



The Ryedale Plan

Draft Core Strategy

Summer 2010

Comment Summaries

December 2011

Section 1 - Introduction

General Comments
• Agree that the area is vulnerable to speculative applications until the new plan is in place (para 1.18). • Para 1.15 – withdrawal of the RSS should be viewed as a positive opportunity as it provides more flexibility to increase the proposed level of new housing. • Pleased that decision making will be local in the future. • Ryedale's contribution to sub-regional working should be noted. • Important to have a plan that is specific to Ryedale. • Para 1.5 – would be useful to include an example of work to harmonise objectives in areas where there is overlap between the RDC and NYNMPA. • Should not be a comma after 'or' on the second line. • Para 1.4 – Replace 'that will take place' with 'which is needed' and 'that will happen' with 'will enhance each of'. • Para 1.6 – should read identify and allocate. • The Sites Document is crucial (given the five year supply situation) and is not on a par with the Helmsley document. • Does the Conservation Area Assessment for Oswaldkirk come under 'Topic or Area' based documents? • How does not doing a detailed dc policies document fit sit with Conservation Area Appraisals? • The EA's Plans are Catchment Management Plans and the relevant one is the Derwent CMP. • Support the Council's intention to press ahead with the LDF despite the recent abolition of the RSS.
Provided by: P Beanland, Fitzwilliam (Malton) Estate, Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation, Oswaldkirk PC, CPRE, Mrs S Hill, Taylor Wimpey North Yorkshire Ltd

Issue 1 – Reported to Policy and Resources Committee 10 February 2011

Issue 2 – see comments made on draft policy CS3 – Affordable Housing

Section 2 - Context

Support

- Pleased to see recognition of the importance of the natural environment for Ryedale and the potential impacts of climate change.
- 2.31 – market housing in the villages / lack of Affordable Housing has been to the detriment of the villages.
- Support the key (Housing) message.
- New houses in villages should be smaller and affordable.
- Agree with drawing attention to shortage of bungalows.
- Support key message in relation to accessibility, to reduce reliance on the private car.
- Welcome references to ensuring alignment with strategies of neighbouring authorities and commitment to ensuring opportunities for Stamford Bridge are fully and consistently considered.

Provided by: Environment Agency, Flaxton PC, Amotherby PC, P Beanland, Highways Agency, East Riding of Yorkshire Council

Disagree

General

- Para 2.15 'not just the Council's Plan' is highly inappropriate considering decisions on recent planning applications in spite of objections from residents
- List evidence documents with dates and any consultation undertaken
- DPD for Helmsley is urgently required. The development of the town should not be distorted by differing policies of each Authority
- States that everyone can influence planning which is not our experience
- Should make reference to the importance of local rural estates, define these and use such a definition as a material planning consideration (definition provided)
- Core Strategy should demonstrate how partners necessary for delivery have been involved. There is no evidence of this

Relationship with other Plans and Strategies

- The volume of sites and willingness to build on every bit of green land contradicts the landscape / environment theme
- Hard to see what the map (illustration of Ryedale / location of the District) contributes
- Include a commitment to addressing alcohol and drug abuse
- Imagine Ryedale sounds idyllic but it does not equate with village life today
- The RSS had a policy of restraint in the area east of York
- Para 2.4 unnecessary given the withdrawal of the RSS and recent planning permissions which contradict the requirement for the document
- RDC can't assume that housing needs generated within the District will be met in part by adjacent authorities
- RSS policy led approach no longer applies – the Ryedale LDF needs to properly quantify its housing needs, making use of recent forecasts suggesting increases in housing
- Imagine Ryedale was done without the Environment Agency, Natural England or Forestry Commission which is why it neglects the rural economy and climate change
- References to the RSS will need to be fully justified
- Presumably references to RSS will be deleted
- PPS12 says that Core Strategies should demonstrate that the partners necessary for delivery have been involved in its preparation. Can't find this demonstration
- Document is heavily reliant on the RSS

- No mention of the need to co-ordinate plans to reduce cross border anomalies
- LEPS may help authorities work on cross – border issues

Issues and Challenges

- Statement about educational attainment (Para 2.17) contradicts the statement on page 36 of the SA/SEA

Population

- Commentary on population is not localised and applies to all the UK

Environment

- 'from' houses would be simpler than 'domestic CO2 emission rates'
- Latest domestic emission figures for Ryedale are 2.7 tonnes per capita
- Policies need to include retention and reinstatement of wildlife corridors
- Refer to River basin plan measure and prevent development that would prevent ecological restoration of the River Derwent
- Acknowledge benefits of ancient and mature trees and hedges as wildlife corridors
- Requires more information on the issues and challenges facing heritage assets

Housing

- Fails to address the implications for the delivery of housing in general
- Amend to recognise the need to provide homes to accommodate latest 350 homes per annum projections
- Affordable Housing needs to be managed. It is not just people who can afford their own home who want to live here
- Low supply of affordable housing is a result of policy-led restrictions. The solution is to promote higher levels of house building in general
- Level of Affordable Housing will always be low as long as the housing requirement remains low
- Essential that the Ryedale LDF properly quantifies housing needs.
- Ryedale has a shortage of flats which should be remedied at the Towns (preferred choice for young people)
- Little demand for flats
- Resist housing that does not meet local villager's requirements
- Findings support the fact that there is not a great need for further market housing
- Penalty charges should be imposed on second homes
- Para 2.29, line 4 should read 'house prices'
- Para 2.29 last line should read 'in' not 'at'
- Para 2.31. Omit 'new market housing has come forward across the District in recent years'.
- Para 2.31 Omit 'appeared to have'
- Support the view of Cllr Andrews and his comments on housing. Habton PC wish to see their brownfield site developed for housing
- Noted that Affordable Housing is a first priority for RDC and second for the NYSP
- Affordable Housing should be centrally located to provide ease of access without the car - Contradicted by recent Persimmon application in Norton

Employment

- Include reference to the North York Moors Railway
- Should be a more positive approach to the land based economy, with an emphasis on new forms of industry
- Low unemployment is as a result of few people of working age. Balanced and sustainable communities require people to work and to have job opportunities

- Developing links with York could be a great advantage to York but not sure how this will be achieved
- More housing will provide the opportunity for people to live and work locally

Transport and Accessibility

- Development outside the Towns contributes to pollution
- Need more safe cycling into towns from nearby villages
- Public transport is declining in Flaxton
- Public transport will need further subsidy if services are to be improved
- NYCC cuts contradicts RDC policy
- Protect public transport services for rural communities.
- Footpaths and cycle ways need to link with public transport, for safety
- Development in villages will increase car use. Major development should be located at the Market Towns
- Mention Ryecot

Provided by: North York Moors National Park Authority, Welburn PC, Mrs C Knott, Oswaldkirk PC, CPRE, Barratt and David Wilson Homes Yorkshire (East) Division, Taylor Wimpey UK LTD, S Harrison Developments LTD, Taylor Wimpey North Yorkshire, Mrs Woodhead, Fitzwilliam (Malton) Estate, Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation, Moorland Energy LTD, P Beanland, Mr M Stenning, Hambleton District Council, Flaxton PC, Ryedale Liberal Party, Habton PC, Wharfedale Homes, Mrs Taylor, Helmsley TC, Mr and Mrs Scott, Welburn PC, Chomley (Place Newton) Estate, Hovingham Estate, Thorpe Bassett Estate, P Hayward, Local Government Yorkshire and the Humber, Council for the Protection of Rural England

Section 3 – Aspirations and Strategy

General - Support / Qualified Support

- No conflict with Hambleton's LDF and does not raise any cross boundary issues that would give cause for concern
- Important to protect and enhance the character and quality of the District
- Welcome recognition of rurality of District, significant challenges in terms of population and household growth and wealth of heritage assets
- Broadly support but increased traffic on the A64 is a concern
- Welcome references to align with strategies of neighbours
- Welcome working with East Riding to ensure all opportunities for Stamford Bridge are fully considered
- Strategy and policies are generally appropriate for Ryedale

Provided by: Hambleton DC, Mrs Woodhead, Thorpe Bassett Estate, Dr R Wheeler, Chomley Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust, Hovingham Estate, Mrs Hill, East Riding of Yorkshire Council, P Beanland

General - Disagree

- Contamination is viewed as a constraint but the opportunities to clean up sites should be reflected
- The Aims and Objectives do not amplify the vision and are not sufficiently locally distinctive
- Concerns over legibility of this section. There is significant repetition / duplication
- Strategy contains too many aspirations and too few spatially specific policies
- Should recognise the unique and valuable role of local rural estates
- No reference to masterplans produced by those with notable interest and influence and which area material consideration
- Core Strategy is not sufficiently strategic focussed and fails to provide a clear strategic direction

Provided by: Environment Agency, CPRE, Thorpe Bassett Estate, Dr R Wheeler, Chomley (Place Newton) Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust, Hovingham Estate

Vision - Support / Qualified Support

- General Support
- Extremely useful section. Pleased to note villages will be retaining their identities and emphasis on meeting needs of local people
- Last sentence should read 'accompanied 'by' not 'with'
- Refer to biodiversity as well as Landscape
- Quality of shopping in Helmsley is going down
- Will be important to deliver a range of new development across a wider array of settlements to ensure choice, maintain a vibrant population and support essential services
- Location and amount of development needs to be balanced with protecting the special qualities of Ryedale
- Welcome vision – could make reference to climate change
- Agree, especially those references to protection and enhancement of landscape
- Support Malton and Norton as the 'capital' of Ryedale
- Supports the development aspirations of the owners of the Pickering Showground as a Tourist attraction and business venue.

- Support vision in respect of Helmsley
- Support vision in respect of Pickering
- Support reference to villages retaining their identities and development in villages better meeting the needs of local people
- Welcome that it recognises the unique rural identity of the District and the need to support the land based economy

Provided by: Barratt and David Wilson Homes North East Yorkshire, Taylor Wimpey UK, P Hayward, NYCC, Oswaldkirk PC, CPRE, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust, Oswaldkirk PC, K Storey, Environment Agency, English Heritage, S Harrison Developments LTD, Barton Wilmore for client, North York Moors National Park Authority, MHA Care Group, Mr M Stenning, Thorpe Bassett Estate,

Vision - Disagree

- Description of Pickering is not as positive as that accorded to Malton / Norton or Helmsley
- Development in rural areas will not permit the maintenance of a 'distinctive and high quality' landscape
- Amend vision to provide for market and Affordable Housing in settlements capable of accommodating development without detriment to the surrounding area
- Empty words – how will the vision be achieved?
- Too negative and prescriptive and lacks strategic vision and aspiration for rural communities in the long term which will lead to continuing decline. This would undermine the rural character of the District and the feature and role of local estates.
- For the villages the vision lacks clarity and fails to recognise the need for growth to maintain vibrancy / vitality. Amend to support new development in villages to enhance / maintain their sustainability whilst retaining identity and character
- Would be undermined if development is allowed to take place at Welburn
- Norton is ignored in the vision although in later sections it is properly addressed
- How can the trust be made to keep the hospital open?
- Disagree with the Plan's pejorative vision of Pickering
- Fails to say how Environment Agency, Natural England and the Forestry Commission will help achieve the vision

Provided by: Pickering TC, Welburn PC, K Storey, Church Commissioners, Mr M Gwilliam, Carter Jonas on behalf of - Thorpe Bassett Estate, Dr R Wheeler, Chomley Estate, CMDR James Life Interest Trust, Hovingham Estate, Mr and Mrs Scott, Oswaldkirk PC, Mrs C Knott, J Mennell, CPRE

Aims - Support / Qualified Support

- General Support
- Support those elements that would support the development aspirations of the owners of the Pickering Showground. Support Aim 1
- Strongly support Aim 1 / reflects need to create employment opportunities
- Support Aim 2
- Support Aim 3
- To achieve all aims all settlements should be allowed to develop proportionally to their existing size
- Aims should apply to all villages
- Generally agree with aims but it is important not to prevent development in settlements due to lack of public transport
- Generally agree but it is vital to allow a level of development in villages to support the

- community and where there would be a negligible impact on the local environment
- Aim 3 – agree with the wording but could expand to include examples of how natural assets could be used to provide renewable energy
- Aim 3 – refer to connecting up areas to increase resilience to flooding / climate change

Provided by: Barratt Homes and Taylor Wimpey Homes Yorkshire (East), Taylor Wimpey UK, NYCC, Natural England, Barton Wilmore on behalf of client, Moorland Energy Ltd, Barton Wilmore on behalf of owner of Pickering Showground and S Harrison Developments Ltd, English Heritage, Mr D Cockerill, DJ and FK Cockerill, Smiths Gore on behalf of K Storey, Smiths Gore on behalf of the Church Commissioners for England, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust

Objectives - Support / Qualified Support

- Generally agree but it is important not to prevent development in settlements due to lack of public transport
- Should recognise the need for more housing across a range of settlements as population increases
- Include a new objective to meet housing needs of rural areas
- Generally agree but it is vital to allow a level of development in villages to support the community and where there would be negligible impact on the local environment
- Generally support / agree – Address the importance of providing new development whilst being sensitive to the area
- Objective 1 - Emphasis on Malton should not be at the expense of the other market towns
- Objective 1 - Replace facilities with cultural activities, leisure and recreation
- Objective 3 - Would be better separated into historical and environmental aims
- Objective 3 - Particularly references to the historic environment
- Objective 5 - Agree / support
- Objective 6 - Need to gain a binding agreement with the hospital trust that they do not close the hospital or reduce services further
- Objective 8 - Very valid but will require high quality accommodation in good surrounds to attract investment
- Objective 8 - Support building links with York / Scarborough
- Objective 8 - Mention linking NYM railway with Malton
- Objective 9 - Instead of 'supporting the provision of local weekday and farmers markets', replace supporting with 'support, develop and drive..'
- Objective 9 - Welcome focus on land based economy but needs recognition of the role of the estates in providing housing and employment opportunities
- Objective 9 - Include reference to racing
- Objective 10 - Could set out a more positive message, requiring development to enhance the environment
- Objective 10 - Welcome references to flood risk, GI and adaptation to climate change
- Objective 10 - Needs greater emphasis on other ways to reduce energy and greater use of renewable / low carbon energy sources

Provided by: Smiths Gore on behalf of K Storey, Smiths Gore on behalf of the Church Commissioners, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes Yorkshire (East) and North East Division and Taylor Wimpey UK, S Harrison Developments Ltd, NYCC, Natural England, Moorland Energy Ltd, Kirkbymoorside TC, The Theatres Trust, Yorkshire Wildlife trust, English Heritage, Carter Jonas on behalf of Thorpe Bassett Estate, Dr R Wheeler, Chomley Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest trust, Hovingham Estate, Ms C Knott, Oswaldkirk PC, Pickering Town Council, Environment Agency, CPRE

Spatial Strategy / Strategy Summary Table

Draft Policy CS1: General Location of Development and Settlement Hierarchy

Spatial Strategy / Strategy Summary Table / Draft Policy CS1 General points - Support / Qualified Support
• Considered the most sustainable approach • Immediate focus for greenfield land release should be at Malton • Welcome need for redevelopment of brownfield sites but should recognise that this may have a biodiversity value • Welcome aspirations to ensure future development is outside the floodplain and minimises flood risk • Supportive of recognition of need to release greenfield land outside development limits • Support release of greenfield sites before brownfield due to lack of available sites • Strategic review of boundaries will depend on the choice of sites which residents are not considered in • Support strategy as directs majority of development to the Market Towns - the most sustainable locations • Welcome promotion of the market towns as a focus for new development • Generally support the strategy although a service village may become a less sustainable location if development occurs and services then decline • Matching local need to development is critical • Supportive of principle of a settlement hierarchy with the largest proportion of growth to urban centres • Criteria for definition of service villages should be outlined in the policy • Provide explanation of what constitutes a reasonable bus service • Reflects local priorities and is a sound basis for future location of development in the area • Offers most sustainable option for future housing delivery • Support housing for local need in Broughton • Broadly support with exception of 'Issue 1' • Support for the use of the local needs occupancy condition
Provided by: North York Moors National Park Authority, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes North East Yorkshire and Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd, Natural England, Environment Agency, Taylor Wimpey North Yorkshire Ltd, S Harrison Developments Ltd, MHA Care Group, S Harrison Developments Ltd, Ms C Knott, Mrs S Hill, Welburn PC, Thorpe Bassett Estate; Dr R Wheeler, Chomley Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest trust, Hovingham Estate, Mrs E Gathercole, P Hayward, G Wright, Simons and Fitzwilliam Trust, North Yorkshire County Council, Woolf Bond Planning on behalf of landowner, Mrs Woodhead, S Hill, Ampleforth PC, Flaxton PC, M Stenning

Spatial Strategy / Strategy Summary Table / Draft Policy CS1 - General Points – Disagree
• The Towns / Service village option has been pursued to extract developer contributions. The Town Council would like to see both the Broughton Road and Brambling Fields junctions improved but not if this changes the character of the towns or leads to too big an influx of people or a worsening of traffic congestion • Core Strategy is not sufficiently strategy focussed and fails to provide a clear strategic direction for the District • Consultation in 2009 (Milton Rooms) placed insufficient emphasis on alternative options for the distribution of development

- The strategy does not represent a balance between Town and Country
- Key decisions were made in Dec 2009 without the Strategic Transport Assessment / adequate transport information
- Concerned about the way in which the settlement hierarchy and proportions of development have been carried forward
- Option 2 – Market Towns and local needs everywhere else is more appropriate
- Previous consultation did not favour Option 3 (Development at the Towns and Service Villages) / Option 2 was preferred.
- Option 2 was the most sustainable option and the most popular in previous consultations
- Option 3 was not the most sustainable option – it is at the limit of sustainability and there should be no further dispersal of development to the villages
- Suggested some detailed wording changes
- Lack of detail over where development is likely to take place in the near future. Needs to provide a clearer indication and principles to guide development. Should include sites for the first five years
- Plans will lead to a deterioration in the provision of public transport
- Should take account of the AONB Management Plan
- Para 3.7 - Use of SUDS will require careful consideration on contaminated sites
- Include in summary section reference to supporting significant heritage and landscape assets
- Truly sustainable option is to concentrate all but local housing needs in the towns
- Land adjacent to FERA should be allocated for future FERA related growth
- Does not provide for any comparative assessment. Sites within settlements (regarded as less sustainable settlements) may still come forward
- Villages will lose their identities
- Successive plans have failed to address local needs in all villages
- Significant level of new development in local service centres near the Strategic Road Network may have an impact on it which will need to be addressed via developer contributions
- Concerned about impact / capacity of A64. More detailed evidence required to demonstrate how developers will be expected to manage down traffic.
- Sites DPD needs to be agreed and in place to prevent speculative applications
- Restrictive approach which will not deliver significant numbers of affordable homes but which will restrict supply. New technologies will enable development to be located beyond the main settlements whilst still reducing the carbon footprint
- Mention in summary table the need to support significant heritage and landscape assets
- Concerned about rurality of the District and the Market Towns losing their character
- Strategy focuses on Malton yet early releases have been in Norton and infrastructure is inadequate. Brambling fields will only give marginal relief
- Pickering should not be singled out for same amount of development as Malton / Norton

Provided by: Cllr P Andrews, Mr and Mrs T J Scott, K and J Warner, CPRE, Kirkbymoorside TC, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust, Hovingham Estate, Environment Agency, Castle Howard Estate, Mrs Cox, Mr P R Pickersgill, Mrs E Gathercole, Church Commissioners, P Goodwill, Owners of land at Wombledon, Mrs M Taylor, D Cockerill, Highways Agency, Malton TC, Norton TC, M Fletcher, Thorpe Bassett Estate, Malton and Norton Area Partnership, M Gwilliam, J Mennell

**Spatial Strategy / Strategy Summary Table / Draft Policy CS1
- Designation of Service Villages - Disagree**

- If services are lost and new housing has been built communities would be less sustainable
- Larger villages are still rural communities and further development needs to be handled sympathetically
- The concept of service villages does not fit Ryedale and will not address the needs of villagers. The best option for future housing is to continue the current policy (market Towns and village envelopes with a view to reviewing the latter regularly to reflect local requirements
- Services will be reviewed regularly which may lead to the designation of new service villages. This will cause uncertainty and anxiety. New service should prove that they are viable for at least two years
- Hierarchy should recognise the predominantly rural nature of the District and allow sufficient growth to the service villages
- Identification of Service villages is not based on a robust evidence base. Seeks clarification why Claxton and Sand Hutton have not been identified as Service Villages
- Against the principle of further development in the parish with the exception of small infill schemes
- Concerned that new development will transform the village into a small town
- Definition of service villages not robust
- Need to take account of the length of time a village service has been operating
- If service village option is taken forward then look at groups of villages. Habton could be considered as part of the Amotherby / Swinton group
- Concerned about 5 year review of sites document and the potential designation of new service villages. Creates uncertainty and anxiety (Need to be clear what happens if a service closes / reclassification of villages
- Monitor length of time a village service has been operating to ensure viability before a village's position in the hierarchy is changed. Suggest two year period of operation
- Criteria for service villages is too limited and weak. Wider criteria should be used
- Support criteria for a school but shops and transport could be lost. Wider criteria are needed
- Concern over scale of development – effect on character of villages and use of greenfield sites
- Review of decisions every five years is flawed. Decisions cannot be reversed.

Provided by: S Hill, Mr T Raine, Cllr P Andrews, J Hopkins, Dr R Wheeler, Hovingham Estate, Church Commissioners, Slingsby, Fryton and South Holme PC, K Storey, Mr M Fox, Dr Cox, J Hopkins, Mr C Ward, Mrs Cox, Mrs E Gathercole, P R Pickersgill, Mr E Gathercole, Mr and Mrs T J Scott, Welburn PC, Ms D Baines, Langton Estate, Ms D Powell, Mr J Magrath

Spatial Strategy / Strategy Summary Table / Draft Policy CS1
- Development Limits - Disagree

- Object to carte blanche no review of Development Limits
- The development limits of all of the named settlements in the Ryedale Local Plan should be reviewed to support the sustainability of the District
- Document does not set out the basis of how they will be identified or the policy approach which considered development outside of them

Provided by: Birdsall Estate, Hovingham Estate, English Heritage

Spatial Strategy / Strategy Summary Table / Draft Policy CS1
- Approach to smaller villages - Disagree

- Strategy should support infill and allocations in service and other villages
- The Local Needs Occupancy Condition will kill future house building in the villages
- Will further restrict housing in villages and won't deliver significant numbers of affordable housing in these areas. New technology can offset concerns about carbon footprint associated with car travel
- Strategy will not support local population or services in the smaller settlements
- Object that rural communities will not experience significant levels of growth
- Consideration should be given to identifying housing sites in other villages to maintain their vitality
- Too geographically restricted if half the population lives in over 100 villages. Smaller villages will suffer
- Little scope for smaller settlements to evolve
- Would constrain the complimentary support measures to help subsidise the conversion of buildings
- Object to the assertion that over the plan period rural communities will not experience significant levels of new development
- Concerned over impact on meeting local need and service provision in the smaller villages
- Core Strategy should not predetermine that there should be no allocations whatsoever in the majority of settlements
- Allocation of sites in the smaller settlements would reduce the need to allocate as much land in the larger settlements
- Under the approach many reasonable sized settlements (eg Terrington / Wombleton) with a range of service will not be able to achieve even a modest level of housing to help maintain their vibrancy and vitality
- Service village option will prevent new housing in the villages and open countryside. The exception would be for affordable housing but there is no evidence that a housing association will build affordable homes in villages in the future
- Should recognise the rural nature of the District and allow sufficient growth in other villages to enhance their sustainability
- Range of new housing is required across the range of settlements
- Low cost housing of a decent quality should be allowed in all villages

Provided by: Thorpe Bassett Estate, Chomley Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust, Cllr P Andrews, M Fletcher, Mr K Storey, Church Commissioners, D Baines, P Goodwill, Owners of land at Wombleton, Birdsall Estates, D and F Cockerill

Spatial Strategy / Strategy Summary Table / Draft Policy CS1**- Request additional tier of villages - Disagree**

- A further tier of rural settlements should be supported
- Entire south and east of Ryedale will be sterilised from delivering new housing
Should be further designation of villages
- Should be a further 'rural settlement' tier where sites DPD can assess the merits of sites
- Could apply a local needs occupancy condition on sites identified in a secondary tier of villages
- Should be a further designation of secondary villages where sites could deliver 50% affordable housing.

Provided by: Landowners at Wombleton, D Baines, P Goodwill, Thorpe Bassett Estate, Chomley Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust, Langton Estate

Spatial Strategy / Strategy Summary Table / Draft Policy CS1**- Brownfield / Greenfield Land - Disagree**

- Brownfield sites should be developed first
- Brownfield sites have the potential for wildlife enhancement

Provided by : Ms C Knot, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust, CPRE

Spatial Strategy / Strategy Summary Table / Draft Policy CS1**- Re-Use of Rural Buildings - Disagree**

- Planning polices should be amended to support the reuse of agricultural buildings for residential use
- Need to increase supply of affordable housing and take a positive stance in relation to the conversion of rural buildings for residential use

Provided by: Birdsall Estate; M Fletcher

Spatial Strategy / Strategy Summary Table / Draft Policy CS1**- Malton / Norton - Support / Qualified Support**

- Hierarchy is sound with Malton as the Principal Town
- Description of role of Malton is appropriate
- Have the capacity for significant development and to produce longer term sustainability
- Irrespective of strategy of RSS, majority of new development to Malton / Norton is the appropriate strategy for Ryedale
- Support emphasis on Malton / Norton
- Strongly support / position of Malton /Norton in the hierarchy / role as Principal Town
- Support a more strategic role for Malton / Norton
- Support taking advantage of proximity to York
- Support specific identification of the Woolgrowers site but should be considered as part of a wider strategy to seek the release of land to the west of Norton
- Support recognition of the need for greenfield housing land
- Support intention to deliver the Woolgrowers site but references to it not being deliverable in the plan period should be removed
- Support proactive approach to location of development within the rail / river corridor
- Support aspiration to better exploit heritage assets
- Welcome intention to enhance the centre of Malton / public realm improvements

- Support A64 junction improvements before any other works, inc Butcher corner
- Welcome reference to the Brambling Fields junction improvement and that further strategic junction improvements will be subject to future reviews of the plan
- Generally support role of Malton but there are conflicting statements – Malton and Norton are described as the Capital of Ryedale whereas Malton is described as the Principal Town
- Welcome Brambling Fields junction
- Endorse the need for flood resistant development along the river and actions upstream
- Brambling Fields improvements are welcomed but details of internal junction improvements need to be provided
- Support but needs to recognise that Malton has specific advantages over Norton

Provided by: K Monkman, P Hayward, Taylor Wimpey North Yorkshire Ltd, S Harrison Developments Ltd, Fitzwilliam (Malton) Estate, Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation, West Park Developments Ltd, National Grid Property Holdings Ltd, English Heritage, Mrs Woodhead, Norton TC, CPRE, Malton TC, Barratt Homes, David Wilson Homes and Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

**Spatial Strategy / Strategy Summary Table / Draft Policy CS1
- Malton/ Norton - Disagree - General Points and role as Principal Town**

- Difficult to understand why Malton / Norton should receive the majority of new housing
- Needs greater clarity for the Spatial Strategy for Malton and Norton
- Para 3.12 – include reference to Sand Hutton and ADAS at High Mowthorpe
- Para 3.14 – references to flooding require further definition
- Competing against / with York will not bring additional High Tech business
- Need to support local services / shops rather than focus on national brands
- Why are more shops needed when more and more are empty?
- Need an Action Area Plan to ensure brownfield sites are developed first and the Town Centre implemented
- Include reference to focussing growth / new development at Malton and Norton in the ambitions column of summary table
- Include reference to increasing supply of new housing at the Principal Town in the ambitions section of summary table
- Lack of differentiation between roles and ambitions of Malton and Norton in summary table
- Should indicate a clear intent to treat the towns as one settlement and implement this through an area action plan which would indicate that development sites in the centre would take precedence over expansion of the built up area
- Concerned about the impact of the scale of development
- Scale of development cannot be sustained

Provided by: Malton and Norton Area Partnership, CPRE, Environment Agency, Ms C Knott, Ms D Powell, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes NE Yorkshire and NE Division and Taylor Wimpey UK, CPRE, Mr A Green

**Spatial Strategy / Strategy Summary Table / Draft Policy CS1
- Malton / Norton – Disagree - Transport**

- Needs to be clear what (Highway) infrastructure is critical and what is aspirational. Critical infrastructure without a funding source would render the plan unsound
- Note aspirations for Broughton Road junction. The (Highways) Agency has a presumption in favour of using existing junctions
- Where will the funding for road improvements come from?
- Existing traffic problems will be exacerbated by significant new development
- Underestimates need for Broughton Road / A64 junction. Weight should be given to the recommendations of the Malton Revitalisation Group on the A64 access.
- No notification of revised STA report
- Plan should provide a clear statement on how sufficient long and short stay car parking will be provided to support long term growth
- Plan suggests Brambling Fields will be sufficient but there is a greater need for the Broughton Road / A64 junction
- Broughton Road junction should not be referred to. Absence of need or evidence to demonstrate it is capable of delivery
- Congestion is a concern - Include details of internal junction improvements / interchange improvements
- The STA needs to be in place before a further response can be made and would like a response to comments made on STA
- Increased traffic cannot be mitigated by increased public transport
- Decline in Malton's attractiveness as a shopping destination will continue if problems with standing traffic continue
- Brambling Fields improvements will not be sufficient to address the problems of the towns / increases in traffic
- Should be no further development in Norton until another river crossing is in place
- Need to be able to guarantee road improvements will happen
- Bus and rail timetables should be synchronised and through ticketing introduced
- Land for slip roads between Broughton and the A64 should be retained and reference included in the Core Strategy
- Increased traffic will also have an impact on the Air Quality Management Area at Butcher Corner Provide alternatives to the car for short journeys eg pedestrian improvements
- Support initiatives to increase the frequency of trains
- How will the Council encourage bus and rail travel?
- Key decisions were made on the Core Strategy (Dec 2009) without the Strategic Transport Assessment being in place. The latter has not been subject to consultation and has not been adopted by the Council
- Need a clearer vision for the development of road infrastructure which will take Malton and Norton beyond the next 15 years. Development should be focussed on making that happen
- Missed opportunity for long term planning of road infrastructure. Land should be reserved
- STA – fails to advise upon the impact of more realistic and likely scenarios. Using group 1 sites as a baseline is not realistic
- A second river crossing must be prioritised to reduce traffic through the Malton Town Centre
- Need a clearer vision for road infrastructure beyond 15 years
- Additional scenarios should have been modelled to include links between Langton and Welham Roads and this in conjunction with a Woolgrowers development and also a complete road link south of Norton. Needs to be considered for the long term

Provided by: Highways Agency, Mrs M Taylor, Scampston PC, Malton TC, Taylor Wimpey North Yorkshire Ltd, Norton TC, Mr D Tatham, Malton and Norton Area Partnership; Ms C Knott; Bradford and Northern Housing Association; P Beanland; Yorkshire Wildlife Trust; Cllr P Andrews, Malton and Norton Town Councils

**Spatial Strategy / Strategy Summary Table / Draft Policy CS1
- Malton / Norton - Disagree - Greenfield / Brownfield**

- How will the fringes of Malton and Norton be protected from the development of green areas?
- Need to consider the impact of greenfield land release on biodiversity, character and access to greenspace
- Immediate focus for greenfield land releases outside development limits should be at Malton and Norton
- Development of the Woolgrowers site appears to have been deferred/ clear intention to develop greenfield sites . Should develop brownfield first. Policy of releasing greenfield sites is already being implemented in advance of the Core Strategy
- There is insufficient evidence to support the immediate release of greenfield sites

Provided by: Ms C Knott; Natural England; S Harrison Developments Ltd; CPRE; Mr D Tatham

**Spatial Strategy / Strategy Summary Table / Draft Policy CS1
- Malton / Norton - Disagree -**

Location of development at the Towns / Relationship between Malton and Norton

- Much of Malton is constrained and the town is limited in its ability to accommodate development
- Land to west and east of Norton should be identified as a 'broad area of search'
- The specifically identified Woolgrowers area known as Derwent Park should be fed through policies CS1 and CS2
- Land to the south east of Norton should be identified as a broad area of search
- Woolgrowers site should be part of the solution to traffic problems with link roads between the other main routes out of Norton. Release of greenfield land should be part of the long term vision for addressing road infrastructure
- For retail purposes Malton and Norton should be separated in the hierarchy
- If developer contributions for Brambling Fields determines where development should take place in the first five years then this should be made clear. Need for developer contributions should not determine the location of development. The Plan should focus on the redevelopment of Malton Town Centre and the Rail / River corridor
- Plan should be focussed on addressing long term problems of road infrastructure not balancing development between Malton / Norton
- More development should be steered to Norton addresses affordability and long term traffic solution making Woolgrowers and new crossing more viable
- If the twin towns are the focus, Norton should be treated equally / equal amounts
- CS1 should stress the importance of retaining the character of Old Malton
- As written, summary table does not recognise that Malton and Norton are different places
- Include ambition to bring forward Woolgrowers site for development in summary table

Provided by: S Harrison Developments Ltd, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes NE Yorkshire and Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd, Mr D Tatham, CPRE, Ms C Knott, Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation, Fitzwilliam (Malton) Estate, West Park Developments LTD

Spatial Strategy / Strategy Summary Table / Draft Policy CS1**- Pickering, Kirkbymoorside and Helmsley - Support / Qualified Support**

- Agree that Pickering should accommodate higher level of development than Helmsley and Kirkbymoorside
- Welcome recognition that new development should not undermine the historic character and landscape setting of the 3 northern towns

Provided by: MHA Care Group Ltd, English Heritage

Spatial Strategy / Strategy Summary Table / Draft Policy CS1**- Pickering, Kirkbymoorside and Helmsley – Disagree**

- Strategy for Pickering should go further to emphasis the growth and diversification of existing tourist attractions
- Recognise the need to protect source protection zones from contaminating development when considering development at these towns
- Essential that RDC and the National Park's policies for Helmsley are harmonised
- Summary table in relation to Pickering should say ' reduce the adverse impacts of traffic upon the character of the Town and enhance the pedestrian experience
- Should be a balance between holiday cottages and local housing need and car parking should be adequate for tourism
- Approach and ambitions for Pickering are not in the interests of the Towns well being and lacks systematic approach to resolving issues
- Rapid expansion of new build estates will compromise Pickering and its attractiveness to visitors
- Proposed supply of houses to Pickering will depress the housing market. Difficult to understand why this level of housing is needed
- Should be scope to alter, though not significantly, the figures for Helmsley
- Mention that the Helmsley Plan will be jointly produced with the National park

Provided by: Catfoss Group, Environment Agency, Wharfedale Homes, English Heritage, Helmsley TC, Pickering Town Council, J Mennell, North York Moors National Park Authority, CPRE

Spatial Strategy / Strategy Summary Table / Draft Policy CS1**- Identified Service Villages - Support / Qualified Support**

- RDC village facilities and services audit shows that Rillington has a large range of facilities that provide for everyday needs. More land for housing should be provided at service villages such as Rillington
- RDC village facilities and services audit shows that Hovingham has a large range of facilities that provide for day to day needs of residents . Support identification of Hovingham as a service village
- Employment Land review demonstrates that there are employment opportunities in Hovingham eg at Wath Court
- Support identification of Ampleforth as a Service Village
- Ampleforth and Thornton-Le Dale are service villages within the NYMNP Core Strategy
- Support identification of Rillington as a Service Village. Reflects role of the settlement and range of services it provides
- Support identification of Hovingham as a service village. Reflects role of the settlement and the range of services it provides

Provided by: Dr R Wheeler; Hovingham Estate; Shepherd Homes; Rural Affordable Homes; North York Moors National Park Authority

Spatial Strategy / Strategy Summary Table / Draft Policy CS1
- Identified Service Villages - Disagree

- Amotherby does not fulfil the criteria of a service village
- The Development Plan does not demonstrate planned development in Slingsby. It is piecemeal enlargement without strategy / vision
- Thornton-Le-Dale – new housing should be infilling or rounding off developments that provide the necessary housing stock that the market desires at the time of an application
- Nawton – has had a disproportionate share of housing. A 50% increase in 17 years with no commensurate increase in infrastructure. Recent development has satisfied existing demand
- PPS7 says that Service Villages should have health care facilities accessible on foot. Nawton has neither. The presence of the school has no credence to the designation and there is limited access to other services. Designation as a service village is contrary to PPS7. Policy CS1 would lead to a 15% increase in population placing too much pressure on the village.
- Suggested review of services will lead to unacceptable uncertainty. Refine to ensure new services are viable businesses for a minimum of two years and to withdraw sites if services no longer cease to operate
- Para 3.29 could be omitted if an explanation is necessary
- Para 3.28 Some Service Villages are borderline on the services that are available
- Para 3.28 Include definition of a reasonable bus service
- Should be allowed to remain as villages. Concerned about need for greenfield sites
- Swinton should not be linked with Amotherby. Neither village has a convenience shop
- Ampleforth will bear a disproportionate amount of congestion and development should be shared amongst neighbouring villages
- Settrington is suitable for future development and should be identified as a settlement for future small scale development
- Oppose the designation of Nawton as a service village
- Thorpe Bassett should be named in a tier of villages where the allocation of housing sites will be supported
- East Lutton and Wintringham should be named in a tier of villages where the allocation of sites will be supported
- Gilling East should be named in a tier of villages where the allocation of sites will be supported
- Significant development at Rillington, Sherburn and Staxton and Willerby is likely to have an impact on the Strategic Road Network and likely to require infrastructure improvement

Provided by: Amotherby PC, Slingsby, Fryton and South Holme PC, Mr J Scarr, Nawton PC, Mrs E Gathercole, CPRE, Mr M Stenning, P R Pickersgill, D Powell, Mrs M Taylor, F Ellis, K Storey, Nawton PC, Thorpe Bassett Estate, Chomley Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest trust, Highways Agency

Spatial Strategy / Strategy Summary Table / Draft Policy CS1
- Villages and wider rural area - Support / Qualified Support

- Support focus on addressing local need as oppose to externally driven demand
- Agree with meeting local needs and providing for small scale employment in other villages Support affordable housing and protection of community facilities
- Welcome reference to flood / land management
- Support recognition given to the countryside being a living and working place Do not

expect significant levels of new development

- There is no demand for affordable housing in Welburn
- Housing for local needs in Broughton
- Conversion of farm buildings outside development limits for affordable housing is a reasonable stance
- Summary table makes reference to affordable housing provision in smaller villages. In places such as Welburn there is no demand for affordable housing due to lack of transport and other facilities

Provided by: Nawton PC, Flaxton PC, Mr Stenning, Environment Agency, Catfoss Group / owners of Pickering Showground, Flaxton PC, P Brown, Mrs A G Woodhead, M Fletcher

Spatial Strategy / Strategy Summary Table / Draft Policy CS1
- Villages and wider rural area - Disagree

- Strategy is a death sentence for other villages and the services they contain
- Many forms of development are acceptable in this 'tier' and there should be a specific reference to these in the plan
- Will not address the development requirements of all villages
- Agricultural buildings should be defined as Previously Developed Land
- Object to a carte blanche no review of development limits. An alternative to reviewing development limits would be to have a criteria - based policy to enable decisions on whether a site was within a village. Support local housing and affordable housing in other villages
- Wintringham has a range of facilities that provide for day to day needs of residents and more land for housing should be provided in other villages such as Wintringham and East Lutton
- Gilling East has a range of facilities that provide for some needs of residents and the strategy should support market housing sites at other villages such as Gilling East
- Para 3.27 – delete first sentence, suggest 'few of Ryedale's many villages have the range....'
- Plans have exacerbated the decline of services provided in the villages
- Nature tourism could be very important to the value of the wider countryside. Include reference in summary table
- Include references to stewardship schemes
- Summary table – is there a definition of local housing requirements
- Concern about diversification leading to urbanisation of the countryside and concern about use of static caravans as affordable housing
- Some types of development eg extractive industries are restricted in their location
- Development at Welburn will not protect the AONB
- Should take a more positive attitude to developing in Claxton and Sand Hutton given their proximity to York. Both villages are wholly suitable for future residential development (Church Commissioners)
- Unduly onerous – refers to PPS4 para 10. Include other examples of development acceptable in principle
- Language is too limiting / restricting
- Crucial development will be deterred in smaller settlements
- Wintringham and East Lutton should be named in an 'other village' category where the allocation of sites will be supported
- In summary table, ambition should be to encourage nature tourism
- Should stress the need for economic development which does not damage landscape character / rural environment but which enhances and sustains a healthy rural economy, sustainable tourism, forest management for sustainable building materials and fuel.

Provided by: Ms D Baines, Birdsall Estate, DJ and FK Cockerill, Chomley / Place Newton Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust, CPRE, Mr D Cockerill, Yorkshire Wildlife trust, Oswaldkirk PC, Moorland Energy Ltd, Mr and Mrs T J Scott, Birdsall Estate, K Storey

Key Diagram

- Colours are poor and the diagram is difficult to read
- Following demise of RSS, York Sub-region boundary should not be there
- Key roads should be included - A169 and beyond; B1257 and roads to Drifffield and Bridlington
- Boundaries of the National Park and AONB are not clear
- Landscapes of local value are included in the text but not in the key
- Improve to illustrate the proposed spatial distribution of development

Provided by: Oswaldkirk PC, CPRE, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Yorkshire, North East Division) and Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

Section 4 : Housing

Draft Policy CS2: Delivery and Distribution of New Homes

Draft Policy CS2 - General Support

- General Support
- Allocation of land at Malton/Norton on medium-large extension sites
- Conversion of Previously Developed Land/buildings restricted to Local Needs Occupancy
- Criteria for proposed Service Villages
- RSS targets remain a sound basis for future development
- Distribution is consistent with the County Council's objectives and priorities
- Housing target is not a ceiling
- Support target for Helmsley. Some will need to be in the National Park area
- Support targets for Malton and Norton
- Support reference to 'at least' as a target for Malton/Norton/Support a higher target for Malton and Norton
- Should be at least 60% for Malton and Norton
- Support at least 50% subject to differential proportions favouring Malton
- Significant opportunities exist to locate the majority of housing on land owned by the Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation and Fitzwilliam Estate
- Avoiding coalescence of Malton and Old Malton
- Avoiding coalescence of Pickering with Middleton
- Targets for Service Villages
- Approach for other villages
- With releasing land outside development limits under PPS3 / lack of 5 year supply
- Support for not seeking strategic sites to ensure a more responsive approach to continuous delivery
- Support the approach of using allocations to provide a high level of certainty

Provided by: G Wright, Woolf Bond planning on behalf of client, S Harrison Development Ltd, Birdsall Estate, Scampston PC, North Yorkshire County Council, Mr K Storey, Church Commissioners, Simons and Fitzwilliam Trust, Shepherd Homes, West Park Developments, S Harrison Developments Ltd, K Monkman, North York Moors National Park Authority, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Yorkshire) and Taylor Wimpey UK, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes NE Division, P Hayward; Fitzwilliam (Malton) Estate, Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation, English Heritage, Taylor Wimpey North Yorkshire Ltd

Draft Policy CS2 - General Comments

- Need to ensure co-ordination with infrastructure
- Maintain separation between Broughton, Amotherby and Swinton
- Authorities policies are failing to deliver homes in a timely manner. Need to work with developers to achieve delivery of a range of homes
- Evidence base that informed the RSS is still valid and can be used to inform the scale and distribution of development
- References to the RSS will have to be fully justified
- Make allowances for residential development to come forward to address unidentified conservation deficit
- The SHMA is a useful source of information on housing need issues. The annual net affordable housing need of 272 homes equates to 4080 homes over the plan period.
- Housing needs to be sustained by jobs
- Should be informed by Housing Market Area work

- Lack of 5 year supply reinforces the need for the Sites DPD
- How many homes that have been built have been occupied?
- Until such time as affordable needs are met, only affordable housing and local needs housing should be built

Provided by: P Brown, A G Woodhead, Wharfedale Homes, Local Government Yorkshire and the Humber, Hambleton District Council, Castle Howard Estate, Thorpe Bassett Estate, Dr R Wheeler, Chomley Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust fund, Hovingham Estate, Kirkbymoorside Town Council, CPRE; C Knott, Ryedale Liberal Party

Draft Policy CS2 - Housing Target - Disagree

- Ryedale should make its own case and say what is achievable in the current climate
- Target is lower than needed
 - o Target is not justified and should be increased in light of recent evidence
 - o References to RSS should be removed
 - o Should be increased in light of affordable housing need
 - o Can't rely on RSS which was based on out dated information
 - o Based on NHPAU requirements should be increased by 11% (this was part of RSS review evidence and is a material consideration)
 - o Latest household projections are for 350 pa
 - o Strategic Housing Market Assessment indicates a need for higher figure
 - o Should make provision for 300-400 pa
 - o Past build rates are not relevant. Past strategy created artificial restraint
 - o If strategic economic aspirations are to be delivered
 - o 300 dwellings per annum more appropriate
- Shortfall in provision is as a result of lack of supply and political resistance rather than building rates
- Shortfall should be made up and a clear mechanism for dealing with undersupply established in advance of the Sites DPD
- Approach is contrary to PPS3 and relies on windfalls to make up the shortfall
- Allocation of land for 200 pa will not address the shortfall
- Would appreciate a strategy where undersupply is built up but realise that setting achievable targets is the correct approach
- No evidence to support discarding the under supply
- Higher ONS figures are wrong as migration is falling
- Plan for higher number of homes to meet the strategic objectives for Malton and Norton
- RSS figure is a floor target – should read 'at least' 200. Permission should not be refused for greater numbers
- No more than 5 years supply ahead of pro-rata targets to be given permission
- Clarify that PPS3 is influencing the phasing of sites not just the need to collect developer contributions
- Should be flexible to cope with additional housing numbers (PPS12)
- More responsive approach to land supply
- Does not provide certainty over how Ryedale will meet its housing requirements in the context of PPS3
- It is not correct to say that a 15 year supply of housing land is required if the RSS has been rescinded
- Para 4.14 'will apply' is better wording and 'meet the housing requirements' would be better than 'better reflect'.
- Evidence needed to support whether this level of housing is needed should be presented
- More land needs to be released to enable greater build rates. Need flexible range of

sites including extensions at Norton • If planned supply has been released no further sites should be approved irrespective of whether approved sites have been built. Should not be based on completions
Provided by: CPRE, Thorpe Bassett Estate, Dr R Wheeler, Chomley Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest trust, Hovingham Estate, S Harrison Developments Ltd Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Yorkshire) and Taylor Wimpey UK, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes NE Division, West Park Developments Ltd MHA Care Group, Shepherd Homes, J Mennell, England and Lyle on behalf of Taylor Wimpey North Yorkshire, Fitzwilliam (Malton) Estate, Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation, The Ryedale Liberal Party, M Gwilliam, C Knott

Draft Policy CS2 - Previously Developed Land and density - Disagree
• Target unlikely to be achieved • Should not stop the sensible development of other land • No evidence to justify the figure • Unrealistic in context of Ryedale and reclassification of gardens • Should make the best use of brownfield sites close to the towns • Presence of biodiversity should be considered • Needs a less dogmatic approach to PDL and density
Provided by: P Beanland, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Yorkshire) and Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd, Barratt homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Division), C Knott, Natural England, Thorpe Bassett Estate, Dr R Wheeler, Chomley Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust, Hovingham Estate

Draft Policy CS2 - Distribution - General Points - Disagree (nb to be read in conjunction with comments recorded in response to Spatial Strategy)
• Target for Principal Town should be reduced to 35% and the additional 15% distributed to service villages and other villages • Question the capacity of the towns to accommodate growth. They are constrained and the SHLAA assumes density levels that are no longer relevant • No longer a direction to focus development at the Towns • Housing need is spread across Ryedale and focus at the town will encourage people to travel • Spreading development will reduce the scale of development and support local builders • Fairer to distribute housing throughout • Makes no reference to landscape constraints or Scheduled Ancient Monuments • Amend to say that no more than 5 years supply ahead of prop rate provision to be given permission • Specify that each location should not exceed its percentage allocation in 5 year periods • Areas of High Landscape Value need to be protected • Development in larger villages needs to take place in line with proven need • Large housing development (Welburn) would result in loss of quality of life to people who have paid a premium to live here • Spatially inadequate. How do proposed allocations avoid increasing problems? • Over enthusiastic support for large scale development based on over estimate of need • Concerned that approach to contributions (cumulative impact over plan period on a whole town basis) meets the tests of circular 05/05

- Rural area of Ryedale will be a suburb of York. Need to consider infrastructure and general unwillingness to have more houses built when need is not there

Provided by: Thorpe Bassett Estate, Dr R Wheeler, Chomley Estate; Cmdr James Life Interest trust, Hovingham Estate, A and V Collinson, M Taylor; Ryedale Liberal Party, M Mackinder, Mr and Mrs A Hewitt, M Gwilliam, J Mennell; Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Yorkshire) and Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Division) C Knott

Draft Policy CS2 - Distribution - Malton / Norton - Disagree
(nb to be read in conjunction with comments recorded in response to Spatial Strategy)

- Growth target is excessive
- The town Council's consider that the distribution of housing to the Towns should be 30%
- Reference to 'at least' does not give enough certainty
- The Strategic Transport Assessment models higher numbers and there is concern that this is what the administration has in mind
- Highways infrastructure is not adequate enough to cope with the level of development
- Target for the towns are related to RSS targets, the continued application of which has not been justified
- Restrict to 1,000 over the next 15 years
- Future should be 50% and at least 2,000 dwellings
- Should be at least 50% but not more than 60-75%
- Clarify that the limited supply of previously developed land requires the need for greenfield sites to comply with PPS3
- Avoid approach of sharing development evenly between the two towns as Malton has advantages over Norton
- Add preference for Malton in the 'spread and distribution' section
- Will change look and feel of Malton and Norton, create congestion and drain local services
- Broad locations for growth should be identified in the Core Strategy in accordance with PPS3 (para 55)

Provided by: Malton Town Council, Mrs A G Woodhead, Norton Town Council, Cllr P Andrews, Taylor Wimpey North Yorkshire Ltd, The Ryedale Liberal Party, Council for the Protection of Rural England, Fitzwilliam (Malton) Estate, Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation, C Knott, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Yorkshire) and Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Division)

Draft Policy CS2 - Distribution - Pickering - Disagree
(nb to be read in conjunction with comments recorded in response to Spatial Strategy)

- Target contradicts the fact that the town is in the designated (RSS) Remoter Rural Sub-Area
- Unsustainable level of expansion. Section 106 contributions will be insufficient and not sure whether the County Council or Health Authority have agreed

Provided by: J Mennell; A and V Collinson

Draft Policy CS2 - Distribution - Kirkbymoorside - Disagree**(nb to be read in conjunction with comments recorded in response to Spatial Strategy)**

- Disagree with restricting development to within development limits and small-medium sized sites to north, east and west of the town
- Level of development will not be met through the stated distribution pattern

Provided by: Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Division)**Draft Policy CS2 - Distribution - Helmsley - Disagree****(nb to be read in conjunction with comments recorded in response to Spatial Strategy)**

- Welcome proposals for additional housing. If properly phased may be a need for more in the plan period

Provided by: Wharfedale Homes**Draft Policy CS2 - Distribution - Service Villages - Disagree / Unsound****(nb to be read in conjunction with comments recorded in response to Spatial Strategy)**

- Should be allocated more housing growth
 - o To meet long term needs
 - o Maintain vibrancy and vitality
 - o Reflect existing settlement patterns
 - o Achieve spatial vision/ objectives
- Level is overly restrictive and should not be set as a ceiling
- Infrastructure improvements are essential before new homes are built
- Should not be expanded. Should be limited to infill or rounding off
- No service village to exceed 1.5% of the total

Provided by: Thorpe Bassett Estate, Dr R Wheeler, Chomley Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest trust, Hovingham Estate, Castle Howard Estate, M E Taylor, Mr Beanland, Ryedale Liberal party**Draft Policy CS2 - Distribution - other villages / open countryside - Disagree****(nb to be read in conjunction with comments recorded in response to Spatial Strategy)**

- More housing should be provided in other villages
 - o to promote sustainable development
 - o help achieve spatial vision / objectives
 - o meet long term housing needs
 - o prevent negative impact
 - o maintain vitality and vibrancy
 - o reflect existing settlement patterns
- should not be capped
- No planned provision for other villages is utterly stupid
- Sites adjacent to other villages should be included as sources of housing where they relate well to the settlement
- Should support the redevelopment of farmsteads outside but in close proximity to

villages - Restricting new housing and conversions to local needs is contrary to national policy - In these locations should be appropriate to local needs and affordable - Development sites should be released with some affordable housing in villages - Low cost housing of a decent quality should be allowed in all villages
Provided by: Thorpe Bassett Estate, Dr R Wheeler, Chomley Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest trust, Hovingham Estate, Church Commissioners, K Storey, D Cockerill, Birdsall Estate, K Monkman, DJ and FK Cockerill

Draft Policy CS2 – Locations - Disagree
- Broad locations for development should be identified for Malton and Norton - Should provide greater certainty over location - Provides limited information on how urban extensions will be delivered - Unclear about what is meant by medium/large urban extensions within the A64 boundary. If this is a defined area it should be shown - Will need to consider whether strategic sites are needed at Malton/Norton through on-going work - Should not predetermine the location of housing land at Kirkbymoorside. It is premature at the Core Strategy stage as no assessment of opportunities have been undertaken - Include a definition of infill to guide development in villages. Suggest filling of a gap and rounding off a group of buildings - PPS 12 allows reference to strategic areas of development or broad locations - Further work is required to demonstrate the Woolgrowers site is deliverable (in transport terms)
Provided by: Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes(NE Yorkshire and Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Division);North Yorkshire County Council, M Southerton, Birdsall Estate, Thorpe Bassett Estate, Dr R Wheeler, Chomley Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust, Hovingham Estate

Draft Policy CS2 - Development Limits - Disagree
- Should be no presumption they will be retained. Core Strategy should require a review of development limits - Should be flexible enough to allow development of land beyond development limits given limited availability of land within them
Provided by: Thorpe Bassett Estate, Dr R Wheeler, Chomley Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest trust, Hovingham Estate, Simons and Fitzwilliam Trust, Birdsall Estate

Draft Policy CS2 - Sources of housing - Disagree
- Concerned about changes of use of tourist accommodation and public houses into residential - Add reference to 100% affordable exception sites outside development limits at Malton and Norton - Change of use of housing to tourist accommodation should only be in exceptional circumstances - Restrict change of use of tourist accommodation to Local Needs Occupancy. This should be the approach in Pickering, Kirkbymoorside and Helmsley and not just smaller settlements - In non service villages replacement dwellings should be like for like size so that

smaller more affordable homes are not diminished • Conversion of holiday accommodation and farm buildings for residential use should be encouraged • The argument that brownfield sites cannot be developed quickly does not necessarily apply to Pickering and Kirkbymoorside, should specify any brownfield sites not 'as above' • Most windfall sites have been filled • Develop relatively unproductive land adjacent to towns and villages. Sites in development limits are becoming exhausted / change in definition of previously developed land • Review development limits to include more sites and include agricultural buildings in the definition of previously developed land
Provided by: Kirkbymoorside Town Council, Ryedale Liberal Party, E Gathercole, Cllr P Andrews, Council for the Protection of Rural England, DJ and FK Cockerill, D Cockerill, Birdsall Estate

Draft Policy CS2 - Implementation Table - Disagree
• Should be consistent with Policy CS19 • Mechanisms are vague and ambiguous • Compulsory purchase is site specific and cannot be used as a broad brush solution to undersupply • Clarify that the need for greenfield land relates to PPS 3 and is not just motivated by developer contributions • Include definition of Local Needs Occupancy • Include reference to monitor progress and adjust release in response to failure to deliver planned rates • Need explicit examples of compulsory purchase to overcome obstacles to delivery • Remove 'consider' in relation to use of compulsory purchase powers
Provided by: Council for the Protection of Rural England, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Yorkshire) and Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Division), Oswaldkirk PC, Ryedale Liberal Party

Draft Policy CS3: Affordable Housing

Draft Policy CS3 - Agree / Support
• Generally support • Of not allowing sub-division in order to avoid thresholds • Requirement for off-site contribution element • Support for Rural Exceptions Sites • Support the target • Support the threshold • Welcome criteria for the provision and location of affordable housing • 35% should be adhered to in all instances
Provided by: P Hayward, Amotherby PC, K Storey, Church Commissioners, North York Moors National Park Authority, North Yorkshire County Council, Scampston PC, T Raine

Draft Policy CS3 - Qualified support

- Should be reviewed to reflect changing economic circumstances and to maximise provision
- Consider the allocation of rural exception sites
- Support the inclusion in policy of provision for negotiation
- Welcome realistic target/ pragmatic approach but
 - o with requirements for other planning obligations it is important that landowners are not deterred from releasing land
 - o should be subject to viability and other costs
- Thresholds are reasonable but each scheme should be assessed on individual merit
- Support consideration of viability and negotiation

Provided by: North Yorkshire County Council, Rural Affordable Homes, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Yorkshire) and Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes NE Division, K Storey, Church Commissioners, Shepherd Homes, Taylor Wimpey North Yorkshire Ltd

Draft Policy CS3 - General points raised - Disagree

- Increased Affordable Housing is best achieved by increasing the overall amount of housing or by innovative schemes such as Community Housing Sites
- Fails to explore options provided by eg empty properties and conversion of commercial properties. Focus on new build and developer contributions
- Definition too tight
- Should make stronger reference to affordable accommodation for people
- Affordable housing should be defined – should be restricted to people that have strong local connections at village level only
- Should be no Affordable Housing requirement associated with schemes for the elderly to encourage provision
- Delete reference to resisting sites that do not reflect the efficient use of land. The national minimum density has been removed
- The policy on social housing is not clear
- Where is the evidence that the Council cannot insist that all homes be affordable
- Cost of Affordable Housing should be borne by developers and not the tax payer
- Consideration needs to be given to the unique needs of the rural Estates and the need for occupation of affordable housing by employees / retired workers as a means of broadening the range of accommodation to meeting the needs of residents / working populations
- The need for Affordable Housing should be
 - o demonstrated
 - o monitored
- Affordable Housing should be for local people
- Should be spread over all settlements rather than town ghettos
- More should be built in the countryside via market housing which would also take the pressure off Malton and Norton
- Contributions in villages should be secured cumulatively
- The majority should be built at the towns
- Those living with parents are not in need as they are provided for

- Help Affordable Housing by penalising second homes
- A key problem in terms of affordable housing which the Council does not address is that there is not the levels of well paid employment
- Note that the policy provides for off-site provision in certain circumstances. Agree that there may be advantages / overriding reasons to provide contributions off-site
- Consideration needs to be given to the unique housing needs of rural estates
- Concerned about providing Affordable Housing for young people
- Lack of Affordable Housing is forcing the young out of Ryedale
- Sheltered accommodation and bungalows should not be confined to listed settlements but available in all settlements
- Needs to be close working with the National Park to ensure resolution of policy discrepancies
- If government want Affordable Housing they must change their approach
- There is a low cost housing need in Crambeck
- Need to be clearer (supporting text) about how much emphasis will be placed on contributions from developers
- Existing Affordable Housing in villages should remain in this category (particularly estate owned)
- Elaborate (Para 4.16) on how much emphasis will be placed on contributions from developers
- Need a flexible approach which reflects economic realities. The Fitzwilliam (Malton) Estate and Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation can work together to co-ordinate the provision of Affordable Housing in different locations
- Oppose a tariff on top of on-site provision to be pooled and spent on unrelated Affordable Housing schemes. Fails tests of circular 05/05 and would render schemes unviable
- Not viable to deliver 35-40% Affordable Housing in the medium term
- Need to include a mechanism to reduce contributions where it can be demonstrated as not being viable

Provided by: Dr R Wheeler, Chomley Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust, Hovingham Estate, Slingsby, Fryton and South Holme PC, Thorpe Bassett Estate, J Mennell, Wharfedale Homes, Garner Planning Associates, M Gwilliam, Ryedale Liberal Party, F Ellis, Kirkbymoorside TC, C Knott, D Cockerill, Cllr P Andrews, Oswaldkirk PC, Fitzwilliam Malton Estate, Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation, North York Moors National park Authority, Council for the Protection of Rural England, P Beanland, Mr and Mrs T J Scott, Flaxton PC, S Hill, Flaxton PC, Dr R Wheeler, Church Commissioners

Draft Policy CS3 - Tenure - Disagree

- Tenure split is too prescriptive and
 - o Should be removed
 - o Determined on a case by case basis according to local need and viability
- Should be more provision for shared equity / intermediate housing

Provided by: Garner Planning Associates, Dr R Wheeler, Chomley Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust, Hovingham Estate, Thorpe Bassett Estate, Wharfedale Homes, Cllr P Andrews

Draft Policy CS3 - Threshold - Disagree

- Viability study has not demonstrated that :
 - o Financial contributions below the thresholds are viable
 - o The thresholds of 5 and 10 are viable

Provided by: Garner Planning Associates

Draft Policy CS3 - Target - Disagree

- Study has demonstrated that 35% is unachievable
- Welcome recognition that targets are not viable and suggest this is likely to continue given increased costs associated with energy efficiency
- No mention of the level of provision to be made in the short-term as target is not viable
- No evidence to support the target which is unjustified
- Unrealistic to require this level of provision
- Until 35% is achievable / viable the level of Affordable Housing should be negotiated at the time of the application
- 35% may still make some schemes unviable
- Should be flexible and provide for lower contributions where this can be justified in terms of viability / other costs
- 35-40% is not viable in service villages and lower order settlements in the plan period
- The Comprehensive spending review will affect the spending power of registered Social Landlords and this will impact upon the viability of seeking the higher contribution
- Aspiration to 40%
 - o Will not be enforceable
 - o Is not clear
 - o Should only be increased after a formal review
- Policy should secure a minimum of 40%
- What is the relevance of the RSS 40% target?
- Preference is for all housing to be affordable and for local needs in perpetuity
- Where is the evidence that prevents the Council from insisting all homes be affordable
- Draft policy refers to a District – Wide target and not for each site (suggests requirements on some sites will be higher. Needs to be clearer
- Where smaller units are to be provided, it is more difficult to achieve higher %'s of Affordable Housing
- Provide clarity around additional contributions in certain post codes
- The Council has moved away from a 35% requirement to a 35% target which is a different concept
- If 40% is not viable the District would not meet planned rates of delivery and therefore Compulsory Purchase should be used in line with policy CS2
- Any developer should know the target of 40% is required and should not apply / purchase land if this cannot be delivered
- The target for off-site contribution should be as a proportion of all of the total on-site provision of market and affordable. Off-site provision should be two thirds of the market houses on-site
- Need more clarity on how equivalent contributions will be sought
- Existing targets for Malton / Old Malton should remain unaltered. Current requirements are already raising significant viability issues
- Hambleton's approach is to have an optimum target which can be reduced depending on individual scheme viability

Provided by: Garner Planning Associates, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE

Yorkshire) and Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd, Barratt homes and David Wilson Homes NE Division, K Storey, Church Commissioners, Castle Howard Estate, Wharfedale Homes; Dr R Wheeler, Chomley Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust, Hovingham Estate, Thorpe Bassett Estate, M Gwilliam, Ryedale Liberal Party, North York Moors National Park Authority, Cllr P Andrews, Flaxton PC, Fitzwilliam (Malton) Estate, Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation, Hambleton District Council

Draft Policy CS3 - Evidence / Viability - Disagree

- The Viability study has not demonstrated that financial contributions are viable
- Contributions should be subject to viability testing
- Not based on appropriate evidence of viability
- Priorities for funding should be identified to
 - o ensure schemes do not become unviable
 - o that a realistic and flexible approach can be taken to negotiating contributions
- High quality design requirements in sensitive locations such as Helmsley must be given proper consideration in terms of viability
- The Affordable Housing Viability Study
 - o Clarify if it is the final version
 - o Does not properly or thoroughly consider the variables that affect the viability of Affordable Housing
 - o Conclusions present no overall view of viability and suggests it is problematic and that further evidence is needed to understand how local targets should be derived
 - o Produced with limited inputs in terms of land valuations and local market conditions
 - o Does not represent a consensual view of developers – acknowledges were some disagreements over assumptions of costs and values
 - o Is reliant on land registry data and no information on sample size or whether this is reflective of modern housing developments or whether this relates to one off dwellings
 - o Should take account of reduced completions and the fact that majority of completions are on PDL
 - o 10% figure for flats is not a realistic position, there is little demand and lenders will not offer mortgages on such dwellings
 - o Not clear how the different contributions levels have been arrived at
 - o Level of contributions has been underestimated. 15K per property is the only realistic scenario and on the basis of the study only 20% Affordable Housing is appropriate
 - o Forecasts of growth in the housing market are not reflective of actual land values or house prices in the study period. This is unreliable and speculative and not reflective of actual land values or house prices.
 - o Does not pay heed to recent rates of Affordable Housing delivery. 35% has never been achieved by the Council
 - o Does not explain why an additional 5% should be applied in some areas of the District. 35% should be applied to all sites over the plan area

Provided by: Garner Planning Associates, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Yorkshire) and Taylor Wimpey Uk Ltd, Barratt homes and David Wilson Homes NE Division, Dr R Wheeler, Chomley Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust, Hovingham Estate, Thorpe Bassett Estate, Fitzwilliam (Malton) Estate, Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation, Wharfedale Homes, Shepherd Homes

Draft Policy CS3 - Rural Exception Sites - Disagree

- Question whether sites at Malton, Norton and Pickering will be brought forward
- When local need is being determined, the residents of holiday home parks should be excluded from consideration as they are intended as holiday homes
- Sites are needed in Ampleforth to meet needs
- Council cannot chip away at key protection provisions (eg AONB) whilst maintaining that it is protecting the scenic and amenity value of the area. The proposed exception site at Ampleforth is an example
- Policy approach appears to exclude exception sites in the wider rural area / villages
- Hambleton refer to 'outside but adjacent to' development limits and this has worked well
- Not practical to make Affordable Homes in perpetuity
- Support sites being contiguous with development limits
- Helps to meet need of split villages and is consistent with the National Park's approach

Provided by: K Storey, Church Commissioners, E Gathercole, Rural Affordable Homes, F Ellis, Hambleton District Council, D Cockerill, DJ and FK Cockerill, North York Moors National Park Authority

Further Consultation Issue - Financial contributions from small sites**Agree with Principle**

- Should apply to all schemes
- All small development should make a contribution except for the individual who builds a house for his family
- Contributions to a central fund based
- Clarify how money raised will be released

Provided by: Council for the Protection of Rural England, Scampston PC, Pickering TC, National Farmers Union, DJ and FK Cockerill, M Fox, North Yorkshire County Council, D Cockerill, M Taylor

Disagree with Principle

- Viability study has not demonstrated that contributions from smaller sites is viable
- Priority should be to make sure schemes do not become unviable.

Provided by: Garner Planning Associates, K Storey

Agree / Support – As % of development value

- Should be calculated as a proportion of the development value and not a flat rate
- % of the value of the scheme should include the land value cost
- Flat rate penalises smaller developments
- 10% could be appropriate
- A flat rate will make development unviable should be proportional on a sliding scale

Provided by: Howardian Hills AONB, Ryedale Liberal Party, National Farmers Union, M Fox, D Cockerill, D Tatham

Agree / Support – Flat rate

Provided by: M Mackinder

Draft Policy CS4 – Type and Mix of New Housing

Draft Policy CS4 - Support / Qualified Support

- Housing for an ageing society must be fully mainstreamed into all policies for housing and planning through -
 - o Accessibility of new housing to allow people to remain in their homes when older and more frail (Lifetime Homes Standards)
 - o Adaptation and review of stock of older persons housing to meet future aspirations of quality
 - o Ensuring preventative services / information and advice is available
 - o Provision of options which mean that people can retain equity and ownership
 - o Ensuring the needs of excluded older people are taken care of
 - o Enable more independent living
- Housing Needs Analysis (Accommodation with Care) identifies a need for x4 additional schemes in Ryedale of at least 40 units each. Mixed tenure would be preferable to ensure older people can retain equity and ownership
- Important that the District maintains a range of property types
- Support building homes to Lifetime Homes standards
- Homes built to Lifetime Homes standards should be carbon zero
- Welcome criteria for the type and mix

Provided by: North Yorkshire County Council, K Storey, Ryedale Liberal Party, Scampston PC

Draft Policy CS4 - General issues - Disagree

- Policy should reflect / address the findings of the SHMA
- Does not need to be prescriptive, the SHMA should determine the types of dwellings required and this should be updated in the AMR
- Make specific reference to the provision of sheltered accommodation in service villages and for developments to contain provision for these
- Stock imbalances might be a function of the local market and should not mean that it is appropriate that more 5 bed houses should be encouraged
- The preamble to the housing policies should make reference to the needs of the elderly as this is one of the key messages from earlier in the document
- Who determines shortfalls in the stock?
- Applications to extend dwellings should consider the impact on the stock of smaller dwellings
- Pickering Town Council supports large retirement / care villages

Provided by: Garner Planning Associates, K Storey, Slingsby, South Holme and Fryton PC, T and J Scott, Pickering Town Council

Draft Policy CS4 - Extra-care Provision - Disagree

- Unclear what is to be provided. Needs clarification. By contribution or on-site provision?
- Disagree that care villages will fuel immigration of elderly households. Ryedale should look to address the needs of its ageing population. Delete para 4.25 and amend to refer to planning for the needs of an ageing population through the allocation of sites
- Not a reasonable response to the issue of an ageing population
- Overly prescriptive. Needs could be met through fewer larger facilities
- Need a purpose built care home

- Pickering has a higher proportion of elderly and should be identified accordingly for care home provision
- How can new sites support this? Inappropriate for the Core Strategy. Should be in the Sites document
- Qualification needed in terms of demand / viability
- Extra care units should be for local need
- Support large care villages

Provided by: Barratt Homes and David Wilson (NE Yorkshire) and Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes NE Division, MHA Care group, Garner Planning Associates, Taylor Wimpey North Yorkshire Ltd, Shepherd Homes, Helmsley TC, Ryedale Liberal Party, Pickering TC

Draft Policy CS4 - Lifetime Homes - Disagree

- Unclear what is to be provided. Needs to be clarified / defined
- This is a building control issue
- Is a blanket policy that will hamper the delivery of Affordable Homes
- Costs will affect development viability. Individual schemes should be assessed on their merits
- Assumes people want to stay in their home throughout life

Provided by: Barratt Homes and David Wilson (NE Yorkshire) and Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes NE Division, C Knott, Garner Planning Associates, K Storey, Church Commissioners, Taylor Wimpey North Yorkshire Ltd, Wharfedale Homes

Draft Policy CS4 - Mix - Disagree

- 5% provision of bungalows
 - o Is too prescriptive
 - o may not be appropriate on all schemes from a design point of view
 - o arbitrary and could impact on the viability of certain sites, particularly in combination with other housing requirements
 - o qualification needed in terms of demand / site viability
 - o should be for local needs and 40% to be affordable
- There is a need for smaller households due to smaller household size
- Does not need to be prescriptive – should be flexible to deliver units identified in evidence documents

Provided by: Barratt Homes and David Wilson (NE Yorkshire) and Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes NE Division, Garner Planning Associates, Taylor Wimpey North Yorkshire Ltd, Shepherd Homes, Ryedale Liberal Party, Church Commissioners

Draft Policy CS4 - No comments at this stage

Provided by: Thorpe Bassett Estate, Dr R Wheeler, Chomley Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust, Hovingham Estate

Draft Policy CS5: Sites for Gypsies and travellers and Travelling Show people

Draft Policy CS5 - Support

- Current site is well run. Support extension at Malton

Provided by: Mr M Gwilliam

Draft Policy CS5 - Disagree

- Need should be met through a new site
- Should be tackled immediately address unofficial camping
- Question how sensible it is to focus provision on one site
- Any further site should be carefully planned and local residents of Malton and Norton should have a say
- Not all Gypsies and Travellers want to live in a permanent location

Provided by: Flaxton PC, Oswaldkirk PC, Ms C Knott

Draft Policy CS5 - General Points

- No comment at this stage but reserve the right to make comments at Submission stage

Provided by: Thorpe Bassett Estate, Dr R Wheeler, Chomley Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust, Hovingham Estate

Section 5 - Economy

Draft Policy CS6: Delivery and Distribution of Employment Land and Premises

Draft Policy CS6 - General Support

- Support for policy in general
- Support for particular sections of the policy:
 - o Distribution in Malton and Norton
 - o 80% in Malton and Norton
 - o Sources in other Market towns
 - o Sources in Service Villages and Other Villages
 - o Business and technology park at Malton / Norton
- Support for majority of employment provision in the larger towns within walking or cycling distance of where people live
- Support for Malton and Norton given transport links to York economy
- Support for using buildings in Malton Town Centre to be used for employment including reuse of buildings for managed work space
- Support for further expansion of existing industrial locations
- If focus employment in Malton and Norton then more housing is appropriate and vice versa

Provided by: Simon and Fitzwilliam Trust, Fitzwilliam (Malton) Estate, Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation, Mr K Storey, Church Commissioners for England, Natural England, Mr K Monkman, owners of site 479, Malton and Norton Area Partnership, Mr P Hayward, Great and Little Barugh Parish Council, Mr P & R Pool, Catfoss Group, Barton Wilmore

Draft Policy CS6 - Qualified Support

- Clarification on the position of the re-use of rural buildings in the open countryside. It is mentioned in CS9, but not in CS6. Such re-use may support wider economic objectives than land based ones
- Diversification schemes must be appropriate to the rural and agricultural setting
- Development should not prejudice tourism and the importance of this to the economy
- Support focus on Malton and Norton and the potential for new employment and road side facilities development (supermarket, hotel, garage) at an improved Brambling Fields junction (A64 / B1248)
- Support for Malton and Norton and the potential for new housing, retail (supermarket) and business use at site 282, land north of Pasture Lane
- The majority of employment land to be located to the north of Malton
 - o to allow access to A64 without congestion elsewhere
 - o to better achieve the wider objectives of the LDF
 - o appeal to developers by lower development costs ie greenfield
- Malton rather than Malton and Norton to be the focus of the policy particularly for those sites accessible to the A64 and housing (both existing and proposed)
- Need to have regard to the impact on highway networks
- Employment sites should be identified. Agricultural employment uses only permitted north of A64
- Relationship with other policies especially CS1 needs to be emphasised
- Draft policy is not flexible. Consideration to be given to using sites that are vacant / under-used / not fit for purpose / failed to attract market interest
- Need to include a reference to the release of employment land where it would not have a detrimental impact on the provision of employment land across the district
- Exact figures should be used eg not approximate but minimum so there is flexibility to cater for changing circumstances

- Reword policy:
 - o “Change of use will be opposed except in exceptional circumstances, where it is considered that they contribute to the sustainability of the local economy”
- Add to policy:
 - o For the Distribution in Kirkbymoorside and Helmsley add “eg maximum 1.5HA for each town”
- Need to address shortfalls for development land for specialist businesses
- The Food and Environment Research Agency at Sand Hutton to be referenced
- A science and technology park is essential
- Para 5.8 – line 4: 200 should be 2000?
- Para 5.9 – Sand Hutton Research Establishment should be mentioned

Provided by: North York Moors National Park Authority, Birdsall Estates, Cllr P Andrews, Ryedale Liberal Party, Simons and Fitzwilliam Trust, Fitzwilliam (Malton) Estate, Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation, Mr P & R Pool, Church Commissioners for England, Mr K Monkman, Catfoss Group, CPRE Ryedale Branch, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Division)

Draft Policy CS6 – Disagree

- Competing with York will not bring the High Tech business that is proposed

Regarding 45 Ha of land allocated

- How is the location / relocation of business to be encouraged?
- Lacks credible and robust evidence base
- Is not in line with PPS1 and principles of sustainable development
- Fails to give proper regard to evidence base of the RSS
- ELR and update adopt inappropriate approaches to quantification of land

Distributions

- Concern regarding lack of support for employment land outside Malton
- There should be modest employment allocations in the Service villages (eg Slingsby) and other villages to enhance their sustainability
- Businesses no longer need to be tied to the larger settlements. The rural nature of the district is a key driver
- Consider mixed use schemes – eg home-working and live-work units in attractive rural locations
- Concerned about the lack of employment opportunities for young people in the smaller towns.

Provided by: Ms C Knott, Mr G Wright, Kirkbymoorside Town Council, Thorpe Bassett Estate, Dr R Wheeler, Chomley Estate, Hovingham Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust, Slingsby, Fryton and South Holme Parish Council

Draft Policy CS6 - General Comments

- Helmsley employment sites will be addressed through the Helmsley DPD
- Concerned regarding the delay in the allocation of sites. The Sites DPD needs to be agreed as soon as possible
- Employment sites need to be set out in the Sites DPD
- Comments regarding sites for employment
 - o support for Norton Grove
 - o disagree with Woolgrowers. With no link road, congestion will get worse
 - o need to identify a gas plant proposed by Moorland Energy. One existed in Pickering in the past and is better than the one now proposed in Thornton-le-Dale

- antiquated infrastructure and leasing arrangements do not attract business
- Cottage Industries in the smaller rural villages should receive greater promotion and encouragement
- Employment need to be met before all others. Financial, environmental and infrastructure incentives should be in place to attract new and expanding businesses
- The strategy must link to higher educational provision by NYCC, Universities and colleges in order to attract business and improve labour skills
- Guiding principles in PPS4 which provides different approaches to reviewing employment land
- Yorkshire Forward can assist (for as long as it exists) if basing employment land on job forecasts and provide advice on the Regional Econometric Model
- Indicative employment forecasts in 2008 are out of date
- The Employment Land Review does not identify any sites within Rillington

Provided by: North York Moors National Park, Malton Town Council, Norton Town Council, Ms C Knott, Heslerton Parish Council, Mr T Raine, Local Government Yorkshire and Humber, Slingsby, Fryton and South Holme Parish Councils, CPRE Ryedale Branch, Dr R Wheeler

Draft Policy CS6 Implementation Table - General Comments

- Need to use Compulsory Purchase powers to overcome obstacles to delivery

Provided by: Flaxton Parish Council

Draft Policy CS7: Town Centres

Draft Policy CS7 - General Support

- Support for the policy in general
- Support for certain parts of the policy including:
 - o The hierarchy and principal town centre – Malton needs to be improved
 - o Expansion of commercial limits
 - o Proportion of food/non-food retailing to address deficiencies and improve the choice and range of food retail
 - o The encouragement of the use of the upper floors
 - o The need to ensure vitality and viability and attractiveness of town centres through improvements to public realm and the provision of an appropriate level of car parking
- Broadening the range and choice of shops is integral to fulfilling Malton Town Centre's potential
- for a quality supermarket to end the monopoly of Morrisons
- Accept that Pickering needs a second supermarket
- support current Lidl proposals in Pickering
- for the Helmsley DPD which will consider further retail provision in Helmsley
- for increases in long term sustainable job creation including a new supermarket to serve the district
- Para 5.17 – recognise Norton's poorer retail performance. Locating housing within walking distance of Commercial Street will have a positive impact on the shops and should be encouraged
- Para 5.21 – do not need an out of town location

Provided by: Flaxton Parish Council, Malton and Norton Area Partnership, Simon and Fitzwilliam Trust, Sainsbury's, Mr K Monkman, NYCC Economic and Rural Services, Malton

Draft Policy CS7 - Qualified Support

- Add to the policy:
 - o Town centres provide a focus for leisure uses, cultural activities and tourism
This needs to be added specifically retention of arts, cultural and community provision and opportunities to address any deficit
 - o Emphasise green infrastructure such as street trees
 - o Add "...and to the wider local economy" to the sentence starting "Retail and other town centre development..."
- Replace :
 - o bullet point regarding improved choice and range of convenience retailing with "strengthen and improve the local food economy"
 - o final bullet point regarding retail choice - replace "whilst" with "by" as the former implies retail choice and strong independent sector are incompatible. It is the large supermarkets that are incompatible with real choice and independent retailing
- consider restricting sales areas of any retail unit over 1000sq m
- need to increase the non-food retail provision
- Para 5.16 – there is a need to avoid Malton becoming another clone town in terms of retail offer. The need to ensure there are sufficient suitably sized units should not be at the expense of existing or new independent retailers
- Para 5.17 – amend line 1 to read "...principally located along the 'high' street...."

Provided by: The Theatres Trust, Natural England, Ryedale Liberal Party, Simons and Fitzwilliam Trust, CPRE Ryedale Branch, English Heritage

Draft Policy CS7 – Disagree

- The proportion of retail development for each settlement should be on a case-by-case basis. Setting limitations is too prescriptive. Should support retail in all settlements commensurate with hierarchy
- Service and other villages need to be enhanced
- Driven by the interests of big business not the people of Ryedale
- National chains drain money out of the District
- Too much increase in retail is planned
- If low cost up-market supermarket provision is increased local distinctiveness will decline harming tourism and choice
- How many village shops have opened?
- "Safety" does not explain the garish appearance of petrol outlets, nor the large shops beyond the commercial limits

Retail Hierarchy - Malton / Norton

- Policy unclear and disregarded officer recommendation for retail hierarchy. Malton referred to as principal town centre with Norton as a local town centre, but policy allocates 70% of retail floorspace to Malton and Norton. They should be separated and allocations made as appropriate
- Need to keep Malton as primary retail centre rather than Malton and Norton
- Norton is a Local Town Centre but is declining with recent closures. Two more supermarkets will undermine it further
- Would like to see the land to the north of Commercial Street used to remove delivery lorries from the street and provide additional parking

- Need public realm improvements to Commercial Street to retain custom. However timing of these is very important to not hinder business
- Car parking and traffic management are key. Need Strategic Transport Assessment and a review of public car parking. St Nicholas Street Car Park is used by commuters from either within Malton or out of town
- It may be necessary to demolish a retail outlet to ensure sufficient car parking provision
- Concern that Malton's retail provision will have increased by 100% by 2026
- It is unrealistic to think that retail retention will increase to 80% by concentrating development in Malton and Norton when the catchment is greater than Ryedale
- How will increasing Malton help local villages and small town's retail provision?
- Need attractions where people can spend their leisure time and money eg racing attraction
- There is no need for a new supermarket. Those who shop elsewhere will continue to do so
- A high quality supermarket will affect the independent retailers the most
- The character of the town will be lost and will not support the tourism industry
- The Malton Town Centre Revitalisation Plan has not been fully considered by the Council
- Para 5.14 – Malton and Norton are in danger of losing their identity with the addition of extra supermarkets and national retailers of the same character “over shopping”
- Apart from the Market Place, the cost of parking is detrimental to using Malton
- Commercial Street, Norton is not performing as well as it could due in part to the lack of parking

Source and Distribution of new retail floorspace

- The table is too prescriptive and should be removed
- Gross or net floorspace?
- Does not add to the sequential approach of PPS4

2801sq m food retailing space in Malton

- The plan to increase convenience retailing by 17% is misplaced and there is no room for it
- Need to phase developments. Concerns regarding short term impacts and impact on shopping mix
- Need to refer to highway considerations and technical reports which demonstrate that the main junctions are over capacity and cannot accommodate additional traffic as a result of the additional retail proposed
- This is inconsistent with guidance in PPS4 and should be removed
- Delete “...Any proposal that subsequently.....impact on town centre uses.”
- Unclear how this was derived and no explanation or justification for impact on town
- Concerned that this figure exceeds those in the evidence
- “approximately 2801sq m” – what is the exact figure?
- The figures provided need to be updated to reflect the Aldi and Lidl approvals. It states that it needs updating so the policy is unsound as it is not based on up to date evidence
- Inappropriate level of detail

Retail Hierarchy - Pickering

- Description of Pickering is not as positive as Malton / Norton and Helmsley

Provided by: Pickering Town Council, Habton Parish Council, Ryedale Liberal Party, Dr R Wheeler, Ms C Knott, Chomley Estate, Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation, Fitzwilliam (Malton)

Estate, Thorpe Bassett Estate, Hovingham Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust, The Campaign Group Against the Sale of Wentworth Street Car Park, Cllr P Andrews, Sainsbury's, Wm Morrison Supermarkets Ltd, Malton and Norton Area Partnership, Mr M Gwilliam, Great and Little Barugh Parish Council, NYCC Economic and Rural Services, Norton Town Council, Mrs AG Woodhead, Scampston Parish Council, Mr & Mrs TJ Scott

Draft Policy CS7 - General Comments

- More high street names should be encouraged
- The various background reports appear to be inconsistent and contradict each other. They rely on questionable assumptions and statements supported by flawed logic and unsupported evidence
- Look at what type of retailing is needed. Would like to do all shopping in Malton but adult fashion and children's clothing is limited / non-existent
- In order to see policies which support small businesses and start – ups without unintended consequences, further analysis may be necessary of the retail leakage rates and the proximity of other retail centres rather than simply the level of choice available being used to determine the policy approach. The additional data could assist in determining if there was a positive impact on Ryedale's ranking by the additional floorspace
- There is a need to make the towns more attractive to live here – improve opportunities for mortgages which will help to increase town centres retail prosperity.
- Access Axiom data on retail expenditure flows up to September 2011
- Note the need to enhance the role of Malton for retailing and that the town could benefit from a higher order food store. Assume the new store is on Wentworth Street car park
- Para 5.27 - What does carefully mean?
- Need to be in line with PPS4 para EC2.1 – the need to have detailed need assessment for land and floorspace for economic development and review allocations in conjunction with SHLAA
- Norton needs to differentiate its offer. Increased competition will not help.
- Local independent retailers need support. National retailers are not the way forward.
- Para 5.6 – use empty retail units before new ones are built
- Para 5.6 – get Fitzwilliam Estate to bring leases up to date to encourage business

Provided by: Mr K Monkman, Cllr P Andrews, Ms D Powell, Yorkshire Forward, Mr T Raine, Local Government Yorkshire and Humber, Scampston Parish Council, Ms C Knott, Thorpe Bassett Estate, Dr R Wheeler, Chomley Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust, Hovingham Estate

Northern Arc - General Support

- Support in general

Provided by: Mr K Monkman

Northern Arc - Qualified Support

- Add to the policy:
 - o Subject to the **Northern Arc** going ahead:
 - A section on how the viability and vitality of the southern part of the town centre is to be supported and secured especially with respect to

- the Conservation Areas - opportunities here for Green infrastructure as street trees, sustainable design and drainage systems
Provided by: English Heritage, Natural England

Northern Arc – Disagree
- The Northern Arc is not referred to in Policy CS7. - It should be deleted as it is inappropriate to introduce this level of detail in the Core Strategy - No justification presented - Consider there is a need for additional convenience floorspace in Malton Town Centre. Retail Capacity Study evidence suggests capacity will not be available until 2021 at the earliest. The allocation of this site for retail purposes must be based on sound evidence. - The inclusion of such a specific area in the CS is beyond the level of detail required in a CS. It is too prescriptive and could stifle development. The Retail Study refers to the need for an improved retail offer in North Malton. This is a more appropriate level of guidance. - Conflict in the evidence base with respect to Wentworth Street Car Park which is considered appropriate by WSP and not by Roger Tym and Partners.
Provided by: Fitzwilliam (Malton) Estate, Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc, Simons and Fitzwilliam Trust, Cllr P Andrews

Livestock Market - General
- Need to support Malton town centre. The Fitzwilliam Estate proposals for a quality supermarket (Waitrose) could achieve this immediately next to the town centre. - Any development larger than the Fitzwilliam Estate proposals or a proliferation of smaller supermarkets would destroy the town centres as there is insufficient capacity to support them. The independent shops will be vulnerable. - The Livestock Market site for a small Waitrose/Booths and good quality shops would better meet the requirements of the policy and broaden the retail on offer. Wentworth Street Car Park will not achieve this. - The Malton and Norton Area Partnership would support a small Waitrose/Booths and good quality shops on the livestock market site - The cattle market should be moved it is not an appropriate use for today's town centres, causes pollution and traffic congestion - Para 5.24 – the strategy acknowledges the importance of retaining a livestock market in the area but does not suggest how this is to be achieved - Para 5.24 – a shift in the retail focus may lead to more vacant units at the southern end affecting the vitality and viability of this area which could have an adverse impact on the southern part of the Malton Conservation Area. The viability and vitality of the southern part of the retail area will need to be addressed and if there is an adverse impact, a strategy will be required setting out how it is intended to manage those areas which may suffer economic decline. - Para 5.24 – relocation of the livestock market could have significant impact on the landscape setting and amenities of residents. There should be a policy which identifies possible locations for a new livestock market or sets out the criteria by which the allocations DPD will identify a site for a new livestock market. - Para 5.24 – redevelopment of cattle market preferable to Wentworth Street Car park as a natural extension to market place. Link developments through existing

passages
Provided by: Mr K Monkman, The Campaign Group Against the sale of Wentworth Street Car Park, Malton and Norton Area Partnership, Cllr P Andrews, Scampston Parish Council, English Heritage, Mr Beanland

Comments regarding the sale and use of Wentworth Street Car Park for a supermarket - Disagree
• The sale of the Wentworth Street Car Park for a supermarket should be considered through the LDF • Need to delay retail development until LDF progressed further to allow for issues and comments on a new superstore to be considered fully • Conflict in the evidence base with respect to Wentworth Street Car Park which is considered appropriate by WSP and not by Roger Tym and Partners. • Evidence points to over-provision with another large supermarket. There is no need for a further supermarket in Ryedale. The evidence suggests there is insufficient capacity for another supermarket. • Recently rushed planning applications contradict this policy. • The sale of the car park could isolate trade in this part of the town • Concern expressed with retail developments already granted permission and those proposed. • Permissions to Aldi and Lidl are outside town centre limits. Wentworth Street Car Park is also beyond the limits and weakens the policy. • Supermarkets on the edge of towns are likely to have detrimental effects on the town centre. • There is no highway strategy in place • The loss of Wentworth Street Car Park will lead to loss of long stay parking for commuters and visitors. • Relocation of the various community facilities as a result of the proposed Wentworth Street Car Park development is unsatisfactory • How can the plan in its present form be considered when recent decisions are contrary to the stated long term objectives? Eg extra employment, housing and tourism generated from the sale of the car park – where will they park? • If the car park is sold, are the proceeds to be shared with other councils in Ryedale? • Para 5.15 – concerned that in meeting local needs the car parking in Malton has not been fully considered in terms of impact. 154 car parking spaces in Wentworth Street car park are not sufficient to meet the needs of the other developments in town. Estimate 300+ spaces will be needed. • Para 5.16 – concern about the downsizing of Wentworth Street car park – undermine any future economic development in the town resulting in continued migration to Monks Cross. • Para 5.24 - Wentworth Street car park should be retained for use by farmers vehicles for livestock market on its current site
Provided by: Malton and Norton Area Partnership, The Campaign Group Against the sale of Wentworth Street Car Park, Malton Town Council, Great and Little Barugh Parish Council, Cllr P Andrews, Kirkbymoorside Town Council, Mr Beanland, Scampston Parish Council, Ms C Knott

Showfield Site – Qualified Support for Draft Policy CS7
• subject to the site north of Pasture Lane (site 282) being developed for housing, retail (supermarket) and business units

Provided by: Simons and Fitzwilliam Trust

Draft Policy CS7 Implementation Table – General Comments

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Strategic Transport Assessment needs to be in place now. It is vital to review car parking issues for Malton and Norton. • Wentworth Street Car Park should be maintained as a car park. • Remove reference to Yorkshire Forward as funding is unlikely |
|---|

Provided by: Malton Town Council, Yorkshire Forward, Mr Beanland, Mrs AG Woodhead
--

Draft Policy CS8: Tourism

Draft Policy CS8 - General Support

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the policy in general • Support especially for : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o using the district's heritage assets as an economic driver o the recognition of the contribution of tourism to the Ryedale Economy o opportunities for the reuse of buildings, especially those under utilised o supporting business plans of existing tourist and visitor attractions eg essential for the continued success of Castle Howard o tourism development in the market towns o tourism development in the service villages and other settlements o tourism development in the wider open countryside and natural environment o balancing tourism growth with other development especially in the service villages and other villages where land and buildings are under utilised o recognising the Howardian Hills AONB • The positive position in relation to the needs of tourists |
|--|

Provided by: English Heritage, Natural England, Castle Howard Estate, Mr K Storey, Mr M Fletcher, Church Commissioners for England

Draft Policy CS8 - Qualified Support

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to add to policy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o nature tourism – Ryedale has excellent potential eg extending Cayton and Flixton Carrs (archaeological interest) into Ryedale, and the Howardian Hills around Helmsley o restriction on the use of holiday homes as residential accommodation (reiterate) o "...can be accommodated without unacceptable visual intrusion and impact on the character of the locality" to the touring caravan and camping section. • There is a significant requirement for an inexpensive hotel of good quality in the Malton area. • Heritage of Ryedale especially Malton and Norton and the river should be emphasised. They provide the complete understanding of how communities develop from prehistoric times to present. • Visitors make up a vital part of the economy. Tourism growth should feature more prominently in LDF • It is vital that proposals, including chalet type accommodation do not affect areas important for biodiversity, wildlife, landscape character and the environment eg ancient woodland, Howardian Hills AONB and that there are measures to enhance |
|--|

the environment eg SUDs, green roof, habitat enhancement

- Need to emphasize:
 - o “..the appropriate scale and location of caravan and camping sites.” Ryedale has quite a lot.
 - o “without unacceptable visual intrusion”
- Need to define “appropriate” with respect to touring and camping sites and chalet and static sites
- Self catering and chalet holiday homes that are available for use all year round
- Consider motor home development in or near to Thornton le Dale to encourage and expand this popular form of tourism in this area
- Support attractions and projects that will attract people to Ryedale, not just accommodation.
- For tourist hotels in the area
- New chalet and caravan parks to be limited to prevent encroachment to southern Pickering
- Promote biodiversity on farms by encouraging eg appropriate hedgerow management, field margins etc which can benefit nature tourism.

Provided by: Natural England, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust, Flaxton Parish Council, Thornton le Dale Parish Council, Malton and Norton Area Partnership, Ms C Knott, Mrs E Gathercole, Catfoss Group, DJ & FK Cockerill, Pickering Town Council

Draft Policy CS8 – Disagree

- What definition of sustainable is being used to assess that the tourist development is sustainable? In the Sustainability Appraisal, the tourism policy rates the worst.
- How is tourism contributing to: living within environment limits? At what point does the development become too much? Ensuring a strong, healthy and just society? A sustainable economy (with low wages)? Promote good governance? Use of sound science responsibility? Are there areas where we are reaching our limits? i.e car parking and traffic management.
- Using local food as a driver in tourism is an oxymoron (it is feeding people who have come a long way). Not possible to maximise food production and farm diversification.
- What levels of tourism will remain sustainable for Pickering, Helmsley and Thornton le Dale? Maximising opportunities to develop further may not be for the best in terms of tourism
- Delete farm diversification, maximising it is in opposition to the spatial strategy.
- Service Villages and Market towns should be in the same box.
- Other settlements should be in same box as wider open countryside.
- Where existing dwellings are to be converted to tourism uses, change of use should be required, as it impinges on our rural affordable housing provision.
- Need to refer to Pickering's historic past and should be a national if not international tourist centre as Helmsley is identified as an important tourist centre
- Pickering Showground should be considered within the second set of bullet points given the references elsewhere in the CS that Pickering is a major tourist centre. Suggest wording: 'Pickering Showground for economic, leisure and tourism development'.
- Para 5.28 – CS to recognise the importance of Pickering Showground for events. Site is vulnerable. Development should not be stifled by policies which do not recognise its special character
- Inclusion of the Pickering Showground will link into the fourth bullet point around the role of Pickering at a gateway for tourism and a wider range of uses would be appropriate.
- Concerned that '...appropriate expansion of an existing hotel, guest house, public

house, farm house, holiday cottage or similar establishment' is too restrictive for development of the Pickering Showfield site beyond what the Council currently consider could be acceptable. • Welburn in the AONB will be permanently damaged by development of more than a few houses
Provided by: Ryedale Liberal Party, P Brown, Catfoss Group, Pickering Town Council

Draft Policy CS8 - General Comments
• Malton does not present itself as a tourist or shopping destination. Investment of Malton Town Centre by all stakeholders • Tourism is an important business for the villages • Para 5.32 – duplication
Provided by: Slingsby, Fryton and South Holme Parish Council, CPRE Ryedale Branch

Draft Policy CS8 Implementation Table - Qualified Support
• The Yorkshire Wildlife Trust could be mentioned as a partner
Provided by: Yorkshire Wildlife Trust

Draft Policy CS8 Implementation Table - General Comments
• What will happen after 2011 when the Yorkshire Moors and Coast Partnership ceases to exist?
Provided by: Ryedale Liberal Party

Draft Policy CS9: The Land Based and Rural Economy

Draft Policy CS9 - General Support
• For the policy in general • For recognising that rural diversity is encouraged and supported • For recognising innovative farm diversification schemes eg energy production • For encouraging new land uses and economic activity • For the intention to support local building skills
Provided by: Castle Howard Estate, Mr K Storey, Dr R Wheeler, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust, Church Commissioners for England, English Heritage, Thorpe Bassett Estate, Chomley Estate, Hovingham Estate

Draft Policy CS9 - Qualified Support
• The policy should be additionally permissive of replacement buildings (PPS4 – EC6.2d) • The CS should either identify the area(s) where the livestock market might be located or include the criteria by which the allocations DPD will identify such a site. • Need to recognise the importance of protecting the soil resource in this policy • The Food and Environment Research Agency is a core part of Ryedale's economy. It should be supported not hindered through the planning system. • Need to recognise the socio-economic role of the Estates in the District as providers

of employment, homes, community facilities and custodians of the landscape, countryside and historic assets. Estates should be given the capacity to contribute to building well balanced communities. - Local Rural Estate MasterPlans or Management Plans should be referred to as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications and in the preparation of development plans. - Add: "...when there is a net CO2 emission reduction and no loss of food producing land." To end of bullet "...appropriate new uses for land...."
Provided by: English Heritage, Birdsall Estates, Natural England, Church Commissioners for England, Thorpe Bassett Estate, Chomley Estate, Hovingham Estate, Ryedale Liberal Party,

Draft Policy CS9 - Disagree - Alter text of "...retention of livestock market..." from "District" to "Malton / Norton" - Para 5.33 – dispute that agriculture is set to decline. World food prices are increasing and world population is growing. There is the potential for decline to be reversed.
Provided by: Ryedale Liberal Party

Draft Policy CS9 - General Comments Hovingham Estate have an Estate Management Plan that sets out the plans by the Estate for improving sustainability, vibrancy and vitality of the settlement.
Provided by: Hovingham Estate

Section 6: Community Facilities and Community Infrastructure

Draft Policy CS10: Community Facilities and Physical Infrastructure

Draft Policy CS10 - General Support

- Support in general
- For providing network of safe cycling and walking routes
- For recognition of playing fields and recreational facilities.
- For commitment to providing green infrastructure – accessible green space connected by cycling / walking should be an essential requirement
- For Para 6.1 through school extensions, play space and by increasing water and sewerage supply

Provided by: Natural England, Mrs AG Woodhead, Mr M Stenning, Mr Beanland

Draft Policy CS10 - Qualified Support

- Needs to be amended:
 - o So that not all developments will be required to contribute
 - o so that the level of contributions sought will be the subject of negotiation during the course of any planning application
 - o leisure and play facilities should be expanded to include community buildings, open space, cultural facilities, leisure and recreational venues and play facilities. Amend para “existing local retail, community...” By the addition of “...So that cultural infrastructure such as cinemas is not excluded from this policy.”
- Need to provide a definition for community facilities that includes arts activities including cultural venues and cinemas. Suggest: “Community facilities provide for the health, welfare, social, educational, spiritual, recreational, leisure and cultural needs of the community”
- The council need to continually monitor the viability of development opportunities when having to contribute to several provisions and to allow for flexibility to accommodate any changes
- Clarification of how developer contributions will be sought for major highway improvements in Malton and Norton as the policy and text is unclear
- Malton and Norton:
 - o Town centre parking problems
 - o Concern that complementary measures in the STA will increase congestion
 - o Vital to secure Malton Hospital for the future
 - o Concern over loss of funding for Norton Primary. Unsure contributions will be able to deliver requirements. Need to identify land for a new primary school now if it is needed
 - o Sewerage at capacity so development needs to be curtailed until solution found
- For schemes within rural areas that improve access to community services and facilities. The Council should allow development of redundant leisure and community facilities and redevelopment where appropriate replacement facilities can be provided – an audit should be undertaken. Any contributions should be subject to viability testing.
- Sewerage infrastructure and connections to main sewerage system are not mentioned
- The council needs to be realistic and confident about the prospects of any transport infrastructure ensuring that they are both necessary and deliverable. Speculative

proposals are not appropriate For para 6.4 - Amotherby and Swinton have sewerage capacity issues and Amotherby school is oversubscribed
Provided by: Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Division), Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Yorkshire), Taylor Wimpy UK Ltd, Taylor Wimpey North Yorkshire Ltd, Mr K Storey, Dr R Wheeler, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust, The Theatres Trust, Kirkbymoorside Town Council, Norton Town Council, Chomley Estate, Hovingham Estate, Thorpe Bassett Estate, NYCC Economic and Rural Services, Church Commissioners for England, Amotherby Parish Council

Draft Policy CS10 – Disagree - The approach is inflexible and could have significant adverse impacts on housing delivery if obligations are requested which are not directly related to planning proposals or necessary to make those proposals acceptable in planning terms - No reference to a community hospital - Infrastructure requirements should be undertaken before development is implemented. - All aspects of infrastructure should be included - Concerned that new development in Pickering will be further away from the town centre increasing car use and town centre congestion. - New housing estates undermine the essence of English market towns - Schools in Pickering do not have capacity for pupils from the new estates. A new primary or secondary school will be needed. Have NYCC agreed this? - Concerns about additional strain placed on pct services through additional development. - Housing figures are arbitrary and have not been considered in terms of infrastructure capacity for Pickering. There will be adverse impacts which will affect the local economy which relies on tourism - RDC need assurance from NYCC that it can provide additional investment to support infrastructure improvements - Public transport provision in Pickering is poor when accessing limited employment provision. - No proposals to encourage people to walk and cycle. More development will make the problem worse.
Provided by: Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Division), Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Yorkshire), Taylor Wimpy UK Ltd, Mr M Gwilliam, Great and Little Barugh Parish Council, J Mennell

Draft Policy CS10 - General Comments - Needs to support the provision of open space and green corridors in development. There are benefits for both community health and wildlife - The Highways Agency understands that the Brambling Fields junction improvement work was originally developed to accommodate existing issues on the local network (Butchers Corner) and not to accommodate future growth. The HA require further evidence from Ryedale DC to support Brambling Fields junction improvement works with respect to accommodating future development - The Highways Agency request that the statement relating to the operational conditions of the Strategic Road Network in the vicinity of Ryedale and programmed improvements (supplied) is included within the LDF or evidence base - If there is still a possibility of a material impact in terms of safety or capacity on the
--

SRN after travel plan measures have been considered, the costs of improvements necessary will need to be met by those developments materially contributing. If the costs are beyond the scope of a single developer, the HA would expect the Core Strategy to identify a ringmasters approach to procure the improvement. Operation conditions on the SRN and the interface with the local highway networks will be kept under review

- HGV movements need consideration to stop damage to minor roads. Developments needing access to non-trunk roads should be refused, or conditions imposed.
- Need to stop rural roads becoming “rat-runs”
- The Highways Agency’s key concern is to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the SRN. The HA would have concerns over development proposals or plans that would have a material impact on the SRN
- Need to protect the Hull-Beverley-York route to enhance links to York and Leeds
- What is the policy on allotment provision?
- Policies will need to respond to the increase in dementia cases. If current policies continue there would be a 72% increase in care home places from 3090 to 5325. However, 60% of these are likely to be living in their own home, which need to be more specialist housing and more general needs housing to address the requirements of people with dementia. Research suggests that in NY there will be a 68% increase in people with late onset dementia (eg Alzheimer’s disease) with figures rising from 8264 to 13876
- The Core Strategy should also set out what social, physical and green infrastructure is required
- The slip road to Broughton Road to be safeguarded
- There should be more cycling into the towns especially from nearby villages eg along B1257 to provide alternative for children attending Malton Grammar School.

Provided by: Yorkshire Wildlife Trust, Highways Agency, Mr M Gwilliam, NYCC Adult and Community Education, Mr T Barnes, Flaxton Parish Council, Thorpe Bassett Estate, Dr R Wheeler, Chomley Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust, Hovingham Estate, Mr Beanland, Mrs AG Woodhead

Draft Table 1

Draft Table 1 - Qualified Support

- **Malton / Norton**
 - o More recreational space needed.
 - o Provide a park that is not part of an historic monument
 - o More allotments needed if the towns are to expand the current ones are insufficient
 - o Delete dry sports centre as it is already provided
 - o Need to mention flood defences
 - o Closure of hospital ward contradicts health / education statement. Number of bed requirements is almost lost. The hospital must be retained and upgraded to meet demand for this service
 - o New schools (primary) will be required to meet the needs of the expanding population
 - o Infrastructure needs upgrading not just maintaining
 - o Improve facilities at the railway station eg toilets, waiting room, retail
 - o Transport section
 - Access issues
 - Current road system is poor
 - Improvements to Whelham Rd / Norton Rd junction needed
 - Need to improve links across the south – York Rd – Whelham Rd –

Langton Rd – Beverley Rd – Scarborough Rd ▪ Improvements to A64 are needed ▪ Improve links across the south of the towns • Open space section - o Include improvements to the public realm in these sections • Need to consider local sewerage capacity – Swinton and Amotherby have no spare capacity, concerns for Malton and Norton which need attention • Need to consider surface water discharge from the villages and hamlets along the western side of the Howardian Hills. Any increases need to be carefully managed and whilst development may not cause any problems locally, the effect downstream may be significant • Developers may not need to contribute to all listed improvements. • The list is not a shopping list of items to request • Refer to necessary improvements that developers need to contribute to ensure compliance with Circular 05/05 • Delete junction improvements at Vivis Lane / the Ropery • Brambling Fields - o The Town Councils (Malton and Norton) support the proposals for an extra slip road in easterly direction. However it will not help traffic moving north-south. A junction at Broughton Rd is essential for north-south traffic - o Brambling Fields will not stop HGVs passing through Norton. A suitable link is needed between Beverley Rd and Norton Grove Ind Est • Concerned over one way system proposed at Railway St / Norton Rd – it will create congestion elsewhere. Look at one way systems elsewhere • Malton and Norton Strategic Transport Assessment - o Consider grouping unrealistic for the baseline. Inaccurate references and unrealistic to consider all sites will proceed to development. Need to consider the impact of single or small groups of sites for development - o Concern at the potential loss of right turn at Butcher Corner - o Revision of pedestrian crossing timings welcomed but could back up at peak times
Provided by: Mrs AG Woodhead, English Heritage, Amotherby Parish Council, Foss Internal Drainage Board, West Park Developments, Mr K Monkman, Ms C Knott, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Yorkshire), Taylor Wimpy UK Ltd, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Division), Malton Town Council, Norton Town Council, Ryedale Liberal Party

Draft Table 1 - Disagree
• Increase the likelihood of flooding by new housing on floodplains and population increases • There is no commitment to press the National Government for improvements to the A64 for safety reasons and for facilitating the development of Malton and Norton • Inadequate. There are no proposals to improve congestion in Malton and Norton except for Brambling Fields
Provided by: Ms C Knott, Mr D Cockerill, Mr M Gwilliam

Draft Table 1 - General Comments
• To meet population increases, more schools must be provided a new primary school should be provided in Malton / Norton • Class sizes are too large at Amotherby school.

- Additional capacity must be a priority unless stringent rules of parental choice are put in place
- Slingsby Primary Community School to be retained
- Infrastructure in Slingsby needs upgrading to attract business eg: limited mobile phone reception, no mains gas, telephone and some electric supplies are still pole based, street lighting is old, footpaths need resurfacing, drainage needs updating and concerns regarding run off. Use S106 Agreements
- Concerns regarding insufficient funding available for the necessary upgrade of services, facilities, utilities and transportation networks. Dependence on developer contributions may mean that some developments are unviable
- Need to preserve the Rillington Junction to Pickering railway for possible future opening
- Concerned over one way system proposed at Railway St / Norton Rd – it will create congestion elsewhere
- Need to improve road infrastructure especially A64 Rillington and Sherburn.
- Cross local authority cooperation of infrastructure is being reinforced by the coalition government. Local Enterprise Partnerships may have a role

Provided by: Mrs D Powell, Mr K Monkman, Slingsby, Fryton and South Holme Parish Council, Scampston Parish Council, Malton Town Council, Malton and Norton Town Councils, Mr T Raine, Mrs C Knott, Local Government Yorkshire and Humber

Section 7: Environment

General Support

- For the chapter as a whole

Provided by: English Heritage

Qualified Support

- Suggest rewording:
 - o Para 7.2 – “predicated” should be “predicted”
- Section 7 should end with landscapes: historic and scenic could be combined into one.
- Re-order section as follows:
 - o Climate change –
 - mitigation
 - adaptation
 - compliance with PPS25
 - reduced water consumption, SUDS, permeable surfaces
 - joint working with EA, Natural England and drainage boards – abstraction plans and flood management and stewardship schemes
 - o retrofitting SUDS and permeable surfaces in existing developments together with conservation of rainwater

Provided by: CPRE Ryedale Branch

Disagree

- Land management is inadequate. What does the Council own and how will it be managed?

Provided by: Mr M Gwilliam

General Comments

- Environmental policies will require one or more detailed DPDs and the proposals for these should be included in the Core Strategy
- LPAs need to consider Waste Management and how waste streams can be managed through joint facilities. Evidence provided

Provided by: CPRE Ryedale Branch, Local Government Yorkshire and Humber

Draft Policy CS11: Ryedale’s Historic Environment

Draft Policy CS11 - General Support

- Support for policy in general
- Support for specific sections of the policy:
 - o Especially the identification and inclusion of non-designated elements which contribute to the distinctive character of the district
 - o For safeguarding the quality of the historic environment by the means suggested
 - o For working closely with the LPA to identify appropriate ways to manage

- o heritage assets - o Holistic approach to management of AONB and other high landscape value areas - o Balancing socio-economic benefits against any perceived harm • For the robust justification for the approach which the plan sets out for the management of the heritage assets in the District
Provided by: English Heritage, Birdsall Estates, Castle Howard Estate, Thorpe Bassett Estate, Hovingham Estate, NYCC Economic and Rural Services, Mr PR Pickersgill, Mrs E Gathercole, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust

Draft Policy CS11 - Qualified Support • Welcome recognition of the role of Estates in protecting historic assets. However, policy is applicable to other estates and landowners not just Castle Howard • Estate conservation management plans need to be progressed as a priority • Refers to estate conservation deficit and public interest to address it • Recognition that enabling development may be appropriate in some circumstances for protecting heritage assets. However, enabling developments should be the exception and should be dealt with on a site by site basis as in a planning application. To identify land or locations would predetermine the planning application • Need to set out the basis upon which planning applications will be assessed with respect to preservation and enhancement of conservation areas. The following to be added: “Within Conservation Areas, development proposals will be assessed against the respective Conservation Area Appraisal. When considering proposals in those areas, the Council will seek to conserve those elements which have been identified as contributing to the special interest of that Conservation Area.” • The policy should allow for development of Visually Important Undeveloped Areas where it can be demonstrated that they no longer have significance or the development outweighs their retention • The policy is not clear whether it is about new development. Add the following text: “...The location, form, scale and detailed design of new development affecting designated historic assets and their settings should respect the context provided by its surroundings and the elements that make the character of individual places...” • Amend the first bullet on page 81 to read: “...seek to ensure that land use change in and around the Market Towns and villages safeguards elements of the historic character and value...”. The policy as written is not clear what is to be expanded and grown around these areas
Provided by: English Heritage, Birdsall Estate, Thorpe Bassett Estate, Chomley Estate, Hovingham Estate, Simon and Fitzwilliam Trust, Mrs E Gathercole, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust, Dr R Wheeler, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Yorkshire), Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Division), Taylor Wimpy UK Ltd

Draft Policy CS11 - General Comments • The conservation nature of Slingsby should be supported by the plan • Norton has a brewing, railway and racing heritage • The release of land to address conservation deficits for specific heritage assets should be supported in the more accessible and sustainable locations • More recognition of the role and contribution of the rural Estates, making it a material consideration • The Council to adopt and maintain a relic (naval shell) of WW1 which stands abandoned on north side of A170 between Aislaby and Middleton. Mr D Cockerill
--

would contribute to it's renovation • The policies should recognise the heritage environment as a non-renewable resource and take into account the wider benefits of heritage conservation recognise intelligently managed change may be necessary for long term maintenance through decisions proportionate to the importance of the asset, the asset is put to use and the recognition of the asset including for the promotion of place shaping • The Core Strategy should set out a positive and proactive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment as set out in PPS5 policy HE3 • The Core Strategy should refer to PPS5 policy HE11 with respect to enabling development to secure future conservation and maintenance of heritage assets
Provided by: Thorpe Bassett Estate, Chomley Estate, Hovingham Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust, Dr R Wheeler, Mrs C Knott, Slingsby, Fryton and South Holme Parish Councils, Mr D Cockerill

Draft Policy CS11 - Implementation Table - General Support
• Support for contents of the table in particular: - o The statement of significance of heritage asset and impact of significance
Provided by: English Heritage

Draft Policy CS11 - Implementation Table - Qualified Support
• The Vale of Pickering to be designated as an area of archaeological importance and possibly AONB • Should refer to working with the community to identify locally important elements in the historic landscape such as in a Conservation Area Appraisal, local list, Parish Plans, Village Design Statements etc • Rewrite "...work with local community to identify local features of historic interest through Parish Plans, Village Design Statements and other community engagement mechanisms." • Heritage Counts by English Heritage to be added to Action / Mechanism column, with EH as body responsible • Delete references to "scheduled ancient monument record" and "registered landscapes"
Provided by: Amotherby Parish Council, English Heritage

Draft Policy CS11 - Implementation Table - General Comments
• What happens if any of these government areas are abolished?
Provided by: Mrs C Knott

Draft Policy CS12: Protecting and Enhancing Ryedale's Landscapes

Draft Policy CS12 - General Support

- For the policy as a whole
- For specific sections of the policy:
 - o Reference that all landscapes matter
 - o To protect and enhance landscapes
 - o Consideration of settings of NYMNP
 - o For the protection of the special qualities and natural beauty of the AONB
 - o Removal of arbitrary landscape designations
 - o Recognising an holistic approach to management

Provided by: English Heritage, Howardian Hills AONB, Thorpe Bassett Estate, Chomley Estate, North York Moors National Park Authority, NYCC Economic and Rural Services, Natural England, Dr R Wheeler, P Brown, Mrs E Gathercole,

Draft Policy CS12 - Qualified Support

- Reword first bullet point “encouraging new development...” as it is open to varied interpretation
- Delete first and third bullet points as they are covered in following paragraph
- To ensure there is a consistent level of appreciation for the values of the landscape and its distinctive qualities, additional features of landscape character (as set out in ERYC policy HQE2) should be added including the contrasting and varying levels of enclosure and exposure, the diversity of the landscapes and the distinctive character and setting of villages
- Amend third bullet of National landscape designations and locally valued landscapes to begin with “Are...”
- Amend the AONB para:
 - o To strengthen protection to special qualities of the AONB to read: “Major development proposals within the AONB that would result in a significant adverse impact on the natural beauty and special qualities of the AONB will be considered within the context provided by national policy and only allowed if they are essential to the local community and in extremely exceptional circumstances.”
 - o To read “...unless it can be demonstrated that the benefits of the proposal the local community significantly outweigh any adverse impact and that the development is essential to the local community and cannot be located elsewhere.”
 - o by adding to the end “...usually where they can be proven to create a net environmental gain.”
- Suggest rewording para “...Outside those landscapes protected by...” as this para could be interpreted as being in conflict with previous statements by suggesting LPA will consider landscape impacts only in listed areas and not across all landscapes
- Amend “...further a field” to read “further afield” in the 6th paragraph
- Provide a map to show landscape designations
- Any development proposals must demonstrate that the benefits outweigh any adverse impact, particularly if the development is supported and needed by the community
- This policy should be taken into account regarding Castle Howard's desire to use land to address the conservation deficit to resist the despoliation of the landscape
- Suggest rewording:
 - o Para 7.9 – add “high” value
 - o Para 7.10 – bullet 3 line 3 “a” should be “and”

Provided by: Natural England, East Riding of Yorkshire Council, CPRE Ryedale Branch, Flaxton Parish Council, Ryedale Liberal Party, Mrs. E Gathercole, Mrs Cox, Mr M Stenning, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Yorkshire), Barrett Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Division), Taylor Wimpy UK Ltd, Taylor Wimpy North Yorkshire Ltd

Draft Policy CS12 - General Comments

- Windfarms need to be carefully sited especially when visible across the countryside
- Need to maintain the fringes to the Moors, Wolds and Vale of Pickering
- The forthcoming North Yorkshire and York Landscape Characterisation project will contribute to the evidence base when assessing the impact of development and necessary mitigation
- Need to ensure a consistent approach is taken across boundaries. However, the criteria based approach to protecting the Yorkshire Wolds is different from the ERYC – which is to designate the Yorkshire Wolds as an area of High Landscape Value. However, ERYC would support further consideration being given to the designation of the Yorkshire Wolds as an Area of High Landscape Value
- River corridors to be protected by:
 - o Requiring a buffer strip of 8 metres designed and landscaped to maximise biodiversity and function as a wildlife corridor
 - o Any water-based recreation to be incorporated sympathetically – without barriers or increasing disturbance
 - o Access to water course for maintenance of flood defence works must be provided where relevant

Provided by: East Riding of Yorkshire Council, Natural England, Mrs C Knott, Environment Agency

Draft Policy CS12 Implementation Table - Qualified Support

- Need to include the CPRE's Tranquillity Maps

Provided by: Natural England

Draft Policy CS13: Ryedale's Biodiversity

Draft Policy CS13 - General Support

- For the policy
- For particular parts of the policy
 - o Protection for all ancient woodland and aged trees
 - o Biodiversity conservation and enhancement across the landscape, not just for protected sites
- Biodiversity gains in line with PPS9. Where development is within YHBF enhancement areas, encourage measures to enhance areas in line with Y+H Biodiversity Strategy
- For the commitment to biodiversity as expressed in the BAP and Local Wildlife sites

Provided by: Yorkshire Wildlife Trust, Howardian Hills AONB, Natural England, The Woodland Trust, NYCC Economic and Rural Services, Environment Agency

Draft Policy CS13 - Qualified Support

- Policy should be second to last in section 7
- There should be a map identifying those areas important for nature conservation
- Need to ensure that those involved in the management of the land, or development of sites are fully aware of designations and requirements of PPS9 including statutory obligations and “material considerations” such as BAP species and sites
- Protect biodiversity providing the buffer zones are protected, particularly for locally important sites
- Need to mention that many historic parks and gardens have a significant number of ancient, veteran and notable trees and their value. Such trees provide important habitats and preserve part of the cultural history – record previous landuses and boundaries. Such trees are vulnerable to pressure from agriculture and development
- Amend text
 - o “Require” rather than encourage use of native and locally characteristic species
 - o Requiring net gain in biodiversity is onerous and should state that there is no net loss
 - o To “...will not be permitted, except in exceptional circumstances. Where loss and harm cannot be prevented or adequately mitigated, substantial compensation for the loss / harm will be recovered.”

Provided by: CPRE Ryedale Branch, Ryedale Liberal Party, Thorpe Bassett Estate, Dr R Wheeler, Chomley Estate, Hovingham Estate, Environment Agency, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Yorkshire), Taylor Wimpy UK Ltd, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Division), Yorkshire Wildlife Trust, The Woodland Trust

Draft Policy CS13 - General Comments

- Diverse wildlife on the edge of Norton with significant local geological and national conservation sites
- Comments on specific sites and biodiversity concerns will be considered in the Sites DPD
- Would like to see a commitment to restoring ancient woodland which has been replaced with non-native species especially in the HHAONB which contains some of the UK’s most important concentrations. It is essential they are restored before the remnant features and seeds in the soil are lost
- Need a policy for commitment to absolute protection of semi natural habitats which are irreplaceable. There should be more protection for locally important sites: 2.4% of land cover has >85% ancient woodland without statutory protection. The importance of such woodland is set out in PPS9. It is also important as richest habitat for wildlife
- Need reference to the importance of trees and woods in this section
- Need a commitment in the Core Strategy to recording as many ancient trees as possible through the ancient tree hunt and affording them protection through the planning system
- Need a policy with absolute protection to those semi-natural habitats which are irreplaceable eg ancient woodland

Provided by: The Environment Agency, The Woodland Trust, Ryedale Liberal Party, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust, Ms C Knott

Draft Policy CS13 - Implementation Table - Qualified Support

- Include reference to:
 - o The North East Yorkshire Ecological Records Centre as a source of biodiversity evidence
 - o Yorkshire and Humber Biodiversity Strategy and forthcoming delivery plan
- Include specific habitat creation targets to meet the England BAP
- Set out priority areas for biodiversity protection within or partly within Ryedale

Provided by: Yorkshire Wildlife Trust, Natural England

Draft Policy CS14: Green Infrastructure**Draft Policy CS14 - General Support**

- for the policy as a whole
- For connecting up habitats (living landscapes)
- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust would like to be involved in development of green infrastructure – can provide examples from other parts of the UK
- For specific sections:
 - o For the multi-functionality of Green infrastructure
 - o To develop a green infrastructure strategy that can be used to inform site selection and site specific policy

Provided by: Flaxton Parish Council, NYCC Economic and Rural Services, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust, Natural England, Environment Agency, English Heritage

Draft Policy CS14 - Qualified Support

- It is rare that disturbance of species would preclude any multi-functional use of the land. Reword – “A key characteristic of green infrastructure is that it is multi-functional. This multi-functionality should be maximised unless this would have an adverse effect upon a species or habitat of conservation concern.”
- Suggest rewording:
 - o Definition of green infrastructure to make it clearer and to emphasise multi-functionality of green infrastructure (definitions added to full comment)
- Examples of multifunctional uses of green infrastructure to be given eg acting as surface water storage areas
- Add a map / diagram to explain the nature, scope and role of green infrastructure
- The SA noted that VIUA should be continued. If this is to be in CS14 the basis of how sites will be identified needs to be set out in the justification and reference to VIUAs made in the policy itself
- GI networks need to be defined and mapped including open space designations and proposed green wedges
- The need for GI is just as great in rural areas as urban
- Functions of GI to be listed but as a not exhaustive list. Health benefits to be in the list
- Seems to equate rights of way with GI. Suggest rewording to make it clear that there are different scales of GI
- Need to emphasise multifunctionality
- The importance of trees and woods to be emphasised in the policy including their importance for environmental stabilisation, supporting wildlife, provision of materials, recreational opportunities, social inclusion, part of heritage and culture, landscape
- Would like to see the Woodland Access Standard adopted as part of the LDF :
 - o No person should live more than 500m from at least one area of accessible

woodland at least 2Ha in size (11.1% of population of Ryedale – higher than HDC and NYCC) o There should be one area of woodland no less than 20HA within 4km of people's homes (38% of population of Ryedale – higher than HDC)
Provided by: Natural England, Environment Agency, English Heritage, The Woodland Trust, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Yorkshire), Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Division), Taylor Wimpy UK Ltd

Draft Policy CS14 – Disagree
• No need for a green infrastructure policy. It should be part of the climate change policy.
Provided by: CPRE Ryedale Branch

Draft Policy CS14 - General Comments
• With the release of significant areas of Greenfield land, has consideration been given to the greening (through the planting of trees and creating amenity areas) of brownfield sites which can not be developed because of flooding, contamination, poor access.
Provided by: Scampston Parish Council

Draft Policy CS14 Implementation Table - General Support
• For the Green Infrastructure Study – to be completed alongside the Sites DPD • For the accompanying Policy Implementation Table to maximise the opportunities for GI expansion
Provided by: Natural England, Mr M Gwilliam

Draft Policy CS15: Responding to Climate Change

Draft Policy CS15 - General Support
• For the policy in general • For particular parts of the policy: - o Whilst all new development is to be built to the highest CfSH standard it is also subject to feasibility and viability - o Climate change and mitigation - o The provision that renewables will need to demonstrate that there will be no adverse impact on landscape character and setting, especially for the NYMNP and HH AONB • support for some larger scale renewable energy development eg on-shore wind • For the offsetting of CO2 emissions. The NYMNPA policy is similar and has been successful in meeting its aims
Provided by: Natural England, NYCC Economic and Rural Services, West Park Developments, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Yorkshire), Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Division), Taylor Wimpy UK Ltd, Mr K Storey, Crown Properties, CPRE Ryedale Branch, NYMNPA, Mr M Gwilliam

Draft Policy CS15 - Qualified Support

Sustainable Building

- Reuse existing buildings and materials as a starting point for sustainable building
- Developers to demonstrate why building / material reuse is not practicable
- After standard add “zero carbon or better” and delete the rest of the paragraph
- Change to apart for exceptional circumstances, for all residential development over 100sqm, and delete everything after “or its successor”

Reducing Carbon Emissions

- What are the proposals for renewable energy production?
- Need to identify suitable areas for renewable energy and low carbon development
- Support for other renewable or carbon-neutral should be more specific eg mention is made of woodland expansion, intensification and short rotation coppice on flood plains, small scale local biomass projects, identification of a pelleting plant
- Anaerobic digestion from farm and community waste and small scale community projects should be encouraged
- Support the use of ground source heat pumps throughout the district. Closed loop systems do not require a permit. For larger developments, open loop systems will require an abstraction licence and environmental permit for the discharge of water
- Add at the beginning of reducing carbon emissions “despite the bullet points listed below, Ryedale will encourage renewable energy projects within Ryedale”
- Need a more positive statement on renewable energy policy which:
 - o embodies energy efficiency in new development,
 - o on-site energy generation,
 - o encouragement of community energy saving schemes and
 - o locating development to reduce the need to travel (cross reference only)
- In reducing carbon emissions
 - o Threshold of 1000sqm should be reduced with emphasis on on-site renewables as installation will be less expensive at the building stage
 - o Amend text as should be able to deliver 10% CO2 reductions through energy efficiency not just renewable / low carbon
 - o Delete all text after “built environment” in first criterion as the cumulative impact needs to be considered in respect of housing, traffic, tourism. CO2 emissions and climate change need to be considered throughout the document
 - o Delete second criterion
 - o Delete third criterion
 - o Define measurable in the fourth criterion
 - o In the fifth criterion add “should present clear plans for any waste produced in the process”
 - o Decentralised and grid connected renewable energy or low carbon energy schemes should refer to “significant adverse effects”

Flood Risk

- Should include reference to the North East Yorkshire SFRA:
 - o level 1 for invaluable source of information when applying the precautionary approach
 - o on securing (ideally 30%) reduction in surface water off brownfield sites
 - o identifying Critical Drainage Areas (parts of Malton and Norton)
- The precautionary approach needs more explanation – ie in accordance with the sequential tests and exception tests required in PPS25
- Essential infrastructure is allowable in flood zone 3b if it passes the PPS25 Exception Test
- Allocations can be made in flood zones 2 and 3a in all locations not just the principle

town in accordance with para 17 of PPS25

- SUDs must be installed in areas susceptible to surface water flooding
- SUDs and green roofs to be used
- Trees and woodlands can assist with water management issues – the use of broadleaf can help reduce nitrate concentrations by 90% and acidification of water
- Permeable surfaces made a minimum requirement for all development
- All impermeable surfaces to require planning permission
- Rainwater storage and the creation of ponds / storage areas should be included
- Flood risk of all sites (including agricultural land) to be reviewed – assume the Council will be responsible and underwrite any costs through flood damage....and reclassification of the land
- Kirkbymoorside needs to be identified as an area of concern for flooding
- Grip blocking in moorland to be mentioned for flood mitigation, rainwater harvesting and CO2 reduction
- need to refer in the policy to the role which new native woodland and managed woodland can play in alleviating certain types of flood risk associated with climate change by alleviating and slowing the rate of flow
- Suggest rewording:
 - o Para 2.24 – include a target for emissions reduction in line with overall national and European targets
 - o Para 7.25 – third line should read “...use of on-site or decentralised renewable or low carbon energy sources.”
 - o Para 7.26 – the 2016 target for zero carbon is under review and should be recognised in the supporting text.
 - o Para 7.27 – mentions managing visitor numbers as a tool to adapt to climate change, but there is no mention of the mechanism for achieving this or how it is to be monitored.
 - o Add “...better insulation of existing buildings” and “support for expansion of energy efficiency and renewable / low carbon energy enterprises”
- Welcome reference to the Yorkshire and Humber Climate Change adaptation study. Would like to see more information on how Ryedale will respond to the likely impacts of climate change and allow communities to adapt – green infrastructure, SUDs, sustainable building standards and the need for wider adaptations

Provided by: Environment Agency, English Heritage, Ryedale Liberal Party, Thorpe Bassett Estate, Chomley Estate, Hovingham Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust, CPRE Ryedale Branch, Kirkbymoorside Town Council, Scampston Parish Council, Mr M Gwilliam, Dr R Wheeler, Mr M Stenning, Mr K Storey, Taylor Wimpey North Yorkshire Ltd, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust, The Woodland Trust, Church Commissioners for England, Natural England, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Yorkshire), Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Division), Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

Draft Policy CS15 – Disagree

Sustainable Building

- Delete the para which requires independent assessment which identifies the level of relevant building standards that can be achieved,
- There should be a policy directed at retrofitting existing buildings
- Welcome focus on tackling and mitigating climate change but consider the policy is unworkable. The policy should set realistic requirements in terms of sustainable building standards. Proposals would be expected to demonstrate that it is unviable to meet the highest standards. This leads to delays in the planning process and discourage development
- Change from “encourage” to “required” with respect to the use of electric cars

- Further research should be undertaken to ensure such schemes are viable and that charging equipment will be used with respect to electric cars
- It should be a requirement for development schemes to meet the highest environmental standards subject to viability testing. The level of contributions in this document would make the majority of development schemes unviable

Reducing Carbon Emissions

- The Council should set the example by increasing energy efficiency and using low carbon or renewable sources
- With the abolition of the RSS, Ryedale should set its own target for grid connected electricity generation from renewables
- Target for emissions reduction to be consistent with national targets and should seek to comply with NI 185 and NI 186
- Needs to be a more positive statement on energy policy
- 19MW target no longer needs to be set. A positive statement in the CS would help if it was necessary to challenge proposals having a serious negative impact on a valued landscape
- Change from 1000sqm to 100sqm
- “Measurable KWH of power” and “provide KWH power output” is obscure

Provided by: CPRE Ryedale Branch, Ryedale Liberal Party, Thorpe Bassett Estate, Chomley Estate, Hovingham Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust, Dr R Wheeler, Mr K Storey

Draft Policy CS15 - General Comments

- There is a clear need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. This plan is not going to achieve it at a Ryedale level and could be misleading to imply that it will, but it does slow the rate of increase and is therefore better than at present
- PPS25 and the Flood and Water Management Act place a duty on LPAs to develop and implement wider integrated strategies for flood risk that also consider cross boundary strategies
- Flood risk partnerships are developing across the region. Catchment Flood Management Plans information held by the EA
- A renewable and low carbon energy capacity study is underway (draft by end of 2010) to provide a strategic high level capacity for renewable energy
- Renewable energy toolkit is available on-line
- Refer to product substitution such as wood to replace plastic to help reduce carbon footprint
- Encouragement of charging facilities for electric and hybrid cars. The Council should do further research to ensure schemes are viable and that charging equipment will be used
- Need to refer to PPS1 principles of sustainable development and PPS1 supplement – Planning and Climate Change

Provided by: Ryedale Liberal Party, Local Government Yorkshire and Humber, Church Commissioners for England, The Woodland Trust, Thorpe Bassett Estate, Chomley Estate, Hovingham Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust, Dr R Wheeler

Draft Policy CS15 Implementation Table - General Support

- Welcome the inclusion of the Interim Code of Practice for SuDs
- For projects such as “slowing the flow” see peat partnership

Provided by: Environment Agency, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust

Draft Policy CS15 Implementation Table - Qualified Support
• Need to refer in the policy to the role which new native woodland and managed woodland can play in alleviating certain types of flood risk associated with climate change such as “slowing the flow – Pickering” which is mentioned in the Policy Implementation Table • Amend text of first point mitigation to: “reducing the rate of growth for energy by reducing private car use” • Amend text of second point mitigation to: “reducing the rate of growth in energy use by supporting improved energy efficiency” • Amend text of “River Catchment Management Plans” to: “Catchment Flood Management Plans” and “River Basin Management Plans” • Reference should be made to the Catchment Flood Management Plans that affect Ryedale: River Derwent, River Esk and Coastal Streams, River Ouse and River Hull and Coastal Streams, and provide a management framework for managing flood risk over the next 50-100 years • “River Catchment Management Plans” 2nd box to include “reducing flood peaks” • Under “reducing flood risk” the Development Management section should include “Surface water management plans” and “preliminary flood risk assessments” – the responsibility of NYCC
Provided by: The Woodland Trust, Environment Agency, Ryedale Liberal Party, CPRE Ryedale Branch

Section 8: Managing and Controlling Development

Draft Policy CS16: Development Management Policy

Draft Policy CS16 - General Support

- General Support for the policy
- Support for the considerations as listed
- Maintenance and preservation of Character
- Promotion of high Design
- B(ii) extensions
- For the protection of natural resources and ecosystems services
- Land Stability Issues

Provided by: English Heritage, The Coal Authority, Church Commissioners for England, Flaxton Parish Council, Mr K Storey, Mrs E Gathercole

Draft Policy CS16 - Qualified Support

- Welcome making efficient use of land
- Each site should be assessed individually and an appropriate density determined
- Additional points to consider include:
 - Topographic setting to prevent development on higher ground dominating the landscape
- Should not appear to discourage innovative design or materials which may be used to meet energy targets
- The urban environment should not be fossilised
- Add “so as to maximise solar gain” to b (i) siting and orientation
- Need to include reference in b) (ii) to the secured by design website and for general guidance
- Follow Hambleton DC regarding density wording in policy as 30dph needs amendment:
 - “..development being at a density of x dwellings” and “the final density for the development of each site will be determined at the planning application stage taking into account all relevant considerations”.
- Density –
 - To be not less than 30 DPH unless justified within context / area
- The inclusion of travel plans in e) welcomed. Travel plans should demonstrate a firm commitment to reduce the number of single occupancy car trips generated or attracted by a development. The Highways Agency will work with the LPA to advise developers how to prepare, implement, monitor, review and update travel plans, and will consider tri-partite agreements with the council and developers where appropriate.
- Sufficient car parking to be provided with development in non-service villages (eg minimum 2 spaces per property) to avoid problems on the roads especially in tourist areas
- Development should have a garage and space for at least 1 additional car. The lack of public transport to key centres makes car use unavoidable. Not providing such facilities contributes to on-street parking and associated road safety issues
- Include sensitive groundwater source protection zones especially most of Pickering, some areas of Thornton le Dale and an area between East Ness and Sproxtun
- In order to protect the quality of drinking water, certain developments (list provided) within the inner zone of source protection zones will be objected to by the Environment Agency
- The legacy of mining should be considered to ensure that public safety is not

compromised

- Refer to PPG14 as principle source of guidance
- Land instability and mining is not a complete restraint. Surface coal resources are outside of this plan area
- Should state that new development will be expected to protect and enhance biodiversity and landscape character
- Need to recognise soil resources and the functions it provides. See “Soil Strategy for England”
- No mention of issues in CS12 and CS15, archaeology and biodiversity, sustainable drainage or minimal energy and water use in protecting our natural resources and ecosystems
- To avoid inappropriate development near pipelines and hazard sites, a general statement (provided) on major hazard sites should be added
- The EA has produced guidance to locate potentially polluting developments away from sensitive areas
- A number of issues require strong development Management policies:
 - o Development to fund heritage conservation
 - o Diversification of farming
- Refers to CABE document “Planning for Places: delivering good design through Core Strategies”. -Tell the story, set the agenda, say it clearly.- This document is applicable to other DPDs and SPDs
- Parking in villages should be referred to

Provided by: Highways Agency, CPRE Ryedale Branch, Church Commissioners for England, Ryedale Liberal Party, Police Architectural Liaison Officer, Environment Agency, Natural England, Mrs E Gathercole, Mr M Stenning, Hambleton District Council, Slingsby, Fryton and South Holme Parish Councils, The Coal Authority, HSE, Environment Agency, Oswaldkirk Parish Council, CABE Space, Mrs ME Taylor, Shepherd Homes

Draft Policy CS16 – Disagree

- Density –
 - o No longer a national minimum standard – conflicts with PPS3
 - o To exceed 30 DPH in market towns is inappropriate and not justified
 - o Set appropriate targets based on local circumstances
 - o Too great and invariable
 - o Needs to be reworded to reflect change
 - o 30 DPH could be acknowledged as a guide for density with each site being considered on its merits
- Use this policy to guide identification of sites for the Sites DPD
- No further development outside current development limits until this policy is adopted
- No further development outside current development limits until the Sites DPD is adopted
- Concern over absence of local vernacular from “large, impersonal and anonymous national developers” schemes proposed in Pickering
- Encourage local businesses to use local vernacular
- Substantial development in outlying villages should not be permitted - it adversely affects character of the area as in policy CS6
- Coal mining has left its legacy in the area, but this is mainly in the National Park
- The following CABE guidance may be useful: Making Design Policy work, Protecting Design Quality in Planning, Creating Successful Masterplans, By Design
- Important that a telecommunications policy remains in the LDF. PPG8 provides the national guidance which is supplemented by the Code of Best Practice
- There should be a criteria based telecommunication policy

- Concerns raised regarding the lack of a DC Policies DPD. Is the Core Strategy (a strategic document) the relevant document for such policies? For clarity a separate DC DPD should be prepared to provide the detail necessary for development management issues
- Need to refer to previous government consultation document on development managements (December 2009)
- No additional street lighting in Slingsby, Fryton and South Holme due to light pollution concerns
- To ensure developments adhere to the approved plans, when unauthorised developments take place and are reported, it is important that these are investigated and the result reported to those who complained

Provided by: Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Yorkshire), Barrett Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Division), Taylor Wimpy UK Ltd, Taylor Wimpy North Yorkshire Ltd, Shepherd Homes, West Park Developments, Mr Beanland, Mr C Garner, Mr K Storey, Malton Town Council, Norton Town Council, Mr & Mrs A Collinson, Mr M Stenning, The Coal Authority, CABA Space, Slingsby, Fryton and South Holme Parish Councils, Mobile Operators Association, Church Commissioners for England; Mrs D Powell

Draft Policy CS17: Occupancy Conditions

Draft Policy CS17 - General Support

- Support for the policy including
 - o Agricultural/ forestry, other occupancy
 - o Ancillary residential accommodation
 - o The lifting of occupancy restrictions
 - o Local needs, especially for all new housing in other villages and countryside
 - o The use of 3 years instead of 5
- A number of issues require strong development Management policies:
 - o Seasonal occupancy

Provided by: Flaxton Parish Council, Scampston Parish Council, North York Moors National Park Authority, Oswaldkirk Parish Council

Draft Policy CS17 - Qualified Support

- Flexibility in housing provision is needed so some new homes should be for local occupancy not all new homes
- Those residents in self catering chalet and caravans should be excluded from meeting local needs occupancy criteria as they are not permanent residences
- Amendments to text:
 - o a) - Add "an" to adjoining parish
 - o a) - Change from 3 to 5 years
 - o a) - Add "are returning to parish where they have a longstanding connection, including a previous residence of over 5 years, but have moved away due to serving in armed and other services"
 - o b) - Removal of the word "normally" in bii
 - o d) - After "year" in second bullet add "at a reasonable market rent"
 - o d) - Removal "shall normally" and replace with "will"
 - o d) - Removal of the word "normally"
 - o f) (ii) - Add "after such time lifting of occupancy restrictions will still be resisted, unless sold as 'affordable, local needs' housing"

Provided by: Ryedale Liberal Party, CPRE Ryedale Branch, Mrs E Gathercole, Church Commissioners for England

Draft Policy CS17 – Disagree

- With Local needs because it would:
 - o Sterilise otherwise deliverable sites
 - o Fail the tests of Circular 11/95 because it is not reasonable
 - o Not support the spatial strategy
 - o Affect viability
 - o Affect sources of finance to fund housing
 - o Restrict capacity of rural communities to meet their own needs
 - o Undermine sustainable evolution of settlements by restricting free movement of people and skills into these settlements.
 - o SHMAA identifies 60% internal migration within Ryedale. This policy could distort the age of the residential population
- Local needs should be removed
- The policy should be deleted
- Make provision for a mix of housing including affordable, market and local needs
- Each settlement is important to the character of Ryedale so a level of in-migration should be accepted
- Local needs occupancy should not be applied to new build and conversions in other villages and the open countryside
- Implications of the approach are not examined
- Local occupancy conditions should only be lifted following a broader review of housing policies
- The condition will mean low volumes of housing units will be delivered and will not meet local needs, and this will put off new businesses moving into smaller villages
- Flexibility is required

Provided by: CPRE Ryedale Branch, Thorpe Bassett Estate, Chomley Estate, Hovingham Estate, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Yorkshire), Taylor Wimpy UK Ltd, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Division), Mr K Storey, Dr R Wheeler, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust, Church Commissioners for England, NYCC Economic and Rural Services, Mr C Garner, Mr K Storey

Draft Policy CS17 - General Comments

- Old and infirm move to be nearer relatives, similarly younger people move to be near elderly or infirm
- Would like to have this confirmed that this is a definite policy approach

Provided by: CPRE Ryedale Branch, North York Moors National Park Authority

Draft Policy CS18: Developer Contributions

Draft Policy CS18 - General Support

- Support for the policy including in particular, developer contributions for the following:
 - o Environmental and public realm improvements
 - o Green infrastructure networks, biodiversity and habitat compensation measures
 - o Drainage and flood prevention. However, these need to extend to funding for the maintenance, repair and replacement regimes for the life of the development
- As a useful starting point for the Helmsley DPD
- The policy recognises the need to comply with tests in Circular 05/05

Provided by: English Heritage, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust, North York Moors National Park Authority, Natural England, Environment Agency, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Yorkshire), Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Division), Taylor Wimpy UK Ltd, owners of site 479

Draft Policy CS18 - Qualified Support

- Needs to be considered together with policy CS3
- Contributions should recognise and be related to the scale and viability of development:
 - o Smaller developments should not contribute
 - o It will not always be viable to contribute
 - o Contributions should be prioritised
 - o flexibility
 - o Larger development should contribute to local needs
 - o Contributions should be to community facilities eg village shop, play areas, communal free parking
 - o Amend to read: "Where appropriate and viable, developers may be expected to contribute towards..."
- The policy should refer to the need to comply with tests in Circular 05/05 and the CIL Regulations 2010
- Support for measures to improve bus and rail links to York, and for a reduction in the traffic on A64.
- Mechanisms need to be in place to ensure such improvements can be delivered
- The needs of older and vulnerable groups to be incorporated into larger developments

Provided by: Helmsley Town Council, Castle Howard Estate, Fitzwilliam (Malton) Estate, Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation, Mr T Raine, Mr K Storey, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Yorkshire), Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Division), Taylor Wimpy UK Ltd, Taylor Wimpy North Yorkshire Ltd, Church Commissioners for England, Natural England, Adult and Community Education (NYCC), Mr K Storey

Draft Policy CS18 – Disagree

- Developer contributions should not outweigh planning guidance
- Planning applications should be determined in principle before any contributions are decided so that the decision is not swayed by any potential gains
- There should be consultation on any proposed contributions
- The policy is too vague regarding the amount and number of categories
- How will the contributions be decided?

- The application of this policy could be construed as selling planning permissions
- “Appropriate” needs to be defined
- The list of development contributions sought will make many developments unviable
- Contributions should be subject to viability testing
- Priorities should be identified to ensure schemes remain viable

Provided by: Malton Town Council, Norton Town Council, Ryedale Liberal Party, Thorpe Bassett Estate, Chomley Estate, Hovingham Estate, Dr R Wheeler, Cmdr James Life Interest Trust

Draft Policy CS18 - General Comments

- Mechanisms for seeking contributions must be through an adopted DPD
- Developers to pay on time
- All developers to be treated the same
- Contributions to be kept in the village where they are collected
- Parish and Town Councils to be consulted on potential developer contributions to identify the appropriate and effective end use. The current best source of local knowledge is neglected
- What is the Council’s attitude to CIL?
- Where is the detailed policy on developer contributions?

Provided by: Malton Town Council, Mrs D Powell, Mr C Garner, Mr M Gwilliam,

Draft Policy CS19: Housing Site Selection Criteria

Reported to Council 10 March 2011

Section 9: Monitoring

General Support

- Inclusion of changes in areas acknowledged for biodiversity value

Provided by: Natural England

Qualified Support

- The Highways Agency would like to see an indicator relating to the on-going monitoring of travel plans to ensure they are being implemented effectively.
- More specific measures could include % of sites in favourable conservation status, or the amount of local and UK BAP habitat created

Provided by: Highways Agency, Natural England

Disagree

- 75 affordable homes per annum is too small. It should be up to 150 homes. Expect equal if not more from housing associations
- Table difficult to read
- No information about how the indicators will be monitored.
- Some targets are omitted
- Additional column to be added and completed – monitoring mechanism

Provided by: Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Division), Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Yorkshire), Taylor Wimpy UK Ltd, CPRE Ryedale Branch

General Comments

General Support

- For the document as a whole
- An improvement on previous versions
- Covers points raised in the past
- Well prepared and sufficiently covers the main features the LPA needs to address
- For specific policies and approaches
 - o Where no comment has been made support the policy / approach
 - o But have comments on certain points
 - o But reserve the right to consider all proposals and applications on their individual merit
 - o Particularly those that encourage job growth and energy production
- The emerging Core Strategy sets out a basis for a robust framework for how the historic environment will be managed, how potential threats to those assets may be addressed, and how Ryedale's historic buildings and areas may be used more positively to help deliver the wider objectives of the LDF area.
- Many of the fundamental issues suggested contain sound forward planning aspects to move the community forward to 2026.
- The document is for the local taxpayers the people of Ryedale

Provided by: Local Government Yorkshire and Humber, East Riding of Yorkshire Council, NYCC Special Projects, S Harrison Developments Ltd, Great and Little Barugh Parish Council, Environment Agency, Heslerton Parish Council, Howardian Hills AONB, Mr Beanland, English Heritage, Malton and Norton Area Partnership, Amotherby Parish Council, Moorland Energy Ltd, Mr T Raine

Qualified Support

- Understand that residents would not want the district to change beyond recognition. Support measures to ensure this is not the case, but development needs to happen otherwise developers will be discouraged from investing in the area and the many benefits that they could bring will be lost.
- Welcome some policies but disappointed by overall content
 - o Presentation does not encourage participation.
 - o Needs maps and tables to assist understanding.
- The document provides sufficient information to aid the planning application decision making process. However, it lacks specificity in phrasing and tone. To address this needs to be more specific in development situations eg what would or would not be permitted and use of generic examples.

Provided by: Moorland Energy Ltd, Mr M Gwilliam, Oswaldkirk Parish Council

Disagree

Procedural

- Concerned about the evolution of the Core Strategy since the previous version was found unsound
- Sustainability and infrastructure issues have not been properly taken into account and debated. The draft plan was agreed before the Highways Strategy was agreed and the economic policy or other issues debated, or without full consideration of the SA report.

Document layout / text

- The document is littered with jargon, is too complex and is not easily understood
- The layout is confusing
 - There should be a clear division between the policy and supporting text
- The policies are not clear and are too long. They should be refined and made more succinct.
- The strategy and policies are Vague. They refer to other documents which all need to be studied within a short time frame.
- The document is long winded.

Consultation

- Inadequate information easily available. The local library only had 1 copy of the draft Core Strategy and no copies of the evidence documents or SA.
- Concerned that the views of the residents of the parish are not being properly considered.
- Consultation on the LDF has promoted issues and options as opposed to being genuine consultation
- There should be more than consultation on the LDF and the implications. There should be local referenda and publication of the procedures for such so that proposals and changes can be agreed locally
- Keep it simple and to the point and residents may answer questions posed
- Ask local councillors what the constituents want - to avoid another consultation exercise
- I cannot be bothered to comment as it appears nobody listens to local voices anymore.
- This is not democracy. The Parish Plan will be ignored. What is the point of the consultation costing tax-payers money?

Prematurity / Planning Permissions Granted in advance of LDF adoption

- To make any sensible comment is a waste of time. The Council already knows the direction it is going to go with all the planning permissions granted in Malton and Norton ahead of the LDF. How can such decisions be made ahead of the LDF?
- Why are large developments outside of development limits being approved in advance of the LDF? Understand there are powers for non-determination on the grounds of prematurity.
- Confusing to the public when sites being proposed through the LDF are being granted planning permission. Appears some developers are being given priority over others because they are ready to submit planning applications.
- Planning permissions outside development limits and in advance of LDF are detrimental to the planning process. Need to progress the LDF to avoid ad-hoc basis for consideration of planning applications.
- Need to defer planning application decisions which are contrary to intended LDF policies until LDF in place
- Concerned that decisions are being made in advance of the RDS that will prejudice the plan.

Sites

- The consultation document does not in any way reflect the strength of objections by Slingsby Parish to the proposals. These views are supported by extensive consultation for the Slingsby Parish Plan
- Proposed sites in Slingsby would seriously impact on the village and its community – affect the character of the AONB and Conservation Area, loss of key facilities eg playing field, traffic implications with B1257, exacerbate sewage and drainage systems. Infrequent bus service, no proper post office. School not accommodate more children.
- Object to sites in Thornton le Dale due to access and traffic issues, and sites outside village boundary.

Provided by: Cllr P Andrews, Ms C Knott, Mrs D Powell, Mr M Gwilliam, Thorpe Bassett Estate, Dr R Wheeler, Chomley Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest Fund, Hovingham Estate, Mr M Bates, Mr F Ellis, MV & D Roberts, Malton and Norton Area Partnership, Malton Town Council, CPRE Ryedale Branch, Slingsby, Fryton and South Holme Parish Council, Mr B Graham, Thornton le Dale Parish Council, Mrs ME Taylor

General Comments

- Assume “viable” = “finance / profitability” and “feasible” = “technically possible and environmentally desirable”. Do not think the role of the LDF is to ensure profitability
- A waste of time and money. Need to see some action.
- The procedure should be scrapped. The Council should put in place a sensible strategy straight away and pursue it with vigour
- More homes to be built with rooms suitable for office accommodation
- Need to encourage people to stop off in Malton eg a riverside cafe
- The Core Strategy needs to include reference to safeguarding the Beverly-York route that part through Ryedale District and ensure it is protected in the allocations DPD
- The Ryedale Plan covers diverse and complicated problems to attain a secure future for the next generation. It should not be jeopardised by the influence of any particular group or individual pursuing their own agenda (eg Wentworth Street Car Park). All parties to set aside their differences to strive for objectivity and to abide by the democratic decisions reached
- The Ryedale Plan is a challenge to planners – government cut-backs and uncertainty over economic expansion, employment and personal finance, are eroding confidence
- The Malton and Norton Area Partnership wish to share the same general views as the two town councils
- The Local Government Yorkshire and Humber Sub-Regional Planning Assessments relate to the roles of places and will be available when completed
- It is no longer a requirement for LPAs to seek advice or conformity of strategic planning applications or emerging LDFs with the RSS
- No longer a requirement to send monitoring information to LGYH

Consultation

- It would be interesting to know the total number of respondents to this consultation. Would you be willing to publish this figure?
- Is it fair that a plan put together over years by trained professionals is expected to be commented upon by the general public in approx 7 weeks?
- Provide an approximate timescale in which to thoroughly study the Core Strategy

Timescales

- Concerned that effective new development is being adversely affected by the timetable for the planning process
- Regret the amount of uncertainty caused by the proposed 5 year review the proposals for which are ill-defined

Sites DPD

- There is no reason why the sites DPD cannot be published before the end of 2010, or early 2011 at the latest. The various evidence base documents, consultation on the sites and the large number of sites provide all the relevant information
- Difficult to comment on specifics such as housing and employment when the Sites document is to be produced later. Will we be given the opportunity to see and comment on this document?

Helmsley DPD

- Early start on the preparation of the Helmsley DPD in 2011 is needed. NYMNPA request meeting

Evidence Base

- Consider evidence base is still evolving. Until evidence base is completed it is not possible to derive soundly formed policies and strategies
- The Core Strategy is not sound as it is not based on a credible evidence base. It is not the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives. It is not effective due to issues of legibility and flexibility and is not consistent with National Planning Policy PPS12, PPS3, PPS4, PPS5, PPS7

Provided by: Ryedale Liberal Party, Mr D Cockerill, DJ & FK Cockerill, Slingsby, Fryton and South Holme Parish Council, East Riding of Yorkshire Council, Mr T Raine, Malton and Norton Area Partnership, Local Government for Yorkshire and Humber, Mrs ME Taylor, Mr M Bates, K&J Warner, CPRE Ryedale Branch, Mrs AG Woodhead, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Yorkshire) and Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes (NE Division), Thorpe Bassett Estate, Dr R Wheeler, Chomley Estate, Cmdr James Life Interest Fund, Hovingham Estate, Mrs ME Taylor, North York Moors National Park Authority

No Comment at this time

Provided by: Commission for Racial Equality, CABE Space, Network Rail, CE Electric UK