



PART A:	MATTERS DEALT WITH UNDER DELEGATED POWERS
REPORT TO:	PLANNING COMMITTEE
DATE:	31 MARCH 2015
REPORT OF THE:	HEAD OF PLANNING AND HOUSING GARY HOUDEN
TITLE OF REPORT:	LOCAL PLAN SITES DOCUMENT: PREFERRED SITE OPTIONS (SERVICE VILLAGES AND KIRKBYSMOORSIDE)
WARDS AFFECTED:	ALL WARDS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 For Members to consider the outcomes of the site selection methodology for the Service Villages and Kirkbymoorside and to agree preferred development sites and site options for these settlements for consultation purposes.
- 1.2 This report is the first of two reports. It will be followed by a further similar report to another meeting of the Planning Committee covering Malton, Norton and Pickering. This second report will also provide recommendations for site specific protection policies across all settlements in Ryedale.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION(S)

- 2.1 It is recommended that Members agree that:
- (i) all of the sites in locations outside of the Market Towns and Service Villages (and not included in the tables within Appendix 2) are not taken forward as part of the site selection process.
 - (ii) the summary of the Site Selection methodology and conclusions (Appendices 1 and 2) are made available for consultation
 - (iii) the sites listed in paragraph 6.21 are consulted on as preferred development sites for the Service Villages
 - (vi) the site options listed in paragraph 6.31 are consulted on as development options for further residential land supply at Kirkbymoorside and that Site 622 is identified as a potential employment site.

3.0 REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 To progress production of the Sites Document and in particular, to enable consultation on preferred development sites or site options to be undertaken this summer.

4.0 SIGNIFICANT RISKS

- 4.1 There are no significant risks associated with the recommendations of this report. The report supports a consultation stage in the plan-making process. It is considered that greater risks to the preparation of the Sites Document would occur if consultation on preferred sites/options was not undertaken.

5.0 POLICY CONTEXT AND CONSULTATION

Relationship with the Local Plan Strategy and Helmsley Plan

- 5.1 Members are aware the Local Plan Sites Document will form the site specific part of the Ryedale Plan. It will identify the sites that are required to meet the development requirements established through the Local Plan Strategy for the period 2012-2027. In this respect Members are reminded that the Sites Document and the accompanying Policies Map will need to:

- Identify sites for residential development at the Market Towns and Service Villages
- Identify sites for employment purposes at the Market Towns
- Identify sites for retail development at Malton and Norton
- Identify Town Centre Commercial Limits and Development Limits
- Identify site specific protection policies eg Visually Important Undeveloped Areas

- 5.2 The planned development requirements established by the Local Plan Strategy will be met through a combination of the supply of sites for which planning permission already exists (but the development is not yet built or built out) together with sites which will be allocated for specific land uses. The land allocations will identify the sites needed to meet outstanding development requirements once existing permissions and completions (from the base date of the Plan - April 2012) have been taken into account. Larger sites with an extant planning permission will be identified in the Sites Document alongside land allocated for development.

- 5.3 To ensure that the Sites Document will identify sufficient sites (sites with planning permission and new land allocations) to meet requirements for the plan period, the Council will need to be satisfied that sites with planning permission remain deliverable. Members are also reminded that in terms of planned housing requirements, the Sites Document will need to identify an additional 20% supply buffer in accordance with the Local Plan Strategy and national policy requirements.

- 5.4 A summary of the development requirements established by the Local Plan Strategy is as follows:

Residential Development

- Delivery of at least 3,000 (net) new homes over the period 2012-2027 / 200 dwellings

per annum.

- Supply 'buffer' (at 20%) equates to sufficient equivalent to a further 600 dwellings/ 40 dwellings per annum
- Planned requirements to be distributed/ met as follows:

Location	Planned level of (net) new homes	Supply Buffer (at 20%)	Total
Malton & Norton	1500	300	1800
Pickering	750	150	900
Kirkbymoorside	300	60	360
Helmsley	150	30	180
Service Villages	300	60	360
	3000	600	3600

Employment Development

- 37ha of employment land to be identified
- A further 8ha to be allocated to released if required during the life of the plan
- Planned requirements to be met/ distributed as follows:

Location	Level of provision (approx)
Malton and Norton	29.6ha-36ha
Pickering	5.55ha – 6.75 ha
Kirkbymoorside and Helmsley	1.85-2.25ha

Retail Development

- Food retail space requirements met by current commitments (planning permissions)
- Non-food retail space requirements as follows:

Location	Level of provision (approx)
Malton and Norton	5,394 sqm
Pickering	1,156 sqm
Kirkbymoorside and Helmsley	1,156 sqm

- 5.5 Members are reminded that the development requirements identified for Helmsley in the Local Plan Strategy are addressed in the Helmsley Plan which has been prepared jointly with the North York Moors National Park Authority. The Helmsley Plan is well advanced in terms of the plan-making process. The Plan is currently at Examination and the examination hearing sessions have taken place. The Inspector's report is anticipated towards the end of April 2015. Including current commitments and land allocations, the Helmsley Plan supports the delivery of 224 new homes and in addition, a 60 unit extra-care facility. The Plan also seeks to allocate 1.9ha of land for employment purposes. It is anticipated that both Authorities will be in a position to adopt the Helmsley Plan in September 2015 in accordance with the milestones identified in each Local Development Scheme.

Procedural Matters

- 5.6 The Sites Document will form part of the development plan for the District once it is adopted. In this respect, key stages in the production of the Plan are prescribed by

legislation. This includes the formal Publication of the Plan and subsequent submission of the document for independent examination. Before these formal stages are reached, an authority is expected to use evidence and on-going consultation to inform the preparation of the plan. Consultation on preferred development sites or site options is used by many authorities to progress site specific plans to the formal publication and submission stages.

- 5.7 Some consultation on sites was undertaken in 2009. The exercise was largely designed to help inform strategic locational policies for the Local Plan Strategy. It covered sites which were submitted early in the plan-making process when the Council announced that it was to review the old Ryedale Local Plan. The exercise itself generated a significant number of additional sites being put forward by landowners. Following the forthcoming consultation, all of the consultation responses received on sites will be presented to Members before final decisions on sites are made.

6.0 REPORT

- 6.1 From the outset of the preparation of the local plan, landowners and developers have submitted sites to be considered as land allocations, largely with residential development aspirations. Approximately 600 sites have been put forward at locations across Ryedale. The number of sites that have been put forward for different uses, particularly residential land, far exceeds the number of sites which will be needed to meet planned development requirements for the plan period. For some locations however, there is a very limited choice of land available for proposed employment uses.

- 6.2 It is important that a strong and transparent audit trail exists to support the site selection process. The allocation of a site for specific uses in the development plan will affect its land value and this is significant for landowners. The examination into the sites document will scrutinise the reasons why specific sites have been selected and why alternative sites have been rejected. Landowners and developers will challenge any decision not to allocate a site through the local plan process, including the examination and potentially through the courts.

- 6.3 The site selection process is informed by:

- The merits of sites (including for example, their 'strategic fit' with policies of the LPS; constraints; 'sustainability credentials' and deliverability)
- The amount of land required to meet (residual) development requirements – the 'to plan for' figures
- The views of statutory consultees, utility providers, local communities and other stakeholders

Merits of Sites – the Site Selection Methodology (SSM)

- 6.4 Members are aware that a Site Selection Methodology has been prepared to inform choices over site allocations. The methodology has been used to collate a range of information relating to the attributes of sites and has been developed against the Local Plan Strategy objectives. The SSM also embodies the sustainability appraisal objectives which have been established for the purposes of subjecting the local plan to sustainability appraisal, in accordance with legal requirements.

6.5 The SSM has itself been developed through consultation with stakeholders and specific consultation was undertaken on SSM principles in 2009 and 2010. A detailed draft of the methodology was agreed for consultation by Council in March 2011 and the final version of the SSM was agreed by members of the Policy and Resources Committee in February 2013. In early 2014, consultation was also undertaken to update the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. This helped to confirm that the sustainability appraisal objectives remain relevant and that their inclusion within the SSM framework remains appropriate. The scoping update consultation was also used to identify local sustainability issues for different settlements in the settlement hierarchy in order to support a more locally specific and 'finer grained' application of the SSM.

6.6 The SSM is split into three stages which are as follows:

Stage 1 – is an initial sift of sites which do not fit the strategic principles of the Local Plan Strategy or which are subject to constraints that would prevent the site from coming forward in principle

Stage 2 – is comprised of three types of assessment. The first considers key strategic considerations – accessibility, highways and flood risk, which were identified as factors which should be given specific weight in the site selection process. The second assessment within stage 2, considers sites against a range of thematic issues, which cover the range of environmental constraints and opportunities. The third assessment within stage 2 looks at the deliverability of sites in terms of physical, commercial, legal or other factors and also considers the likely ability of sites to contribute to the infrastructure required to support planned growth.

Stage 3 – Summarises the conclusions of the Stage 2 assessment following the Stage 1 'sift'. The collation of the information allows a comparison of the relative merit of sites to be made. The SSM tables are available for Members to view using the password protected web access which has been previously set up for this purpose and summary tables for the service villages and Kirkbymooside are Appendix 2 of this report. To aid site selection, sites have then been placed within one of four groups:

Group 1	Sites which fail Stage 1 of the SSM and that are not considered to be suitable for allocation.
Group 2	Sites where it is considered that there is no reasonable prospect/ very unlikely that concerns identified at Stage 2 of the SSM can be mitigated or sufficiently mitigated or, There are compelling reasons which indicate that a site is not considered to be deliverable/ developable
Group 3	Sites where issues have been identified as part of the Stage 2 assessment. Mitigation could be used to reduce impact/achieve an acceptable form of development on sites within this group if they are required to meet development needs.
Group 4	The site generally performs well across each of the stages of the SSM

6.7 It is important to note that the SSM is a tool to help inform the decision making process. It is not a 'scientific model' that automatically generates the 'best'

development sites based on specific technical weightings. Very few sites can be developed for new uses without any implications and even sites which are relatively unconstrained may be unsuitable for a single reason. The SSM and the grouping of sites has been informed to date by a combination of technical evidence; information provided by the landowners and developers who have submitted sites; responses from statutory consultees and the application of planning judgement. The approach is designed to ensure that decisions on sites are made using as much information as possible and in a way which is transparent.

- 6.8 Members should also note that the SSM has been applied using currently available information. Whilst it is considered that this work has progressed to the point where officers are in a position to make recommendations on preferred sites/site options to members, the SSM tables will continue to be refined and populated with information to support the process in an on-going way. Indeed, once the preferred sites consultation has been undertaken it is likely that the SSM tables will need to be updated to take into account any further information provided by landowners or others. The conclusions of the site selection work may need to be revisited as more information is received during the consultation process.
- 6.9 It is important therefore that Members are aware that in agreeing preferred sites/ site options for consultation at this stage, that this is on the basis that further information may be received during the consultation period which could alter the suitability of a specific site or which reveals that alternative sites become more suitable in comparison.

Residual Development Requirements

- 6.10 The identification of preferred development sites/ site options is informed by the current supply position. It is important that Members note that land supply does not remain static. Additional sites may enter the supply before the sites document is completed. Equally sites with permission may fall out of the supply for various reasons and there may be a need draw on alternative sites which have not been selected as a preferred site at this stage. The consultation will be used to help identify suitable alternative sites in the event that these are required.
- 6.11 Members are aware that the Council reports its land supply position as at the end of each financial year. For this reason, the figures included in this report are an indicative position using information provided from the last land supply check in December 2104 together with new permissions.
- 6.12 Although the residual development requirement or 'to Plan for' figure includes some flexibility (as the figure reflects the need for an additional 20% supply), the extent to which this is subsequently exceeded is a matter which requires careful consideration. Suitable sites will still need to be found beyond the Plan period and as many sites are not without some form of constraint or issue, potential supply does need to be carefully managed. However, this does need to be balanced against that fact that it is not considered to be appropriate to 'artificially' reduce the site areas of suitable sites in order to reduce their yield. Additionally for some settlements, such as those in the Service Village tier, exceeding the planned requirements would help to ensure that supply of housing land is better spread across these villages.

Consultation

- 6.13 As well as the public consultation in 2009, the sites work to date has been informed by the views of statutory consultees, including for example Natural England, English Heritage, the Environment Agency, NYCC. Officers have also offered to meet town and parish councils to discuss the site selection process and to enable them to make initial views. A number of local councils have engaged in this process and have provided officers with views on sites, albeit largely on an informal and without prejudice basis at this stage. These meetings have also proved useful in gathering local knowledge and evidence on sites, particularly in relation to landownership and deliverability matters.

Sites which are not in accordance with the Ryedale Plan: Local Plan Strategy

- 6.13 Almost half of the sites submitted for consideration through the plan process (circa 320) have been put forward by landowners at locations (outside the Market Towns and Service Villages) where the Local Plan Strategy does not look to accommodate new development to any significant extent. They are not in locations which accord with Policies SP1 and SP2 of the Local Plan Strategy and for this reason, it is considered that it is not appropriate or necessary for them to progress further through the site selection process. These sites will be listed in the consultation material as sites which will not be taken forward through the process for this reason.

Preferred Sites/ Site Options – Service Villages

- 6.14 Members are aware that ten villages/groups of villages are defined as Service Villages in the Local Plan Strategy. From the base date of the Ryedale Plan 55 homes have been completed at the settlements within this tier and planning permission exists for a further 229 homes. This is summarised in the tables below. Taking into account a 10% non-implementation (applied to small sites) and the deliverability of larger sites in the existing supply, this results in a requirement for sites for a further 116 homes in order to meet planned requirements established by the LPS when taking into account the need to identify a further additional 20% land supply.

Service Village	Supply at and since basedate*	Pending s106 agreement	Completions since basedate	Total provided to date^
Amotherby & Swinton	6	0	2	6
<i>Amotherby</i>	3	0	1	3
<i>Swinton</i>	3	0	1	3
Ampleforth	40	0	2	40
Beadlam & Nawton	34	0	20	34
<i>Beadlam</i>	0	0	0	0
<i>Nawton</i>	34	0	20	34
Hovingham	20	0	16	20
Rillington	33	0	6	33
Sherburn	18	73	3	91
Sheriff Hutton	3	0	0	3
Slingsby	33	0	5	33
Staxton and Willerby	3	0	1	3
Thornton le Dale	20	0	0	20
TOTAL	211	73	55	284'

*This includes supply as at 01/04/12 and permissions granted since 01/04/12. It also takes into account repeat applications and sites minded to approve subject to s106 agreement.

^Total includes supply and pending s106 agreements.

*Figure of 284 doesn't include allowance for non-implementation.

Residual Requirement for Service Villages Taking into Account Non-Implementation

Stages to arrive at Residual Requirement	Number of dwellings
(1) Total provision/ available supply to date (includes supply at basedate; additional permissions since basedate; outstanding s106 agreement; and completions since basedate (55))	284
(2) Taking into account non implementation Individual assessment of deliverability of large sites. Currently three large sites: -Land at OS Field 4848, Station Road, Ampleforth (30) [Deliverable] -56 Low Moorgate, Rillington (10) [Deliverable] -Richardsons Haulage Yard, Malton Road, Slingsby (24) [Not currently considered deliverable or developable] Global assessment of small sites. (Taking 10% non-implementation allowance of remaining small site supply (165 minus 10% non-implementation = 149)	Large site contribution 40 Small site contribution 149
(3) Total provision taking into account non-implementation / deliverability assessment (Stage 1 minus non implementation identified in Stage 2)	244
(4) Residual requirement Local Plan Strategy plan requirement of 300 homes for Service Villages (300) 20% NPPF allowance over the plan period (60) Total requirement for service villages (360) Plan requirement (360) minus figure from Stage 3 (244)	116

6.15 A summary of the application of the SSM for the Service Villages and the conclusions drawn from this work is at Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 of this report. Appendix 3 includes the maps of sites submitted for consideration, by settlement. Approximately 27 sites at the Service Villages have been identified as either having failed Stage 1 of the SSM with a further 60 sites identified as having significant constraints or concerns which would suggest that the site is not deliverable/ developable or cannot be developed in a way which could be made acceptable through mitigation. However, the process has revealed that 6 sites generally perform well against the SSM (Group 4 sites) and a further 15 sites (Group 3 sites) are identified as having some potential for development by virtue of the fact that mitigation to address a particular constraint or concern is likely to be achievable.

6.16 It is important the merits of individual sites are considered against the strategy of the development plan which aims to distribute new development across the Service Villages. Two 'Group 4' sites (Site numbers 430 and 638) are located at Service Villages (Slingsby and Rillington) which do not currently have a deliverable supply of larger sites or which have not recently experienced completions from a significant source of supply.

- 6.17 At a yield of circa 73 units, the Slingsby site is likely to deliver a larger number of units than the indicative site size included in the development plan. However, the developable area of the site will need to take account of the need to protect mature trees and to provide on-site open space and in design terms is capable of being developed without detriment to the form and character of the settlement and a design led approach is likely to reduce the yield from this site. Site 638 at Rillington is an extension to an existing site with planning permission for 10 units within the development limits. It is considered therefore, that both of these sites should be identified as preferred development sites.
- 6.18 Other 'Group 4' sites have been identified at Sherburn, Ampleforth and Nawton/Beadlam. However, these settlements have either experienced recent housing development or have an existing supply of housing land as a result of the recent release of a major site for residential purposes. Therefore, it is considered reasonable that the very limited remaining land required for allocation should be identified from sites falling within 'group 3' in settlements which have not recently experienced development to any significant extent and where there is a low level of extant supply.
- 6.19 Of all of the Service Villages, Sheriff Hutton is a settlement that has had very little residential development in recent years. In addition to the 'sustainability' criteria which are the reason for its designation as a Service Village, the settlement benefits from a significant employment area. Unlike some other service villages which are in closer proximity to each other (for example Hovingham and Slingsby or the A64 Service Villages) Sheriff Hutton is also located at some distance from other settlements which would be capable of providing homes to meet local needs. For this reason, it is considered that the Group 3 site at Sheriff Hutton (Pecketts Yard) should be identified and consulted upon as a preferred development site for the service village 'tier'.
- 6.20 Taking account of the supply position across the service village tier, this only leaves Amotherby/Swinton and Staxton/Willerby without any significant source of housing land supply into the future. The identification of development sites at either of these locations would be beneficial in this regard. Of the 'Group 3' sites available at these settlements and information provided to date, officers are confident that Site 8 at Amotherby is likely to be deliverable and that the constraints which have been identified for this site can be more easily mitigated. For this reason, it is considered that Site 8 at Amotherby should be identified and consulted upon as a preferred development site for the service village tier.
- 6.21 In summary, it is considered that the following sites should be identified as preferred development sites at the Service Villages –
- **Site 51- Pecketts Yard, Sheriff Hutton (circa 15 units)**
 - **Site 430 (incorporating site 464) - Land East of the Balk and south of Aspen Way, Slingsby (Circa 73 units max)**
 - **Site 638 (including previous site submission references 176/286/291/292/536) - Land to east of Low Moorgate and north of Manor View, Rillington (circa net additional 17 units)**
 - **Site 8- Land to east of properties on Main Street and north of St Helen's, Amotherby (circa 19 units)**

6.22 It should be noted that in addition to seeking views on the preferred sites, the consultation will also be used to seek views on alternative sites which have been placed in groups 1, 2 and 3. This will help to test the application of the SSM. The consultation will help to inform whether there are alternative sites in Group 3 in particular, which consultees consider to be preferable sites.

Preferred Sites/ Site Options – Kirkbymoorside Residential Development

6.23 Members will be aware that the recent Gladman appeal decision at Kirbymoorside means that the residual 'to plan for' requirement at the town is considerably reduced as illustrated in the tables below.

Settlement	Supply at and since basedate*	Pending s106 agreement	Completions since basedate	Total provided/ supply to date^
Kirkbymoorside	304	0	13	304
TOTAL	304	0	13	304

*This includes supply as at 01/04/12 and permissions granted since 01/04/12. It also takes into account repeat applications and sites minded to approve subject to s106 agreement.

^Total includes supply and pending s106 agreements.

Nb - Figure of 304 doesn't include allowance for non-implementation.

Residual Requirement for Kirkbymoorside Taking into Account Non-Implementation

Stages to arrive at Residual Requirement	Number of dwellings
(1) Total provision/ available supply to date (includes supply at basedate; additional permissions since basedate; outstanding s106 agreement; and completions since basedate (13))	304
(2) Taking into account non implementation Individual assessment of deliverability of large sites. Currently three large sites: -Land at Westfields, Kirkbymoorside (225) [Deliverable] -Land to the North of Wains Field (29) [Developable] -Russells (Kirkbymoorside) Ltd, New Road, Kirkbymoorside (24) [Not currently considered deliverable or developable as current permission for Tesco store and being marketed for retail purposes] Global assessment of small sites. (Taking 10% non-implementation allowance of remaining small site supply (12 minus 10% non-implementation = 11)	Large site contribution 254 Small site contribution 11
(3) Total provision taking into account non-implementation / deliverability assessment (Stage 1 minus non implementation identified in Stage 2)	278
(4) Residual requirement Local Plan Strategy plan requirement of 300 homes for Kirkbymoorside (300) 20% NPPF allowance over the plan period (60) Total requirement for Kirkbymoorside (360) Plan requirement (360) minus figure from Stage 3 (278)	82

6.24 One site (Wains field) has been identified as being a 'Group 4' site through the SSM.

However, Members will be aware that there is an extant consent on this site and it is already accounted for in the supply figures. To make up the 'to plan for' figure, it will be necessary to identify land for sites currently identified as 'Group 3' sites. Group 3 sites include three sites to the far north- east of the settlement (Sites 431, 201 and 345; one small site off Swineherd lane (Site 265); the Micrometalsmiths site (Site 454) and Land to East of West Lund Lane and North of Gawtersike Lane (Site 259). Other sites identified in Group 3 have the benefit of planning permission.

- 6.25 A number of factors can be used to compare these sites and assist in informing choices over which should be selected for future development. However, a particular situation has been identified at Kirkbymoorside which needs to be considered in terms of future land use options for the town. The engineering firm Micrometalsmiths have a longstanding presence at Kirkbymoorside. However, it is understood that the existing site/facility is not longer suitable for their business requirements. The Company has indicated that it will need to relocate to a new purpose built facility in order to remain competitive and to ensure its long term sustainability. It is understood that the business is currently committed to remaining within Ryedale to help minimise disruption to existing employees, particularly those that are locally based. The company is working with developers and adjacent landowners (Site 259) to explore how the redevelopment of the factory site and adjacent expansion land could facilitate its relocation.
- 6.26 The redevelopment of existing employment land can often prove controversial, especially in locations such as Kirkbymoorside where there are limited sources of new employment land. This needs to be balanced against the extent to which the site is likely to be attractive to alternative business users. It also needs to be considered against the need to support an existing local employer.
- 6.27 The Micrometalsmiths site together with adjacent land would meet the residual 'to plan for figure' for the Town. Alternatively, the requirement could be met through a combination of alternative sites in Group 3 and or sites from Group 2, if necessary.
- 6.28 The SSM process has highlighted that the three sites to the north east of the settlement present concerns in terms of landscape impact, which could be mitigated or reduced using significantly smaller site areas. However, in comparison with alternative sites within this group these sites are less accessible (particularly in terms of walking distance and ease of walk) to key facilities at the Town Centre. For this reason, it is considered that it would not be appropriate to use these sites in combination to meet requirements.
- 6.29 On its own and without the redevelopment of the Micrometalsmiths site, Site 256 is unlikely to be able to be developed in full given its proximity to the operational factory. Site 265 whilst physically separated from the main built up area of the Town is a brownfield site and from distance landscape views is unlikely to result in an unacceptable landscape impact. However, it has a very limited potential yield. For these reasons, it is considered that it is appropriate and necessary that a Group 2 site is identified to ensure that requirements can be met through an alternative development option.
- 6.30 Of all of the Group 2 sites, Site 156 is well located to the town centre and the existing form of the Town. Any development of the site would result in the loss of a historic strip field although it is considered that if Group 2 sites were to be required for Kirkbymoorside, on balance Site 156 would represent the most appropriate site.

6.31 The SSM process considers the merits of individual sites and helps draw comparisons between sites. It is not however, designed to address the situations where the alternative site uses are sought for specific socio-economic reasons such as those presented by Micrometalsmiths at Kirkbymoorside. For this reason it is considered that before Members confirm what they consider to be preferred residential development sites for the town, the forthcoming consultation should be used to set out the 'pros and cons' of the two distinct development choices for the Town which are:

- **The redevelopment of the Micrometalsmiths site and adjoining land for residential purposes to support the relocation of the factory and deliver circa 124 homes or,**
- **The development of a combination of other sites including site 265; a limited supply of land from sites 201, 345 and Site 156**

Employment Development

6.32 One employment site has been promoted at Kirkbymoorside near to the Kirkbymoorside Industrial Estate. The site would represent a logical extension to the industrial estate however, there are flooding constraints related to the site. In view of the limited options for new employment land at the Town, Officers will use the consultation period to work with the Environment Agency and the landowner to investigate the detailed mitigation required in response to this issue. The consultation will also be used to help identify whether landowners have any additional sites which may be suitable for employment use.

Retail Development

6.33 As set out in paragraph 5.4 above, the Local Plan Strategy identifies 15% (or approx 1156 sq m net floorspace) of the non-food (comparison) of the retail requirement to go to Kirkbymoorside in Policy SP7. As distinct from Malton Town Centre where the LPS anticipates land allocations for comparison retailing, the source of this additional retailing space at Kirkbymoorside is to be achieved through 'the redevelopment of land and buildings within or on the edge of the Town Centre commercial limits and the 'expansion and/ or intensification of existing retail uses'.

6.34 It should also be noted that there are two existing commitments for convenience retail stores, which involve a small proportion of non-food floorspace as part of the development, though it is unclear at this point whether there is retailer interest in these schemes. On this basis, no allocations are proposed for retailing at Kirkbymoorside and that the LPS requirement can be met through redevelopment opportunities, expansion/ intensification of existing retailers and through existing retail consents should they be developed.

7.0 IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The following implications have been identified:
- a) Financial
Addressed through the Service Unit budget.

- b) Legal
There are no direct legal implications associated with the report
- c) Other (Equalities, Staffing, Planning, Health & Safety, Environmental, Crime & Disorder)
None

8.0 NEXT STEPS

- 8.1 Once Members have agreed the Preferred Sites/ Site Options, Officers will prepare the consultation material to allow public consultation on the sites will be undertaken in the summer.
- 8.2 Following this and after considering comments made, Members will be asked to agree the sites which they wish to include within the development plan and the document will be formally published and subsequently submitted for examination. It is anticipated that this will be towards the end of this year.

Gary Housden Head of Planning and Housing

Author: Jill Thompson, Forward Planning Manager
Telephone No: 01653 600666 ext: 327
E-Mail Address: jill.thompson@ryedale.gov.uk

Background Papers:

The Ryedale Plan – Local Plan Strategy
The Ryedale Plan – June 2009 Consultation Summaries
The Ryedale Plan – SA Scoping Report Update
The Ryedale Plan Site Selection Methodology
Ryedale Site Selection Methodology tables

Background Papers are available for inspection at:
www.ryedale.gov.uk; Members Room; On request