norton was the only Principal Service Centre in the District, although several respondents thought that Pickering could be classed as a Principal Service Centre.
- 5.7 The main area of concern arising in relation to the settlement hierarchy remains the extent to which development should take place in the villages and the way in which service villages are defined.
- 5.8 It has been raised that the shop at Welburn has re-opened which would mean that the village would qualify as a Service village. This will be considered as part of a revised Core Strategy.
- 5.9 A key purpose of the document was to undertake consultation on the distribution of levels of development to different settlements. The issue of proportions has, inevitably, proved to be one of the most controversial areas of the consultation. Two broad potential approaches to distribution were consulted upon. Approach One suggested that distribution be balanced between the Principal Service Centre (50% at Malton and Norton) and the Local Service Centres (50% split between Pickering, Kirkbymoorside, Helmsley and ten identified service villages). Approach 2 suggested higher levels of development at the Principal Service Centre. Both approaches were predicated on the requirements of the Draft RSS, which stated that the majority of development in rural areas should be located at the Principal Service Centre, although this interpretation has been challenged by a small number of respondents.
- 5.10 It is clear from the responses received that the majority of respondents agree that Malton and Norton should be the focus for new development, although there are differing views of the way in which this should be interpreted in terms of distribution. However, a key point that has been consistently raised is that the precise proportion of development should be more strongly informed by the capacity of the twin towns to accommodate additional development in terms of their infrastructure and character. This is also a point that has been raised in relation to other settlements in the hierarchy.
- 5.11 Ultimately, it is considered that this issue can only be fully resolved through site-specific work, which will enable proportions to be established following more detailed investigation and consultation. Furthermore progressing site specific work, (with its emphasis on public consultation), will also provide a further opportunity to reflect on the settlement hierarchy. Traditionally, site-specific consultation generates a high level of interest from local people. It will be valuable to test whether

the majority of local residents reiterate the calls for a more dispersed pattern of development to the villages.

- 5.12 Progressing revisions to the Core Strategy alongside site-specific work is not the strategy-led approach that the Council has been encouraged to take by Government Office but it is likely to be the only approach that will enable a revised strategy to be prepared which will address some of the key issues raised following this consultation.

Visions for the Market Towns

- 5.13 The consultation sought views about the types of changes that people wished to see in each of the Market Towns in order to enhance their roles. On the whole, the suggestions were broadly supported and well received. Issues of town centre/public realm improvements, transport, parking and improving services are issues that have been consistently raised in relation to each of the Market Towns, particularly at Malton and Norton. Site/area specific consultation work will develop this further.

Potential Growth Locations

- 5.14 Comments were sought on a range of broad locations for the future growth of each of the towns. Inevitably this has attracted the attention of those promoting specific sites but in general it has helped to identify a number of issues and, in some cases, consistent views. The inclusion of broad locations for future growth is now a level of detail that Government Office expects to be included in Core Strategies, although this was not clear when the consultation was undertaken. Again, site-specific work will help to focus this issue and inform the compilation of a revised Core Strategy.

6.0 OPTIONS

- 6.1 Not applicable. The report is a report of a consultation exercise and does not require policy responses at this stage.

7.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The costs associated with the Local Development Framework are addressed through the Service Unit budget and Service Unit Delivery Plan.

8.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 There are no direct legal implications associated with the report.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 It is important that this report is read in conjunction with the report on this agenda regarding the Ryedale LDF & Local Development Scheme. Against the issues in that report the recommendation is considered appropriate.

Background Papers: Policy & Resources Committee: 28th June 2007

OFFICER CONTACT: Please contact Jill Thompson, Planning Policy Manager. If you require any further information on the contents of this report. The officer can be contacted at Ryedale House, 01653 600666 ext 309 or at jill.thompson@ryedale.gov.uk

CORPORATE POLICY APPRAISAL FORM

Annex A

Policy Context	Impact Assessment	Impact +ve -ve Neutral
Community Plan Themes <i>(Identify any/all that apply)</i>	The LDF will help to facilitate the delivery of many Community Plan objectives	+
Corporate Objectives/Priorities <i>(Identify any/all that apply)</i>	The LDF will help to facilitate the delivery of many corporate policies	+
Service Priorities	Forward Planning and Economic Development	+
Financial	Service unit budget & agreed LDF funding	
Legal Implications	No direct legal implications	
Procurement Policies	N/A	
Asset Management Policies	N/A	
LA21 & Environment Charter	No direct implications	
Community Safety	No direct implications	
Equalities	No direct implications	
E-Government	No direct implications	
Risk Assessment	No direct implications	
Estimated Timescale for achievement	To be agreed via revised LDS	