

ANNEX A CONSULTATION COMMENT SUMMARIES

Release of Land to address Conservation Deficit – General Comments

Issues raised

- Appropriate for the LDF to consider how the development strategy address the issue of conservation deficit
- Highlighted the importance of Castle Howard to the District
- Disappointed specific reference to Castle Howard was removed but encouraging that its importance has been recognised
- Castle Howard is committed to carrying out thorough consultation to ensure proposals address concerns of residents of estate villages
- Has the potential to lead to uncertainty in relation to planning housing provision within the settlement hierarchy
- The Castle Howard Estate and the Council held discussions prior to the 2009 consultation although no formal submissions (in relation to this issue) were made or consulted on.
- The Council were a consultee on the preparation of the Castle Howard Management Plan. Residents of the estate villages were not consulted on the document
- Would require close control otherwise any development might detract from the amenity value of the asset itself.

Provided by: English Heritage; Castle Howard Estate; Cllr P Andrews; MV and D Roberts; Mr F Ellis;

General Support

- Ryedale has many historic assets. This should be part of the Core Strategy so that owners do not have to rely on national policy.
- Encouraging that the release of land would enable the repair and restoration of the (Castle Howard) Estate
- Castle Howard Management Plan identifies the areas requiring significant capital expenditure to ensure the long term conservation of important buildings . Costs will quadruple in 50 years if work is not undertaken
- There are mechanisms which would ensure any development was of a standard befitting the area
- Birdsall Estates are in need of enabling development with an estimated conservation deficit of 10 million
- Strongly support the principle to support the repair/ restoration of assets of national, regional or local importance
- Cannot be left to national policy as this is too vague to respond to assets of local significance

• Provided by; Mr Tatham; Castle Howard Estate; Birdsall Estate; Ms D Baines

Qualified Support

General Issues

- Concept is sensible
- Conservation deficit must be demonstrable
- Would need to be supported by robust evidence
- Only where other funding sources have been explored
- Should only apply where the deficit can be realistically met by the release of land
- Should not be restricted to a specific landowner or Estate
- Should be part of the Core Strategy so owners do not have to rely on national policy
- A formal Conservation Management Plan should be a requirement
- Consistent with the need for Local Planning Authorities to express housing targets as floor targets

- Providing principles of the Core Strategy are adhered to
- Providing gain is directed to purpose intended
- Should just be for buildings of national significance
- Applicants will have to justify need and the Council should have absolute discretion in deciding whether a case has merit
- The Council should invite landowners to list worthy cases
- Should be supported in more sustainable/ accessible locations
- Should not be restricted to designated assets when many traditional buildings contribute to the character of the area
- Conforms with/ provides a local context for PPS5 Policy HE11
- No objections provided development is for local needs/ affordable housing only otherwise this would be selling planning permission
- Merits of the site should be the key consideration not the needs of the owner
- Should not be applied to local sites as there are too many of this level of significance. Should be consistent with CS11 of the Core Strategy
- Should not be at the expense of other environmental interests (eg the AONB; Landscape character, biodiversity, accessibility, green infrastructure)
- Applicable to other estates, not just Castle Howard

Raised by; Oswaldkirk PC; Fitzwilliam (Malton Estate; Thorpe Basset Estate; Castle Howard Estate; P Beanland; Ms Knott; Mt Tatham; P Hayward; Mr M Fletcher; Dr R Wheeler; Chomley Estate; CMDR James Life Interest Trust; Hovingham Estate; Ryedale Liberal Party; Natural England; Thorpe Bassett Estate; Dr R Wheeler; Chomley Estate; CMDR James Life Interest Trust; Hovingham Estate

Criteria – Based Approach

- Most appropriate option
- Provides flexibility for future
- Needs to be tight enough to justify excessive development
- Include criteria ensuring other sources of funding have been fully explored
- Should comply with the criteria of the Core Strategy and provide affordable and other developer contributions/ be of benefit to the District as well as the asset
- Could be a policy which amplifies or provides a local context to the implementation of national enabling development policy
- Support subject to any policy amplifying national policy
- Support when this is to meet any conservation deficit
- Should be in addition to stated levels of housing development
- Would allow other landowners to seek additional development if a conservation argument became relevant

Raised By; Mr M Gwilliam; K Storey; Oswaldkirk PC; Mr Tatham; Thorpe Basset Estate; P Hayward; Ms D Baines; Natural England; Dr R Wheeler; Chomley Estate; CMDR James Life Interest Trust; Hovingham Estate; M Gwilliam; K Storey; English Heritage

Identify Settlements/ Locations /Sites- Agree

- Most appropriate option/ support this option
- This option coupled with a Conservation Management Plan to demonstrate how and where value gained will be utilised
- Beneficial as it would prevent owners making applications that are contrary to policy
- Could select sites that would not mar the landscape
- Should be in addition to RSS housing figures and outwith distribution requirements
- Concerned that this would require a robust mechanism for enforceability, linking the development/ allocation of sites to conservation works as this would be beyond the definition of enabling development
- Level of information required to support such an approach would not be far short of that required by an enabling development approach
- Allows a public airing of the issues and may be essential to give some owners the confidence to progress more expensive planning applications but there will be many practical problems to

overcome

- Sites should be allocated without changing the status of the settlement in the settlement hierarchy – this would provide more specific benefit to the Estate

Raised by; Pickering Town Council; Castle Howard Estate; M Taylor; English Heritage;

Identify Settlements/ Locations/ Sites – Disagree/ Concern

- Some concerns over the practical mechanisms used to establish the quantum of development and the robustness of the identification of location
- Settlements which do not correspond with the settlement hierarchy/ development strategy would undermine the integrity of the Core Strategy and make the document unsound
- Sites allocated on this basis would not be defined as enabling development and could not be securely linked to the benefit of the asset
- Identification of settlements/ locations which do not correspond with the settlement hierarchy would inhibit the capacity of Local Service Centres to fulfil their role/ not appropriate to allocate land to benefit one landowner at the expense of the other
- Need for and quantum of enabling development will change over time. Only allocating land will not respond to this.
- Would require a robust mechanism for enforceability to link the development of a site to the restoration/ repair of an asset
- Requires a detailed level of information to support such an approach which is not far short from the information owners would need to provide through an enabling development route. May reduce uncertainty for owners but is not a less involved/ cheaper process
- Specific policy would become out of date and would not respond to new assets

Raised by ;Thorpe Bassett Estate; Dr R Wheeler; Chomley Estate; CMDR James life Interest Trust; Hovingham Estate; English Heritage; D Baines. (Note – many of the objectors/ comments recorded in the general disagree section reiterate the concerns outlined above)

Disagree

Issues raised

- Generally disagree
 - Conflicts with good planning/ contrary to planning law/ subverts the process
 - Sets a precedent
 - Undemocratic
 - Has hallmarks of bribery
 - Conflict of interest with English Heritage
 - Historic assets should not be a determining factor in determining housing allocations
 - National problem which should be dealt with nationally
 - One individual/ organisations should not be favoured
 - Estates should stand on their own
 - Should not allocate land to the detriment of other Landowners/ Estates who have similar difficulties
 - No details as to how this would work in practice
 - Leads to more development pressure as it would be in addition to the 3000 homes planned
 - An explicit policy would become out of date
 - Development should be for the needs of residents
 - If the principle is taken forward it should apply to all assets that contribute to the well being of the District
- Development Land must not be released to fund privately owned assets/ upkeep of private possessions
- Would take a more conciliatory view if they were for publically owned assets
- Funding should be raised by other means (examples given - reviewing expenditure; sale / reuse of other assets, including empty properties; Renewable sources of income)
- Existing enabling development policy should be used/ will suffice

- Is more rigorous/ appropriate
- Ensures funds are used appropriately
- No need for a local policy to support the release of or identify sites as national policy (PPS5) and English Heritage guidance (on enabling development) embed necessary criteria / guidelines/ level of scrutiny
- Approach would be contrary to Government policy (PPS5) and English Heritage Guidance
 - National Policy and Guidance states that plans should not identify land for such sites/ enabling development as the case for enabling development can only be properly considered in the context of a planning application
 - Site specific provisions run the risk of becoming development in accordance with the Plan, which would by definition not be enabling development and could not be securely and enforceably linked to the benefit of the place
 - Has been suggested by some that this issue is not enabling development (development which is unacceptable in planning terms) and the English Heritage guidance is therefore not relevant. This is not the case as under this plan development at non service villages would be considered unacceptable in planning terms
- Contrary to national policy on sustainability – PPS3
- Conflicts with the criteria, objectives and strategy of the Core Strategy
 - Would lead to development in less sustainable/ accessible locations
 - Contrary to objectives to protect the AONB
 - Scale of development would be contrary to objectives aimed at safeguarding the historic built environment
 - Contrary to objectives 3 and 10 and policies CS11, CS12, CS16 and CS19 of the draft Core Strategy
 - CS would be unsound/ its integrity undermined
 - New development sites should be linked to good access to jobs, services and transport
 - Housing development should recognise the requirements and interests of the local community
- Would inhibit the ability of local service centres to fulfil their role in the settlement hierarchy/ would reduce the need for housing land in more sustainable locations
- The allocation of land for this purpose is not appropriate
- Concern over mechanism to establish a suitable quantum of development and robustness of identification of location
- The allocation of land will not respond to changing circumstances - the need and quantum of 'enabling development ' will change
- Concern over the inappropriate scale of development required to address some conservation deficits (which may - examples given - demand year on year development to provide funds; result in development of a scale out of character with the area; place a strain on infrastructure and services, traffic and parking problems in villages; Landscape implications in AONB and settings of Listed Buildings; negate the purpose of conserving buildings and their settings
- Preservation of historic buildings should not be at the expense of an AONB
- Concern it would lead to a repeated commitment to release land to the detriment of character
- Concern over how it could be guaranteed/ policed to ensure funds are used as intended, for conservation
- Concerns over how it would be properly established that funds are required
 - There are no proven / verifiable records of Castle Howard's Conservation deficit. Uncertainty over how this is calculated. Should be independently audited
 - Castle Howard Management Plan is insufficient to justify including sites
 - Only 4.5 million of Castle Howard's own money has been spent on conservation since the 1940's
 - No urgent repair notices have been served by RDC in the case of Castle Howard
- Concern over implications of applying approach to all historic assets which would lead to unlimited housing development across the District
- Concerned that Castle Howard approached the Council before the previous consultation but that this was not mentioned in it

- Against major development in Welburn to help Castle Howard
- Over 80% of Welburn's residents are opposed to the development of more than 10 houses over the life of the LDF
- Would be contrary to Welburn's Parish Plan and those of Crambeck and Slingsby
- Welburn already has a high proportion of rented and social housing
- Development at Welburn would not comply with national sustainable development policy
- Welburn lacks the services to meet the criteria of a service village/ is not a service village
- Welburn is in a AONB. Would alter the character of the village/ area
- Should not be large scale development at Welburn
- Use smaller sites in boundaries
- Access to A64 is already dangerous
- Where would people work?
- Castle Howard has not consulted with Welburn village
- Castle Howard has failed to maintain property for decades
- Villages wish to govern their own affairs via a Parish Council and not a feudalistic way
- Could distort the local tourist economy
- Concerned about Church Lane (Welburn) being an access route
- Welburn had few amenities which is what those you feel would wish to live here will require
- Use sites at Coneysthorpe
- Terrington is very over developed
- Liberal allocation of development sites have the risk of being unsaleable ghost communities

- Majority of residents of Howardian Villages are opposed to this
- Infill is more appropriate

Provided by; CPRE; Slingsby, Fryton and South Holme PC; Scampston PC; Hambleton District Council; Ampleforth PC; Terrington PC; Mrs M Mackinder; Howardian Hills AONB; Helmsley TC; Mr N Symington; Welburn PC; Mr S Danbury; Ryedale Liberal Party; Mr and Mrs T Scott; Mrs E Gathercole; Mr and Mrs A Hewitt; Mr A and Mrs M Bell; MV and D Roberts; Ms E Freer; Mr P Hill; Dr Cox; E Banks; Mr P Benham; K and J Warner; Mr M Southerton; Mr M Fox; P Brown; Mr A Robinson; A Johnson; Mr T Strickland; J Hopkins; A and E Johnson; Mr C Ward; Mr J Magrath; Mrs J Gibson; Mr M Stenning; Mr P Fenby; Mrs Cox; Mrs S Hill; Mr J Lewis; Ms S Symington; Mr E Gathercole; Mr and Mrs Manging; North Yorkshire County Council; Mrs A Barnett; Mr P Pickersgill; P Goodwill; M Southerton (on behalf of client in Wombleton); Mr B Graham; Flaxton PC; Amotherby PC