

Ryedale District Council

Local Plan Working Party

Report: LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – DISTRIBUTION OF DEVELOPMENT CONSULTATION

APPENDIX

CONTENTS (Hold Ctrl + Click to go to question)

[Question 1 – Which factors do you see as being important reasons that should influence where we should locate new development, in particular housing development?](#)

[Question 2 – Which of these options do you prefer and your reasons?](#)

[Question 3 – In general, which settlements do you think could be expanded to accommodate future housing and by how much?](#)

[Question 3a – For Malton and Norton, what further development \(other than existing allocations\) can take place, and if so where is this?](#)

[Question 3b – Do you think that there are any opportunities to grow the town of Pickering and if so, where and why?](#)

[Question 3c – Do you think that there are any opportunities to grow the town of Kirkbymoorside and if so, where and why?](#)

[Question 4a – Thinking about Malton and Norton – are there places where you would not want to see development take place and why?](#)

[Question 4b – Thinking about Pickering – are there places where you would not want to see development take place and why?](#)

[Question 4c – Thinking about Kirkbymoorside – are there places where you would not want to see development take place and why?](#)

[Question 5a – Could growth of Malton/Norton in a particular way/location deliver wider, key infrastructure?](#)

[Question 5b – Could growth of Pickering in a particular way/location deliver wider, key infrastructure?](#)

[Question 5c – Could growth of Kirkbymoorside in a particular way/location deliver wider, key infrastructure?](#)

[Question 6a – What infrastructure improvements are needed to support additional development at Malton/Norton?](#)

[Question 6b – What infrastructure improvements are needed to support additional development at Pickering?](#)

[Question 6c – What infrastructure improvements are needed to support additional development at Kirkbymoorside?](#)

[Question 7 – If you live in a village, what would you say are the most important local village services/facilities to your community?](#)

[Question 8 – What services and facilities do you consider to be essential/need sustaining?](#)

[Question 9 – Are there specific facilities/services that a village should have before we consider allocating land for housing at the village?](#)

[Question 10 – If you live in a village, would you like to see more housing development if it brought wider improvements such as public open space, biodiversity enhancements, as well as address as a minimum any infrastructure requirements of the development?](#)

[Question 10a – If you answered yes to the above question, what type and size of housing development would likely be supported?](#)

Question 10b – If you answered no, is this in relation to a specific settlement? If so, please identify the settlement and your reasons for why you would not wish to see new housing delivered there.

Question 11 – Would you like to see development in the smaller villages? If so, what would be your reasons for this?

Question 12 – Land allocations at the villages have been made to help provide affordable housing in the rural area and to help sustain local services. They could also be used to help support our local landed estates in conserving important heritage assets and landscapes. Do you think that this is something we should be looking to directly support in Ryedale through the review of the Local Plan?

Question 13 – Do you think we should deliver more housing than the Government requires in its ‘Standard Method’ to deliver other aspirations such as more affordable housing, infrastructure and support wider economic development in the district?

Question 14-14a – Should we continue to use the Local Needs Occupancy condition? If yes, should we continue to use it in its current form or with changes to the ways in which we operate the condition?

Question 15 – Do you have any views on the use of a primary residency occupancy condition for new dwellings in your community?

Question 16a – Do we make specific allocations which will be only for Self-Build properties?

Question 16b – Do we employ a set of criteria to assess Self-Build homes by; what should these criteria be; what is most important?

Question 17a – (Development Limits) Do you agree with this approach?

Question 17b – Do we make small scale adjustments to take account of appropriate Self-Build proposals that have been submitted through the ‘call for sites’ event?

Question 18 – How important do you think it is to maximise the following aspects of new development? (Ratings of various sustainability issues)

Question 19 – Are there any other areas of the Ryedale Plan we should be looking to review at this time and why?

Question 1: Which factors do you see as being important reasons that should influence where we should locate new development, in particular housing development?

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|---|
| ID Planning obo The Vistry Group | <p>Development should take place in the most sustainable locations and should therefore be guided by the settlement hierarchy with the majority of development focused in the Principal Town of Malton and Norton.</p> <p>The consultation document indicates that it is likely to be significantly more challenging to deliver the same scale of housing in future plan periods at Malton and Norton as major investment in infrastructure will be required. At this stage there is no evidence to demonstrate the nature of the constraint and the infrastructure that may be required to address it. However, the Council should seek to provide evidence in relation to this matter at the next consultation stage.</p> <p>Supporting the growth of the Principal Town is the most sustainable option and the Plan should focus on seeking solutions which will support the sustainable growth of Malton and Norton. This may require the identification of medium to large sites which will help to support the delivery of new infrastructure but this should be a key priority of the plan in order to support sustainable development objectives.</p> |
| Evolution Town Planning | <p>The majority of development should be located in the most sustainable areas of the district to comply with national planning policy. The most sustainable area is Norton/Malton.</p> |
| Freeths LLP obo Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation | <p>Sustainability is key to determining the location of new development and that means ensuring that new development is located in close proximity to existing services and facilities with good access via non car modes. Moreover, such new development should similarly be located on sites where there are genuine opportunities to create mixed and balanced communities that can be delivered to include mix of unit sizes and range of tenure types with access to good quality green infrastructure for recreation and wellbeing.</p> |
| Persimmon Homes | <p>Persimmon Homes support the adoption of an alternative Spatial Distribution Strategy to guide the distribution of development in the Ryedale Local Plan Review. As noted within the consultation document, Persimmon Homes support the view that infrastructural and environmental capacity and constraints are important factors in deciding on where new development should be located. However, it is also important to take into consideration, and respond to, market requirements and understand the changing demands on where people want to live.</p> <p>As one of the largest housebuilder brands in the UK, Persimmon Homes are always monitoring changes in consumer demands and behaviours. It has found that many of its consumers are now choosing to live in more rural locations away from the larger urban areas where there are typically a higher concentration of jobs and services. This is particularly prevalent due to the significant increase in those people being able to work from home following the Covid-19 pandemic.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--|--|
| Rural Solutions obo Castle Howard | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revitalisation of rural areas inc rural housing and a prosperous rural economy (in line with NPPF) • Some development sites in 2013 Local Plan Strategy have not progressed and infrastructure has not been brought forward; therefore location is important • Need for development at Castle Howard • Castle Howard estate needs to address its heritage deficit • Need for affordable housing in settlements where Castle Howard owns land • Need for new accommodation for Castle Howard staff • New development needs to support local services in village, particularly local primary schools |
| KVA Planning | Landscape and settlement character, setting (landscape and heritage), biodiversity interests, ancient woodland and hedgerows, brownfield sites, green and blue infrastructure, avoidance of coalescence of settlements |
| Steve Murray Associates Ltd | <p>Sustainable location Ability to deliver - no constraints / barriers In keeping with the environment Good quality / mix of designs</p> |
| Carter Jonas obo Nawton, Nunnington, Place Newton, Thorpe Bassett and Westow Estates | <p>Carter Jonas recognises that it is beneficial for a logical hierarchy to be set out to guide the spatial distribution of development. The National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (hereinafter referred to as the NPPF) supports the Government’s objective to significantly boost the supply of homes, to provide a sufficient amount of land that meets the needs of groups with specific housing requirements. Chapter 5 relating to Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes (Paragraphs 60 to 80) of the NPPF does not suggest that development should be limited and focused within one particular area. In line with the overarching objectives of the NPPF detailed in Paragraph 8, it is considered vital that a variety of land comes forward to meet specific housing requirements across the district which includes areas such as ‘Other Villages’.</p> |
| ArkleBoyce | The Local Plan Review in Ryedale provides an ideal opportunity to consider new sites for growth within the District. A range of sites will be required to deliver this growth to ensure that sustainable villages within the District are able to not only survive, but thrive. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Pegasus Planning Group | <p>The need to accommodate the housing requirements in the area. Despite development taking place in the Principal towns (Malton and Norton) & larger settlements such as Pickering, very little has taken place in smaller settlements/villages. There is a need to allocate in these areas to maintain and enhance their facilities & services by ensuring there is sufficient demand.</p> |
| Edwardson Associates | <p>Recognition that Ryedale is a rural district, so there needs to be some scope for residential development in rural areas, villages and the countryside. This should include scope for smaller allocations in a number of sustainable settlements.</p> |
| ELG Planning obo Mandale Homes | <p>No significant comments to make in relation to the factors to be considered as set out in Appendix 2 of the consultation document. We would only add that the previous housing allocation at Ampleforth has already been delivered by the David Wilson Homes scheme, which was quickly taken up and clearly evidences the local need and demand for development in this location.</p> |
| Savills obo the Settrington Estate | <p>As set out at paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2021) the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. At a very high level, the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.</p> <p>It is therefore vital, as part of this overall objective, to meet the housing needs and demands of the District now and in the future. This is to ensure that all residents within Ryedale have appropriate and suitable homes to reside in. To do this, more housing needs to be developed. However, to ensure that the needs of the entire district are met, the housing needs to be developed across Ryedale in sustainable locations (economically, socially and environmentally) whilst meeting the needs of a variety of communities, not just those of the Market Towns.</p> |
| Northminster Properties Limited | <p>It is appropriate to have a fair spread of new development across the district. There is a housing need in every settlement and therefore housing development should not just be concentrated in certain areas. It is important that all communities have the opportunity of benefiting from the advantages that new development brings, be it investment in services and infrastructure or providing new jobs linked to any development.</p> <p>It is also appropriate to consider how working practices have changed and developed over the last 2 years during the Covid pandemic. It is not necessary for people to work from their offices full time, indeed a large number of people will now be adopting near full time working from home practices. Therefore new development needs to reflect this new work reality.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Johnson Mowat obo KCS Development | <p>The factors outlined by the Council in the consultation document relating to infrastructural and environmental capacity and constraints are important. It is welcomed that the Council recognise that the historic focused delivery of housing in Malton and Norton cannot be sustained at the same rate without major infrastructure investment, and we therefore welcome the Council's consideration of an alternative spatial distribution in the Ryedale Plan Review. The spatial distribution needs to support sustainable development.</p> <p>In accordance with the Framework sustainable development within all market areas is required and the spatial distribution needs to ensure that the right quantum and variety of land comes forward in the right locations to ensure that the housing needs of all groups are met.</p> |
| Johnson Mowat obo Yorkshire Land Ltd | <p>It is welcomed that the Council recognise that the historic focused delivery of housing in Malton and Norton cannot be sustained at the same rate without major infrastructure investment, and we therefore welcome the Council's consideration of an alternative spatial distribution in the Ryedale Plan Review. The spatial distribution needs to support sustainable development.</p> <p>The spatial distribution needs to ensure that the right quantum and variety of land comes forward in the right locations to ensure that the housing needs of all groups are met.</p> |
| Savills obo Birdsall Estate | <p>The current distribution strategy of Ryedale is to concentrate new housing at the Market Towns, with a focus on Malton and Norton, and on the ten key Service Villages. Whilst this approach has worked well in the past and has allowed Ryedale to surpass its Local Plan housing requirement (191% in Housing Delivery Test 2021). However, moving forward we consider an amended approach may be necessary to ensure the Council can overcome key constraints associated with this approach, continue to meet its housing targets, ensure the ongoing viability of smaller settlements, whilst embracing and supporting key historic estates.</p> <p>The Distribution of Development paper identifies some of the constraints to a continued focus on development in Malton and Norton. Congestion in the Market Towns is one key issue, which would be exacerbated by significant levels of new development if these settlements remained the focus for future growth. The existing infrastructure in these areas is clearly reaching capacity. The Distribution of Development Paper also outlines that high levels of additional growth will soon begin to impact the character and landscape setting of the Market Towns.</p> <p>Ryedale District is largely rural in nature, characterised by impressive landscapes and open spaces, with market towns and villages dispersed across the District. Towns and Villages in Ryedale are generally characterful. As a result of this tourism is one of the key industries in the District, alongside agriculture. Any future distribution of development should seek to support and enhance the attractive character of the District, to ensure that the visitor economy is supported and Ryedale remains an attractive place to live and visit, whilst also meeting the needs of residents.</p> <p>The NPPF outlines that in rural areas, planning policies and decisions should be responsive to local circumstances and support housing developments that reflect local needs. Clearly dispersing development more broadly, with appropriate levels of development in villages across the District can deliver benefits to rural settlements. Growth in these locations will contribute to creating strong, vibrant and healthy rural communities, improving vitality and providing increased support for existing local businesses. Developer contributions resulting from development in villages will also deliver benefits to the wider community. This should be taken into account when determining the future growth strategy.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--------------|---|
| | <p>Policy SP1 of the adopted Local Plan incorporates an element of flexibility pertaining to Enabling Development. ‘Enabling development’ is development that would be unacceptable in planning terms, but for the fact that it would bring public benefits sufficient to justify it being carried out, and which could not otherwise be achieved. The public benefits are paid for by the value added to land as a result of the granting of planning permission for its development.</p> <p>This Policy makes provision for development in other villages, hamlets and the open countryside which ‘can be justified in order to secure significant improvements to the environment or conservation of significant heritage assets in accordance with the National Enabling Development Policy’. Given the position of the Local Plan review is now running in tandem with the Enabling Development Program for the Birdsall Estate, the identification of suitable development sites promoted by the Birdsall Estate could be successful in supporting the Enabling Development Strategy of the Estate whilst also relieving development pressure on Market Towns in the District.</p> <p>Whilst not specifically mentioned within the Distribution of Development Consultation, we are also supportive of Local Plan Policy SP12 which relates specifically to the conservation and enhancement of the Districts Historic Environment and puts in place specific criteria to inform Enabling Development proposals within Ryedale. There are a number of heritage assets of local, regional and national importance within Ryedale of which Birdsall House represents one example. A supportive policy environment for the maintenance and upkeep of these heritage assets is very much supported. We request that the emerging distribution of development strategy takes this into account when allocating sites for the next Plan period.</p> <p>Given the rural nature of Ryedale, settlements such as Cropton, Leavening, North Grimston, Scagglethorpe and Settrington should be given due consideration when distributing growth. All of the settlements listed are identified as ‘other villages’ within the adopted settlement hierarch and yet have key services which could be further sustained through the distribution of growth.</p> <p>Table 2 below shows the services and facilities available in each village. Each settlement is also served by a local bus service, providing access into the Market town of Malton. The size of the villages also means that any services at the village core, are within walking distance of dwellings in the area. The NPPF seeks to support sustainable development, which includes actively managing patterns of growth in support of sustainable travel objectives and focussing development in locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel 1. Settlement Services in the Village</p> <p>Cropton - Pub - Village Hall - Church</p> <p>Leavening - Pub - Church - Primary School</p> <p>North Grimston - Pub - Church</p> <p>Scagglethorpe - Village Hall</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--------------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pub - Playing Field <p>Settrington</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - School - Village Hall - Wedding and Events Venue <p>In addition, given the rural nature of the District, careful consideration must be given to the support offered to smaller villages through housing growth and the subsequent inward investment this growth will offer. This is particularly relevant following the Covid-19 pandemic, which has resulted in a shift in the requirements of the market, with more people working from home for the long term, and looking for more living space in more rural locations. Whilst many of the sites promoted by the Estate are in rural settlements with few services, we would urge the Council to consider the adoption of a 'Functional Clusters Model' to distributing growth, whereby settlements with essential services (such as a GP surgery, convenience retail, post office or school) form development 'clusters' with more rural villages within an appropriate radius, which do not. This approach will ensure that housing delivery is distributed to support rural settlements and will lead to sustainable development patterns in a Ryedale Context, in line with Paragraph 78 of the NPPF.</p> <p>The below plan demonstrates how the adoption of the Functional Clusters Model could be used to support growth in many of the rural settlements in Ryedale.</p> <p>The Birdsall Estate wish to utilise their landholdings to deliver high quality, well designed housing to meet the needs of the community. The Estate considers good design to be an important element of creating a legacy, delivering great place to live and work for years to come.</p> <p>The Local Plan should seek to deliver growth in locations that can contribute to and enhance the character of a village. Good design at edge of settlement locations is key to this, particularly in schemes which identify the special qualities in an area and reflect these in the development. Although some landscape impact is likely in any edge of settlement locations, development should be located where this can be minimised. The Distribution of Development consultation paper indicates that any more large scale development in the Market Towns could negatively impact the landscape character or the area and the setting of the settlement. Distributing appropriate levels of well-designed housing development more broadly, to Villages across the District, could be one way to minimise this impact.</p> <p>In conclusion, we consider the following to be key elements of determining where growth should be delivered in Ryedale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Location in relation to sustainable transport options - Potential contribution to the vitality of rural settlements - Impact on the character of a village and the District more broadly - Ability to support the protection of heritage assets - Ability to support services in surrounding villages <p>Distributing more growth to rural settlements could ensure Ryedale continues to meet their housing requirement, delivering growth in sustainable locations and reducing the burden on the Market Towns of Malton and Norton whilst also supporting the Estate to fulfil their duty to protect the heritage assets within their ownership.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Savills obo Hovingham Estate | <p>The current distribution strategy of Ryedale is to concentrate new housing at the Market Towns, with a focus on Malton and Norton, and on the ten key Service Villages, including Hovingham. We broadly support this approach, which has allowed Ryedale to be successful in surpassing its Local Plan housing requirement (191% in Housing Delivery Test 2021). However, moving forward, we agree it is important to review this approach to ensure the Council can continue to meet its housing targets moving forward and to ensure the future vitality and viability of sustainable villages, such as Hovingham.</p> <p>The Distribution of Development consultation paper identifies some of the constraints which would arise if the existing growth distribution strategy is taken forward in this Local Plan review with continued focus on development in Malton and Norton. Congestion in the Market Towns is one key issue, which would be exacerbated by significant levels of new development, if these settlements remained the focus for future growth. The existing infrastructure in these areas is clearly reaching capacity. The Distribution of Development Paper also outlines that high levels of additional growth will impact the character and landscape setting of the Market Towns.</p> <p>Ryedale District is largely rural in nature, characterised by impressive landscapes and open spaces, with market towns and villages dispersed across the District. Towns and Villages in Ryedale are generally characterful and as such, along with agriculture, tourism is one of the key industries in the District. Any future distribution of development should seek to support and enhance the attractive character of the District, to ensure that the visitor economy is supported and Ryedale remains an attractive place to live and visit, whilst meeting the needs of residents.</p> <p>The NPPF outlines that in rural areas, planning policies and decisions should be responsive to local circumstances and support housing developments that reflect local needs. Clearly locating development in service villages such as Hovingham can deliver benefit to these settlements. Hovingham is an active rural village, which benefits from a number of shops and services, including a GP and a Primary School.</p> <p>It is extremely important to the Estate that Hovingham is living village. Growth in Hovingham will contribute to creating a strong, vibrant and healthy community, improving vitality and increased support for existing local facilities, services and businesses through increased footfall, developer contributions and visitor income. The ability to be able to truly enhance the vitality and viability of villages such as Hovingham should be taken into account when determining the future growth strategy.</p> <p>In a Ryedale context, settlements such as Hovingham are sustainable locations for growth. Hovingham is located a short distance from the abundant shops and services in both Malton and Norton, located circa 7 miles south east of Hovingham. Both Market Towns can be accessed by bus service. The size of the village also means that all of the shops and services at the village core, are within walking distance of dwellings in the area. The NPPF seeks to support sustainable development, which includes actively managing patterns of growth in support of sustainable travel objectives and focussing development in locations which are (or can be made) sustainable, through limiting the need to travel¹.</p> <p>The Hovingham Estate wish to utilise their landholdings around Hovingham to deliver high quality, well-designed housing to meet the needs of the village. The Estate considers good design to be a vital component in creating a legacy, making Hovingham a great place to live and work for years to come. We would therefore strongly support more growth within Hovingham, which would enable the Estate to deliver this vision.</p> <p>The Local Plan should seek to deliver growth in locations that can contribute to and enhance the character of a village. Good design at edge of settlement locations is key to this, particularly in schemes which identify the special qualities in an area and reflect these in the development. Although some landscape impact is likely in any edge of settlement location, development should be located where this can be minimised. The Distribution of Development consultation paper rightly indicates that additional large-scale development in the Market Towns could negatively impact the landscape character and the setting of the settlement.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| | <p>Therefore, by distributing appropriate levels of well-designed housing development more broadly to appropriate locations of Service Villages such as Hovingham, would help mitigate these concerns, whilst providing the much needed growth and injection of life into the village to help support and sustain its services and facilities.</p> <p>In conclusion, we consider the following to be key elements of determining where growth should be delivered in Ryedale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Location in relation to existing shops and services - Location in relation to sustainable transport options - Potential contribution to the vitality of rural settlements - Impact on the character of a village and the District more broadly - Impact on heritage assets - Impact on landscape considerations - Infrastructure capacity <p>Distributing more growth to Service Villages such as Hovingham could ensure Ryedale continues to meet their housing requirement, delivering growth in sustainable locations and reducing the burden on the Market Towns of Malton and Norton by distributing growth more broadly.</p> |
| Spawforths obo Keyland Developments | The current Local Plan is based on a settlement hierarchy approach, however a more cogent strategy would be to consider the role and function of each settlement and its ability to grow sustainably. This approach would seek to balance economic and housing growth across the district. |
| Home Builders Federation | The HBF considers that it is important that the spatial distribution of sites follows a logical hierarchy, provides an appropriate development pattern and supports sustainable development within all market areas. The NPPF sets out how important it is that a sufficient amount and variety of land comes forward where it is needed and to meet the needs of groups with specific housing requirements. |
| North Yorkshire Local Access Forum | in easy walking access of facilities (shop, school, Doctor, Post office, community centre etc); easy access to open space/countryside for recreation; good broadband, use of all brown/empty sites to avoid further encroachment of countryside; |
| Network Rail | The impact of new development on nearby level crossings (and the efficient and safe operation of the railway). It is understood that there is already road traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Malton Level Crossing and the road over this crossing is a key access route between Malton and Norton. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------------------|---|
| North Yorkshire Police | Within Ryedale there is a response Police Team which will be based at Eden Camp development and one within the Community Safety Hub at Ryedale House at Malton. Ryedale is beset by geography and this impacts upon our 999 response times. To that extent I would prefer developments to be along the arterial routes – A64, A170, A169. |
| Heslerton Parish Council | Concern has been expressed at the capacity of local services infrastructure to cope with further development. This must be a condition of any planning permission that the capacity of services, Water/Electricity/Sewage etc. must be enhanced. |
| Wintringham Parish Council | Local opinion, infrastructure, impact on landscape and biodiversity |
| Malton Town Council | Traffic, Air Pollution, Infrastructure. |
| Chair Wintringham Parish Council | Protecting the green belt and the views of local people |
| Amotherby Parish Council | 1. Access to services and infrastructure capacity - GPs, sewage etc 2.The REAL need for new housing in light of the upcoming review of housing targets by Mr Gove, Minister for Housing (see attached article from The Telegraph) 3.The views of local Parish Councils and residents |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|------------------------|---|
| Pickering Town Council | <p>New housing is necessary for Pickering, but housing developments must be accessible for travel and must be able to access the appropriate infrastructure. It is important to recognise that some of the local road network does not have capacity for additional traffic and in Pickering the junction around Lidl and around the A170 are already at capacity. The need for improved infrastructure should be addressed so that appropriate land can developed for housing.</p> |
| Member of the public | <p>New development should be spread evenly and proportionately across all Ryedale villages and towns in order to help sustain the economic viability of the services and facilities that exist in all those places. Catchment villages for local schools are equivalent village clusters that support the sustainability of <asc>39</asc>service village<asc>39</asc> facilities - be they the local bakery, pub, shop or village hall.</p> <p>Whilst it is true that only certain villages have school buildings, every village and town settlement in Ryedale - indeed every child of school age - has a local school. It is the catchment villages (the village clusters >) that support the schools, and the same catchment villages that support and sustain the facilities and shops etc in our so-called service villages.</p> <p>The idea that a village is somehow sustainable (or more sustainable) due to the presence of a shop or pub or a local bus, presents a distorted view of how modern rural communities and rural economies work and survive. It is an overly simplistic view of rural life which ignores the extent to which much local trade and shopping is now done online.</p> <p>The key to understanding and unlocking the potential and viability of all Ryedale villages (and towns) is to acknowledge the interconnectedness and interdependency of our communities.</p> <p>The populations of Ryedale other villages support the so-called service villages shops and pubs and village halls which, in turn, serve the other villages. It is a naturally occurring circular economy that has been the same for 100 years. There are no village shops in Ryedale service villages that are viable businesses without the custom (passing trade) they receive from tourists and cyclists and walkers, and without the support and custom they receive from their smaller cluster village cousins. From my experience of running a small rural-based enterprise for over 25 years, I doubt that there is a single village facility in Ryedale that could or would survive on the business it receives from its own village inhabitants.</p> <p>As people and places, we rely on each other. It is the majority of people living in small villages in Ryedale who underpin the sustainability and prosperity of the so-called service villages. We are mutually dependent.</p> <p>For the above reasons I believe all Ryedale villages should be treated equally and the distribution of new, unencumbered, housing spread evenly and proportionately across all the villages and towns in the district.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|------------------|---|
| Member of public | Existing Infrastructure, proximity to shops, schools, doctors, public transport, leisure activities. Impact on the environment and carbon footprint. |
| Member of public | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) it should be close to local services - shops, healthcare, leisure, etc to minimise travel 2) housing should be near employment opportunities 3) public transport should be easily accessible |
| Member of public | <p>Infrastructure...shops, employment, doctors, public transport.</p> <p>It is important to conserve the countryside and heritage we have in Ryedale.</p> |
| Member of public | Maintaining/improving biodiversity, assessing flood risk with reference to predicted climate changes; environmental impact |
| Member of public | Respect the rural nature of Ryedale by restricting development of villages while allowing growth to housing and infrastructure in its main towns, which would encourage residents to shop rather than travelling to York or Scarborough |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|------------------|---|
| Member of public | Affordable housing so local families can stay in the village or town they grew up in if they so wish. |
| Member of public | Developments should be sustainable with access to services and amenities. |
| Member of public | Access to existing public services and transport links |
| Member of public | Balanced design & location. issue of local occupancy housing for rural village/open countryside needs to be re-addressed so the policy works to help sustain these villages & areas |
| Member of public | Maintaining the character of local villages |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|------------------|--|
| Member of public | Where there is a need and also an infrastructure of services to deal with additional housing and or Industrial development. |
| Member of public | Provide a high-quality environment and protect those attributes of the Ryedale Local Development Framework (LDF) Plan area which are considered to represent Critical Environmental Capital namely High Quality Agricultural Land and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) |
| Member of public | Local infrastructure - shop, transport including road access, school including distance to schools |
| Member of public | My thinking is that the "principal town approach is valid. Having lived in York and the North East previously I have witnessed the impact of concentrating investment on current assets in creating a sustained, vibrant community. Diluting investment across many sites tends to dilute impact. |
| Member of public | There has been lots of development in the major towns as part of the current Plan, which has altered them in many ways most notably that the amount of traffic has increased. Every house seems to have 1.5 cars on average but apart from minor interventions the infrastructure hasn't really changed to cope with this. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|------------------|---|
| Member of public | <p>Current road infrastructure and amenities - such as shops, leisure opportunities, bus services, schools, work opportunities,</p> <p>Maintaining the integrity of local environment</p> |
| Member of public | <p>New houses should be built where there is demand and where the services can be supplied without significantly increased costs.</p> |
| Member of public | <p>The key is to ensure all communities remain active and that young people including those with young families have the opportunity to live and add to village life. Whilst the current plan has worked well in terms of getting infrastructure into the larger towns it has done nothing for the smaller villages where the policy has stagnated the villages providing no opportunity for younger people to acquire property and they are left waiting for people to die and then having to compete with second home buyers who have no restrictions on using a property as a second home or commercial holiday cottage (arguably this should need a change of use permission!).</p> <p>The combination of this is villages effectively becoming retirement villages with arguably greater demand on resources than school children needing to catch a bus to school.</p> <p>There is no need/desire for "estate" type building in the smaller villages and in fact new houses should be encouraged to have their own individual character as occurred when these settlements commenced.</p> |
| Member of public | <p>Bringing visitors into the Ryedale District is important as it generates income for many people in the hospitality industry. The Howardian Hills offers natural beauty, the villages are generally idyllic with lots of character - this is a draw card. The more you build them up, the less character they have. Other areas will be better able to compete with what can be offered here.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| Member of the public | <p>Given the Government’s commitment to combating climate change, the key factor should be sustainability. This means that all new housing should be located close to places of work, leisure and other facilities such as schools, major shops and healthcare so that there is no need to travel by car. Even electric cars require electricity to operate – and it will be a very major challenge to meet targets set for carbon reduction while producing sufficient electricity for all future uses in heating, transport and other uses. Major work will be required on the electricity grid system as well as in generation.</p> <p>This approach also allows for the efficient deployment of new infrastructure to a large number of properties with single developments, rather than piecemeal improvements in many small and widely dispersed locations. This applies to the provision of public transport, cycling and pedestrian ways, roads, electricity supply, gas mains, water supplies and internet access. I include gas because it is a Government aim to use hydrogen as a replacement fuel. This is likely to be more effective than air source heat pumps which still use a large amount of mains electricity, placing further demand on the network. Most current public transport options are insufficient. Even in towns such as Pickering, there is no public transport access to and from York in the later evening. All villages have a wholly inadequate public transport system as daytime services are infrequent and evening services are almost non-existent. A car becomes a necessity.</p> <p>New development should only be located where the road system is adequate and unlikely to increase accidents. Narrow country roads are therefore not suitable for increased housing development.</p> <p>Given recent events in Ukraine, it is clear that there needs to be a sea change in attitudes to the supply of food. This puts far greater emphasis on the preservation of agricultural land which should not therefore be used for housing. Brown field land should be extensively developed instead.</p> <p>With ever increasing requirements for housing driven largely by inward migration, it is critical to protect the rural environment and landscape from unacceptable and extensive development of any kind. This protection must be a key element of planning policy in Ryedale.</p> |
| Environment Agency | <p>We recommend that the distribution of development should actively avoid / discourage new development in areas of that hold significant environmental value. For example, development should not occur within (or in close proximity) to areas with existing conservation designations and protected habitats or species.</p> <p>The distribution of development should aim to both protect and enhance the District's environmental resources for all including areas of international and national importance, the character and qualities of the Districts heritage, landscape and countryside and maximise the contribution they can make to the delivery of wider economic and social objectives.</p> <p>Ryedale’s network of surface water bodies (including streams, rivers, floodplains, wetlands, canals, ponds etc.) play an important role in contributing to the areas habitat network. They also provide wider ecosystem services. We recommend that the Local Plan review makes use of existing data – such as the detailed river network, Humber River Basin Management plan (RBMP), Water Framework Directive (WFD) surface water body data and the Ryedale district habitat network – to identify key areas where new development should be avoided (or at least carefully planned). Further detail is provided below.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-----------------|---|
| | <p>There is often a tendency to promote brownfield site redevelopment over greenfield site development. In most cases we support the effective and efficient re-use of previously developed land. However, there are circumstances where redevelopment of brownfield sites over greenfield sites may not be the environmentally optimal solution. In some instances previously developed land may hold (or have the potential to hold) significant environmental / ecological value. For example, a brownfield site can also be important stepping stone within an existing wildlife corridor, and therefore can be valuable in providing connectivity within ecological networks. This is particularly relevant where previously developed land lies next to rivers and streams – as these are the only location where the river environment can be improved to provide the blue infrastructure that is valuable (for health, wellbeing, biodiversity and climate change mitigation etc.). Based on the above we recommend that the presumption for development on brownfield sites over greenfield sites should be qualified with a statement that recognises the need to assess both the current and future / potential environmental value of the previously developed site prior to making the decision. For example, previously developed land immediately adjacent to river corridors, even if currently in a poor state, has a high environmental value – to unlock previously lost environmental value through de-culverting rivers and streams should be given weight when determining site selection.</p> <p>Flood Risk Flood risk will form an integral part of your decisions as to where to locate development, and to what scale and distribution. This should principally be informed by the SFRA(s) that are in preparation, ensuring that all sources of flood risk are taken into account and assessing flood risk now and in the future.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Your Local Plan policies should be used to make it clear how flood risk within the authority area will be used to inform development proposals. We have made separate comments against the existing policy SP17 (Natural Resources). • Through the above, you will be able to use the Sequential and Exception Tests (where they apply) to help identify suitable sites for development. We draw your attention to the latest SFRA Guidance (https://www.gov.uk/guidance/local-planning-authorities-strategic-flood-risk-assessment), and also the recently published SFRA best practice guide (https://adeptnet.org.uk/system/files/documents/FRS18204%20SFRA%20Good%20Practice%20Guide_Final_Nov2021.pdf). <p>Ground water protection The Environment Agency would wish to see new development set away from sensitive groundwater settings, such as groundwater source protection zones (SPZs) where groundwater is utilised for potable water supply.</p> |
| Natural England | <p>We recognise that the decision making around the distribution of development is an important stage for the Local Plan. Natural England advises that in order to allocate the most appropriate sites to deliver high quality, sustainable development, environmental issues and opportunities should be considered as an integral part of the assessment process.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|---|
| Historic England | <p>We welcome the recognition given to the need to understand the capacity of the settlements to adapt/accommodate the amount of development and to understand what new infrastructure may be required to deliver that development, taking account of historic/cultural and environmental sensitivities that may be present at a place. This understanding of the capacity of settlements is critical in order for the Council to put forward a spatial strategy in the Local Plan that will deliver sustainable development, as required by paragraph 11 of the NPPF. The first paragraph on page 6 of the paper refers to looking at the environmental capacity and constraints of places. This review should include a consideration of the historic environment.</p> <p>The NPPF make is clear that enabling development is development that is not otherwise in accordance with adopted policy. Paragraph 202 of the NPPF states that “local planning authorities should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies.” We would therefore urge caution with the use of the phrase enabling when discussing heritage unless you are fully satisfied that all of the necessary conditions are met. Advice on enabling development can be found on Historic England’s Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 4: https://historicengland.org.uk/imagesbooks/publications/gpa4-enabling-development-heritage-assets/</p> <p>We welcome the reference made to the consideration of landscape setting and impacts on the form and character of the settlement, including heritage and archology, in determining appropriate locations for land allocations in the Local Plan Review. We also support the preparation of background papers for each settlement subject to allocations as part of the evidence base to the plan review.</p> |
| NYCC Strategic Policy and Economic Growth | <p>Access to Services, green Space, Jobs and community are all factors which contribute to healthy, sustainable places and communities and should be considered when establishing a suitable approach to the spatial distribution of development. Ensuring that that the high quality homes, including affordable homes, are in locations that support the principles of healthy place shaping would be encouraged. This includes, but is not limited to, such considerations as the creation of Complete and Compact neighbourhoods; that places are connected and provide enhanced walkability and the provision on green and open space.</p> |
| NYCC Minerals and Waste Management | <p>When assessing sites of potential development Safeguarding policies in the emerging Minerals and Waste Joint Plan should be considered and acted upon if criteria have been met.</p> <p><u>Waste water infrastructure provision</u></p> <p>When considering new housing developments the capacity of the waste water and sewage infrastructure needs to be taken into consideration and whether any improvements would need to be made to accommodate the additional waste water and sewage which would be generated.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|---|
| NYCC Highways | <p>As with the 2016 report, any aspirations to grow and develop strategic villages/towns within Ryedale should provide a transport evidence base to aid development. This should also be accompanied with a robust developer contributions funding mechanism, to deliver the transport infrastructure (IDP) to support the Local Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, without an updated development log to summarise the “most likely” and “near certain” sites within the detailed study area for residential and employment land use to be developed in a study area by 2038, it will be difficult to provide a specific response to the each of the questions set within the consultation.</p> <p>It is our recommendation that that a strategic transport review be carried out, based on proposed development locations and associated trip rates and distributions, which will be needed to identify potential mitigation; and to produce outline cost estimates for the proposed mitigation as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>This analysis is an essential element of the evidence base underpinning the preparation and justification of any site allocations, which will help:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of any major constraints on the local roads network as a result of Local • Plan proposals. • Assessment of any improvement measures to support the above. • Provide feedback and allow for consultation between key stakeholders, including • Ryedale District Council, North Yorkshire County Council (as the Local Highway • Authority) and the Highways Agency (for impacts upon the A64 trunk road). • ☑ Provide a transport evidence base to aid development of a robust developer contributions funding mechanism, to deliver the transport infrastructure to support the Local Plan. |
| NYCC Local Lead Flood Authority | <p>Each location identified within the Distribution of Development Consultation document is nonspecific and will be affected by fluvial and/or pluvial flood risk to a greater or lesser extent, depending on the location of individual sites, which are still to be determined. Additionally, there may be instances where groundwater and sewer flooding will need to be considered, depending on each specific location. Each site/location will be unique, therefore it will be difficult to reasonably satisfy the question presented and provide underpinning advice from which to make sound decisions.</p> |
| NYCC Children and Young People's Services | <p>From the perspective of the Children and Young People’s Service (CYPS) ensuring that developments are able to be supported with appropriate sustainable Education provision is a very important factor. In addition it is preferable if pupils are able to live close enough to Educational establishments that they can easily access on foot. It is preferable that development occurs where school places are available or where the impact of the development can be mitigated for example via the expansion of an existing school or by providing a new school.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------------|---|
| NYCC Adult and Social Care | <p>Population projections evidence that Ryedale has an aging population that is increasing, alongside an increase in people requiring care homes or nursing care and people who are living with dementia.</p> <p>Population data also indicates that the number of people living with a learning disability are increasing.</p> <p>From an Adult Social Care perspective ensuring that developments have appropriate access to the local community with housing that is accessible for people with all disabilities or older people (including but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Affordable with housing benefit limits• level access / modern wheelchair accessible,• mix of individual occupancy and shared accommodation – extra care, supported living and support housing• essential safety features for people with complex needs including ligature safe accessories or sound proofing, damage proofing etc),• dementia and autism friendly accommodation• ☑ close to specialist health, social and educational services for younger / transitions |

Question 2:

Option 1: Continue the existing approach of the Ryedale Plan- the more explicit growth strategy which focussed on the towns and the Principal Town in particular- concentrate new housing at the Market Towns and key 'Service Villages' with meeting local needs elsewhere.

Option 2: A less concentrated, more dispersed approach to distributing growth - with development focussed at the Market Towns and specific villages, including existing 'Service Villages' and selected additional villages.

Which of these options do you prefer and what are your reasons?

All Option 1 responses

| Organisation | Option | Reason |
|-------------------------------------|--------|---|
| ID Planning obo The Vistry Group | 1 | <p>We support Option 1.</p> <p>The existing approach focuses growth in the Principal Towns and then the Market Towns. This approach ensures the majority of development is in the most sustainable locations with access to jobs, shops, services and public transport choices. These are the settlements that are most suited to growth and development in the higher order towns will support their role and function in a sustainable manner.</p> <p>In locating development in the most sustainable town this approach will help to reduce congestion and air quality issues as jobs, shops and services will be within walking and cycling distance without people being reliant on private car use. A dispersed approach will result increase travel to access shops and services in the higher tiers and thereby increase air pollution and congestion in the Principal Town.</p> <p>In following the settlement hierarchy, this also directs the majority of growth to the areas where the greatest need for affordable housing is. The distribution of the majority of new development in the Principal and Market Towns will therefore support the delivery of affordable homes where they are most needed.</p> |
| Evolution Town Planning | 1 | <p>Option 1 is the most sustainable option, it reflects the existing local plan which has been examined by an inspector and meets the requirements of national planning policy.</p> |

| Organisation | Option | Reason |
|---|--------|--|
| Freeths LLP obo Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation | 1 | Option 1 is consistent with National Planning Policy. Malton should be the principal focus for new development as it is the most sustainable location with all necessary social and physical infrastructure to support growth. Moreover, a number of the Preferred Options for development that were identified in the preparation of the now adopted Ryedale Local Plan were not ultimately allocated because they were not required to meet housing requirements at that time but remain suitable and deliverable as part of the Local Plan Review. Option 2 is significantly less sustainable. |
| PB Planning | 1 | Whilst there is robust evidence to support maintaining the current strategy for the distribution of housing growth to Malton/Norton, the same evidence would also support an increase in the distribution of growth to the settlement area to 60%. Furthermore, the allocation of our client's land interest at Land Adjacent to Norton Lodge (Ref. 253) would enable the continued delivery of the District's previous/current successful and sustainable distribution of development strategy. |
| ELG Planning | 1 | As set out above, FME's preference would be option 1, which focuses new development on the Market Towns, and they have put forward the site at Castle Howard Road as a sustainable extension to Malton. This approach is considered to be the most sustainable approach to future development (and as such, the approach most in line with the NPPF), and would allow for further strategic infrastructure improvements to take place which would be of benefit to the town, and indeed the wider area. FME are eager to work with Ryedale District Council to create a scheme that would complement the existing built environment at suitable scale that meets the needs of the local area and does not impact on the nearby AONB. |
| ArkleBoyce | 1 | By providing a dispersed approach to distributing growth and allowing for modest growth within Harome will allow key businesses within the village to be sustained through the local community and even encourage the location of additional services. |
| Pegasus Planning Group | 1 | We agree that a greater proportion of housing development should be focused on Market towns and service villages. However, in the last plan period, 74% of completions have been in the larger settlements, which demonstrates an over-focus has been placed on these. As seen in Appendix 2 of the consultation document, only 2 allocations were made in service villages. |

| Organisation | Option | Reason |
|--|-----------|---|
| Spawforths obo Keyland Development Ltd | Option 1b | <p>Option 1 is effectively a continuation of the current development plan. It assigns development levels dependent upon the size of the settlement, but it does not consider the role and function of that settlement, or the needs and aspirations for that settlement. It focusses most development in Malton and Norton (50%) followed by Pickering (25%), Kirkbymoorside (10%) and Helmsley (5%) with circa 10% in the Service Villages.</p> <p>Option 2 considers an extreme dispersal strategy expanding more growth into the Service Villages and smaller villages throughout the district.</p> <p>The Options report suggests that further growth to Malton and Norton at the rate from the current plan is not sustainable due to perceived technical constraints in accommodating that level of growth. However, the Options report does not consider other approaches to accommodating the housing need of the district.</p> <p>Keyland consider that a more appropriate and balanced option would be to review the spatial distribution between the Market Towns and increase and direct growth to those larger settlements, such as Pickering that can accommodate that growth. Redistributing growth between the Market Towns would direct growth in a sustainable manner to those settlements that already have services and facilities.</p> <p>Keyland consider this suggested Option 1b is the more appropriate approach for the district and reflects the Framework on promoting a sustainable pattern of development to meet development needs, whilst meeting as a minimum the objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses. Such an approach would also reflect paragraph 73 of the Framework which suggests providing sustainable extensions to existing towns and villages where they are well located to support a sustainable community with sufficient access to services and employment opportunities.</p> <p>Therefore, Keyland suggest that if Malton and Norton is not able to accommodate 50% of the new homes the district needs and requires, that the proportion that is not able to be accommodated is redistributed firstly to Pickering, which is the next largest and sustainable Market Town, followed by Kirkbymoorside and then Helmsley. Scenario testing should be undertaken to identify the most appropriate proportions and quantum.</p> |
| North Yorkshire Police | 1 | <p>The concentration of the populace in market towns shortens response times as they are on arterial routes. In addition there is a greater access to diversion and support services for the vulnerable in larger towns - many of the vulnerable we support feel isolated in villages without appropriate transport links.</p> |

| Organisation | Option | Reason |
|----------------------------------|--------|--|
| Heslerton Parish Council | 1 | Development needs to be tailored to meet the local employment opportunities with locations being driven by this factor. |
| Wintringham Parish Council | 1 | The existing plan has been successful, worked well, is easy to understand and explain to residents. |
| Chair Wintringham Parish Council | 1 | The current approach has worked well. It is clear, understandable and logical. This strategy has consistently exceeded Ryedale's new homes target over the past few years. There is much high value landscape in Ryedale. |
| Member of the public | 1 | It is likely that the non-service villages will not meet the criteria and will lack the important factors relating to existing infrastructure. Expansion in villages with no amenities will increase road transport. When considering Existing Infrastructure, proximity to shops, schools, doctors, public transport, leisure activities. Impact on the environment and carbon footprint. |
| Member of public | 1 | Services, transport, etc are all accessible in town. Children can walk to school. Employment is close by. Rail link and regular buses. Access to major roads. People want to live in market towns for convenience. Malton is highly regarded |
| Member of public | 1 | There is no point in developing areas which lack the necessary infrastructure...this will only cause further environmental and climate issues. |

| Organisation | Option | Reason |
|------------------|--------|---|
| Member of public | 1 | Concentrate on 'brown field' sites to maintain countryside biodiversity and ensure support of the Environment Bill by commitments to both protecting and increasing woods and trees in Ryedale. |
| Member of public | 1 | Many of the villages have no facilities, poor road access, no public transport, and low quality technology connectivity. These will not be provided by either large or small builders. |
| Member of public | 1 | Market towns and service villages will have existing infrastructure. Future development can be carefully integrated into existing population centres to minimise community concern. |
| Member of public | 1 | Ensures that some affordable housing is provided in the larger service villages as well as at the towns |
| Member of public | 1 | Maintains the character of more local villages |

| Organisation | Option | Reason |
|------------------|--------|---|
| Member of public | 1 | No point in increasing village sizes by adding housing where there is limited or no public transport for those who have no car. Equally no point in adding industrial sites where there is no unemployment problem. |
| Member of public | 1 | The existing policy is providing sustainable housing growth within the wider district. |
| Member of public | 1 | These villages have existing infrastructure that can support and sustain growth - increased housing in smaller less serviced villages will simply increase road usage at a time when we should be seeking to use less resources |
| Member of public | 1 | Malton/Norton are in need of further development and investment as the centre of the Ryedale area. Those villages which are identified as service villages can also expand in a controlled way and create viable communities. |
| Member of public | 1 | <p>We live in an AONB - wish to maintain this for everyone to enjoy.</p> <p>Not to loose the character of the villages</p> <p>Not to increase traffic on single track country roads. New housing in towns makes for a stronger economy and a commercial hub for surrounding population.</p> |

| Organisation | Option | Reason |
|----------------------|--------|--|
| Member of public | 1 | <p>Infrastructure already in place.</p> <p>More people in the larger towns mean more money generated to pay for the improved infrastructure.</p> <p>The additional people can support more restaurants, sports facilities and thus greater appeal.</p> |
| Member of the public | 1 | <p>Option 1 – continue the existing approach of the Ryedale Plan and focus the majority of housing towards the Principal Town and Market Towns. For the reasons discussed below, the majority of growth should be directed towards the Market Towns of Pickering and Kirkbymoorside. Malton and Norton, Pickering, Kirkbymoorside and Helmsley are home to approximately half of the District’s population. They provide jobs, services and education for the communities both within the towns themselves and also act as service hubs for the wider rural hinterlands. They benefit from the most frequent public transport facilities and are sustainable locations for growth. The majority of growth should therefore be directed towards these towns which will deliver affordable housing in areas where it is needed and support economic development. In 2019/2020 the majority of affordable completions were in the Market Towns, with only 5 affordable homes delivered in one Service Village and 1 affordable home elsewhere. If more growth were to be directed towards Service or other villages it is likely that affordable needs will not be met as these villages are less likely to be able to accommodate large sites which will contribute towards affordable housing. The Council has suggested that major investment in infrastructure may be needed to sustain the same scale of housing within Malton and Norton as has occurred in the current Plan Period if improvements to congestion and air quality are to be achieved in the future. Whilst Malton and Norton should still be a focus for growth, a higher proportion of growth should be directed towards the Market Towns. Helmsley is heavily constrained by its location within the North Yorkshire Moors National Park and so the majority of growth should be directed towards the Market Towns of Pickering and Kirkbymoorside.</p> <p>The remainder of the population is dispersed across over 100 villages across the District. The majority of these villages are small, rural villages and only a very limited number support a range of services or have good public transport links to Market or other towns. The limited number of villages which do support a range of services are defined as ‘Service Villages’ within the Local Plan and have a minimum range of services considered to help support a sustainable community. These facilities typically include a primary school, convenience store and reasonable bus service.</p> <p>Service Villages could therefore support a small amount of growth The SHLAA shows that the majority of new development has taken place in Market Towns and there has been a high proportion of completions on larger sites, which provides confidence in the existing approach</p> |

| Organisation | Option | Reason |
|----------------------|--------|---|
| Member of the public | 1 | <p>Option 1 – but with the whole focus on market towns – not even the service villages which are becoming over developed.</p> <p>The advantages of option 1 which are stated in the document are very powerful ones. I whole heartedly agree with the first 5 stated, but less so with the remaining 3.</p> <p>No village offers sustainable development. Access to cars is still a key requirement as public transport in all villages are limited to infrequent daytime trips to the nearest market town. Car travel is still required for trips to doctors, hospitals, leisure facilities and shops. Rather than cutting down on car travel, rural schools tend to increase it as many spaces at such schools are occupied by pupils from nearby towns whose parents believe the quality of education will be better. Once they reach secondary school age, children need to travel to nearby towns and their extra curricular and social lives require parents to act as taxi services with many additional car journeys. Village shops cannot supply the bulk of shopping requirements for villagers. At best, they act as somewhere to top up on basics or often luxury treats. They cannot compete on price with supermarkets and so main shops are still carried out in the towns.</p> <p>Even if new developments in villages helped sustain existing services, those services are unlikely to be sufficient to make the development truly sustainable.</p> <p>A key area of housing shortage is for young families trying to buy their first home. Villages can never fully provide for the needs of such families as regards work, secondary education and social facilities. They are better served living in towns, close to such facilities.</p> <p>Current housing levels in villages were set in earlier centuries when agriculture was a labour intensive industry. It is not now – so large numbers of houses are not required for this purpose. Where there is a requirement for housing for those working in this or other rural industries, such development is currently allowed by virtue of applying a local occupancy condition which also ensures the market value of the property is more affordable.</p> <p>Any housing allocations in villages will simply draw in those from elsewhere who wish to vacate the cities and does not serve the local population. They will often be retired and so will put added pressure on health and social care services.</p> <p>Apart from agreeing that there is a limited supply of sites at Service villages, I do not find the disadvantages for option 1 to be convincing. Improved infrastructure to create truly sustainable development will be required anywhere that new development happens – and that expenditure will be more efficiently and effectively spent in the towns rather than the villages.</p> <p>Having seen what some major landowners are considering by way of development opportunities (even within the AONB), it is very clear that by allowing some development it would open the floodgates to the destruction of the rural nature of many villages. Any expansion of villages (including the service villages) which would be truly sustainable would require such a level of expenditure on all aspects of infrastructure and services that it could only be justified by effectively turning them into new towns. This is unacceptable in the rural landscape of Ryedale.</p> |

| Organisation | Option | Reason |
|--------------|--------|--------|
| | | |

All Option 2 responses

| Organisation | Option | Reason |
|-----------------------------------|--------|---|
| Persimmon Homes | 2 | <p>Persimmon Homes support the view that the primary focus of housing delivery in Malton and Norton cannot be sustained. Instead, a more dispersed and less concentrated approach to distribution growth which would seek to deliver housing in the most sustainable locations across the region is more appropriate. Less emphasis on focusing the bulk of development in Malton and Norton will in tandem reduce the harm to their built form and character, as well as omit the need to require significant infrastructure investment to overcome the environmental impacts resulting from further inappropriate growth in those locations.</p> <p>Option 2 is supported which would result in an increased housing delivery being directed to the northern market towns of Pickering and Kirkbymoorside, as well as a dispersed distribution to the Service Villages and sustainable selected additional villages, to help sustain crucial local services and facilities.</p> |
| Rural Solutions obo Castle Howard | 2 | <p>Castle Howard's preferred option is option 2.</p> <p>The selection of option 2 would allow many of the important needs and opportunities for development referenced in relation to question 1 to be realised.</p> <p>Option 1 refers to the existing approach. This includes a more urban centric planning model with 85% of housing development proposed for allocation in the four main settlements in the adopted Local Plan.</p> |

| Organisation | Option | Reason |
|--------------|--------|---|
| | | <p>From discussions with Officers, we understand that there are some major allocated sites on the edge of major settlements which have not delivered allocated housing development. In these circumstances allocation of additional development to these larger settlements when existing allocations have not been met would appear to be sub-optimal.</p> <p>In addition, since the existing local plan strategy was adopted there have been a number of factors that suggest that option 2 is the preferable one. These factors include:</p> <p>i) Rising house prices, particularly in popular rural areas, such as Ryedale District, have created challenges for local communities in terms of affordability. House price increases make it more difficult for young people to live in rural settlements, thereby reducing the sustainability and vitality of these settlements. These changes have knock-on effects for rural businesses, such as Castle Howard, in terms of recruiting and retaining staff, as they find it difficult to accommodate new workers.</p> <p>The adoption of option 2 allows the issue highlighted above to be tackled effectively through the delivery of affordable housing as a proportion of new housing developments. A general increase in housing stock to include market housing will also provide opportunities for people to access the housing market in rural areas. In some cases, providing smaller housing will not only provide options for those wishing to get onto the housing ladder but also for more elderly people who wish to downsize, thereby freeing up larger houses for occupation by families.</p> <p>ii) One positive impact of the pandemic has been to accelerate the use of information technology and acceptability of people working from home. This presents an unparalleled opportunity for rural communities as more of the working age population can make housing location choices based on the ability to work from home, those residing in villages during the working day can also support rural businesses.</p> <p>This changing pattern has profound implications for planning and makes a dispersed level of growth a more strategically favourable option.</p> <p>The continuation of the existing approach (Option 1) could lead to all of the following negative impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The continuing ageing of the population in rural villages, without affordable housing (on developments of scale). • As a result of the above, pressure on local services such as schools and businesses. • Continued ‘in commuting’ to some villages to have children educated at village school, with pupil numbers from the village itself continuing to fall. NB. More information in relation to school rolls is provided in section three. • In commuting by staff to village businesses and the Castle Howard Estate operation, if indeed staff can be found who are willing to travel a distance to work. <p>For the reasons set out above and the responses provided in relation to question 1, it is considered that option 2 provides the most cogent spatial option for Ryedale. Option 2 is by no means a radical option, but it would deliver powerful benefits.</p> <p>For someone looking back in the future on both the Local Plan Strategy (2013) and Local Plan Review plan periods, the delivery of development under option 2 would simply be seen as a sensible and proportionate ‘rebalancing’ of the approach taken under the adopted Local Plan Strategy.</p> |

| Organisation | Option | Reason |
|--------------------------|--------|--|
| | | |
| KVA Planning | 2 | Less pressure on Malton and Norton which has issues with congestion and air quality, ensures affordable housing is delivered in service villages as well as towns supporting smaller communities, may help to sustain smaller villages |
| Amotherby Parish Council | 2 | <p>More houses needed - Amotherby PC prefer Option 2 for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The concept of being a Service Village when falsely combined with another settlement is wrong. It has lead to Amotherby being given a totally unsuitable housing allocation in terms of numbers in the current Local Plan. We do not want any other allocations foisted on us. • There are other small villages where small scale development could be accommodated and would be welcomed. |
| Amotherby Parish | 2 | <p>Give smaller local building firms ability to build rather than huge conglomerate building 50+ houses in one development.</p> <p>Allow some development in the villages to keep them "alive" and existing services there such as pub to continue to thrive</p> |
| Malton Town Council | 2 | More development in the service villages will encourage the services to continue to exist. |

| Organisation | Option | Reason |
|-----------------------------|--------|--|
| Habton Parish Council | 2 | Although the present policy has certainly helped rejuvenate Malton it is so concentrated it will flood the existing infra structure and inadvertently help kill off some villages. Option 2 would be acceptable if it is reworded: "A less concentrated and more dispersed approach to distributing growth across the towns and villages of Ryedale", that a revision of the existing village and town development limits be initiated" |
| Steve Murray Associates Ltd | 2 | <p>Delivery of smaller scale developments</p> <p>Enhanced opportunities for small / medium housebuilders</p> |
| Barton Willmore | 2 | Our Client supports a more dispersed approach to development which will allow development in selected additional villages which are not currently designated in the Local Plan. Development in selected additional villages should be proportionate to the scale of the settlement and located within or adjacent to the built form of the settlement. |
| Carter Jonas | 2 | <p>We consider that the 'Other Villages' such as Nunnington, Pockley, Thorpe Bassett, Westow and Wintringham are capable and as such, should be considered for expansion to accommodate future housing.</p> <p>Paragraph 79 of the NPPF identifies that planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, and it is recognised that where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. We consider that development in 'Other Villages' would support nearby services in accordance with Paragraph 79. Furthermore, development within 'Other Villages' would also support Paragraph 80 of the NPPF, as development of this kind would not result in "the development of isolated homes in the countryside".</p> |

| Organisation | Option | Reason |
|--------------------------|--------|--|
| Edwardson Associates Ltd | 2 | <p>As stated above, Ryedale is a rural district and there is a need to sustain the vitality of rural communities and support local services. A dispersed approach would facilitate this objective. Careful consideration of scale and other development management considerations can ensure development can be accommodated in a variety of smaller rural settlements</p> |
| Northminster Properties | 2 | <p>It is important that there should be a more dispersed approach to distributing growth across all settlements within the district. This is for the following reasons: Small scale new development in the smaller settlements will attract new investment into areas where local services are reducing. New development will help to sustain local services and assist in bring in new services and local jobs. Since the Covid pandemic working practices have changed substantially. With more home working opportunities people to do not need to be living in the main settlements. With a more dispersed development strategy people will have a greater choice of where they would like to reside. Bringing new development to smaller settlements will bring in new people into this settlements helping sustain them for the future. There will be enhanced opportunities for smaller housebuilders and also for self-build opportunities across the district. It will be easier to the housing numbers required by having the ability to include a wider range and number of sites. By having a greater number of smaller sites in smaller settlements the district will not be reliant on the delivery of larger single sites. Thus diversifying the delivery of new housing and ensuring that delivery will take place as if the delivery of a single large site is delayed this will have a large impact on the district. It will bring a greater amount of choice to the population and requires less land to be released in towns which will struggle to identify large deliverable sites.</p> |
| | 2 | <p>With regard to the principle of the approach to distributing development in Ryedale, our client, the Church Commissioners for England, support Option 2: “A less concentrated, more dispersed approach to distributing growth – with development focussed at the Market Towns and specific villages, including existing ‘Service Villages’ and selected additional villages”.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that Option 2 would see some changes to the approach to the distribution from that currently within the Ryedale Plan, however, whilst it would continue to seek to deliver housing at the market towns with less emphasis on Malton and Norton, it would propose to deliver a greater proportion of housing at the villages in the District. Our client very much supports the more disbursed approach to development.</p> <p>Our client supports future growth in Ryedale and in particular that which supports the vitality and viability of a wider range communities, not just the Market Towns key ‘Service Villages’.</p> |

| Organisation | Option | Reason |
|--------------------------------------|--------|--|
| Savills obo The Church Commissioners | | <p>Whilst we acknowledge that, historically, the focus was placed on Malton and Norton to secure major infrastructural improvements in and at the two towns, and to deliver affordable housing where it was considered to be primarily needed, going forward it would be significantly more challenging to deliver the same scale of housing in future plan periods at Malton and Norton without the need for even more major infrastructure investment and improvements, which as a result, would significantly alter the settlements' character.</p> <p>In addition, the current adopted spatial policy has led to the delivery of only a number of modest housing completions outside of the Service Villages and Market Towns, with only 12% of housing completions between 2012 and 2021 being in such locations. As such, villages have been subject to very limited development, restricting housing opportunities and market choice for residents throughout the more rural areas of the district.</p> <p>To address such issues, it is considered that the most appropriate method would be to support modest development growth in a wider range of villages throughout the district to accommodate future development which is commensurate with the size of the existing settlement. This would continue to help meet the housing targets and development needs of Ryedale (a primarily rural area) whilst complying with paragraph 79 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2021 which states "To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby".</p> <p>Furthermore, since the adoption of the Ryedale Plan, the NPPF also now requires Local Planning Authorities to ensure that at least 10% of their housing allocation are on sites which are less than 1ha in size (paragraph 69a). Modest development in villages across the District will ensure that this national policy requirement is met.</p> <p>The delivery of more smaller-scale housing schemes can help support/sustain a greater range of village services. As set out at paragraph 69 of the NPPF, small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, and are often built-out relatively quickly. This also enhances opportunities for small/medium housebuilders to operate across a wider number of locations to improve choice in the housing market. As such, we do not agree with the assertion that small/medium sites create a less reliable land supply due to greater uncertainties around delivery. This can be said more about the larger strategic sites relying on infrastructure delivery etc. Small and medium sized sites should be supported throughout the district as part of the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>Having allocations and sites that vary in size brings a greater level of choice to the types of allocations available and housing types for residents. For larger scale development (10+ dwellings), it also ensures that affordable housing will be delivered in the more sustainable villages as well as the larger settlements in the District, rather than just relying on rural exception sites.</p> |

| Organisation | Option | Reason |
|------------------------------------|--------|--|
| | | <p>In addition, due to the rural nature of the District, and the number of villages within it, villages, in line with paragraph 79 of the NPPF could be considered in clusters. For example, Sand Hutton and Claxton have a joint village hall and therefore combines could be considered together to house greater development. Please see our comments below for further detail on this matter.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that Option 2 is the most appropriate option in terms of future distribution of development which would also comply with national policy and guidance as referenced above.</p> |
| Savills obo The Settrington Estate | 2 | <p>With regard to the principle of the approach to distributing development in Ryedale, our client, the Settrington Estate, very much supports and prefers Option 2: “A less concentrated, more dispersed approach to distributing growth – with development focussed at the Market Towns and specific villages, including existing ‘Service Villages’ and selected additional villages”.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that Option 2 would see some changes to the approach to the distribution from that currently within the Ryedale Plan. Whilst it would continue to seek to deliver housing at the market towns with less emphasis on Malton and Norton, it would propose to deliver a greater proportion of housing at the villages in the District. Our client very much supports the more dispersed approach to development.</p> <p>The Settrington Estate supports future growth in Ryedale and in particular that which supports the vitality and viability of a wider range communities, not just the Market Towns and key ‘Service Villages’.</p> <p>Whilst we acknowledge that, historically, the focus was placed on Malton and Norton to secure major infrastructural improvements in and at the two towns, and to deliver affordable housing where it was considered to be primarily needed, going forward it would be significantly more challenging to deliver the same scale of housing in future plan periods at Malton and Norton without the need for even more major infrastructure investment and improvements, which as a result, would significantly alter the settlements’ character.</p> <p>In addition, the current adopted spatial policy has led to the delivery of only number of modest housing completions outside of the Service Villages and Market Towns, with only 12% of housing completions between 2012 and 2021 being in such locations. As such, villages have been subject to very limited development, restricting housing opportunities and market choice for residents throughout the more rural areas of the district; thus impact on house prices and affordability by the nature of supply and demand.</p> <p>To address such issues, it is considered that the most appropriate method would be to support modest development growth in a wider range of villages throughout the district to accommodate future development which is commensurate with the size of the existing settlement. This would continue to help meet the housing targets and development needs of Ryedale (a primarily rural area) whilst complying with paragraph 79 of the NPPF 2021 which states “To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby”.</p> <p>Furthermore, since the adoption of the Ryedale Plan, the NPPF also now requires Local Planning Authorities to ensure that at least 10% of their housing allocation are on sites which are less than 1ha in size (paragraph 69a). Modest development in villages across the District will ensure that this national policy requirement is met.</p> |

| Organisation | Option | Reason |
|--|--------|--|
| | | <p>The delivery of more smaller-scale housing schemes can help support/sustain a greater range of village services. As set out at paragraph 69 of the NPPF, small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, and are often built-out relatively quickly. This also enhances opportunities for small/medium housebuilders to operate across a wider number of locations to improve choice in the housing market. As such, we do not agree with the assertion that small/medium sites create a less reliable land supply due to greater uncertainties around delivery. This can be said more about the larger strategic sites relying on infrastructure delivery etc. Small and medium sized sites should be supported throughout the district as part of the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>Having allocations and sites that vary in size brings a greater level of choice to the types of allocations available and housing types for residents. For larger scale development (10+ dwellings), it also ensures that affordable housing will be delivered in the more sustainable villages as well as the larger settlements in the District, rather than just relying on rural exception sites.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that Option 2 is the most appropriate option in terms of future distribution of development which would also comply with national policy and guidance as referenced above.</p> |
| Johnson Mowat obo KCS Developments Ltd | 2 | <p>Continuing with the existing approach in the Ryedale Plan which focuses on the towns and in particular the Principal Town of Malton and Norton is not considered to be the most appropriate option moving forward in the Ryedale Plan Review.</p> <p>KCS prefer the alternative Option 2 of a less concentrated, more dispersed approach to distribution growth, which would result in a lesser emphasis on housing delivery in Malton and Norton. Option 2 is supported by KCS on the assumption that this would result in more of the housing requirement being directed to the northern market towns of Kirkbymoorside and to a lesser extent Pickering (given the flooding and congestion constraints in Pickering). A dispersed distribution as proposed in Option 2 would need to ensure a focus to the Market Towns and the most sustainable villages.</p> <p>It is recommended that the wording of Option 2 is amended to make specific reference to a more focused delivery of housing to the sustainable Market Town of Kirkbymoorside.</p> |
| Johnson Mowat obo Yorkshire Land Ltd | 2 | <p>Continuing with the existing approach in the Ryedale Plan which focuses on the towns and in particular the Principal Town of Malton and Norton is not considered to be the most appropriate option moving forward in the Ryedale Plan Review.</p> <p>Yorkshire Land Limited prefer the alternative Option 2 of a less concentrated, more dispersed approach to distribution growth, which would result in a lesser emphasis on housing delivery in Malton and Norton. Option 2 is supported which would result in an increased housing delivery being directed to the northern market towns of Pickering and Kirkbymoorside, as well as a dispersed distribution to the Local Service Centres (Service Villages) and sustainable selected additional villages, to help sustain crucial local services and facilities. A dispersed distribution as proposed in Option 2 would need to ensure a focus to the Market Towns and the most sustainable villages.</p> |

| Organisation | Option | Reason |
|--|--------|--|
| Savills – On Behalf of Birdsall Estate | 2 | <p>We strongly support Option 2, which proposes a more dispersed approach to distributing growth. Whilst we consider some growth to Market Towns is positive and necessary, the significant levels of growth located in Malton and Norton in recent years and the associated capacity issues and other constraints mean that more rural Villages should be allocated growth going forward, in recognition of the important contribution they can make to the District housing requirement and to ensure their on-going viability.</p> <p>The Distribution of Development consultation paper outlines a number of infrastructure capacity issues in Malton and Norton, any significant growth in these settlements would therefore be likely to require significant infrastructure improvements to facilitate it. This will undoubtedly slow the pace of delivery in the District. The Consultation Paper also identifies that there are limited sites available for further growth in these settlements, which are constrained by Flood Risk and the Howardian Hills AONB.</p> <p>In contrast, the Birdsall Estate have put forward a number of sites in Villages across the District, which would be suitable for an appropriate scale of housing. It is considered that in each instance, there is sufficient infrastructure to support an appropriate level of growth and this growth distribution strategy could relieve the pressure on Market Towns.</p> <p>We have also outlined within our response to Question 1 the numerous benefits that can be realised through the distribution of growth to these Villages. Cropton, Leavening, North Grimston, Scagglethorpe and Settrington all benefit from services which benefit local residents. Duggleby and Wharram- Le- Street are smaller settlements, however when viewed as a cluster, development in these locations would make a valuable contribution to the economic viability of nearby local services.</p> <p>Growth in Villages and other rural settlements, such as those listed above, will also ensure that an appropriate level of affordable housing can be delivered. High house prices in rural villages, driven by a lack of supply, often results in residents having to leave in order to secure more affordable homes. The distribution of growth to these areas will contribute an appropriate mix and tenure of homes to meet the housing needs.</p> <p>It is also important that the emerging Local Plan considers the market requirement in a post-Covid world. The pandemic has resulted in a shift in working practices, with more people working from home and a reduction in commuting or travelling for work. In turn, there has been an increase in demand for homes in countryside or village locations. A Savills research publication (Appendix 4) has demonstrated that the pandemic has resulted in a ‘race for space’ with a strong market of people upsizing to larger homes with gardens, in more rural area. It also demonstrates greater activity in the higher price bands with rise in the average size of home transacted.</p> <p>The Distribution of Development Consultation Paper identifies some disadvantages to a more dispersed distribution of development to villages across the District, however we do not feel these are significant constraints which should limit development. We address these in turn below:</p> <p>Rebuttal to Disadvantage 1: ‘Would involve the expansion of selected villages, which could put pressure on their character or some of their existing services’</p> <p>The Birdsall Estate have submitted a number of sites proposed for residential or employment uses through the Call for Sites process. Whilst many of these sites are small, infill plots which would deliver below the threshold considered for allocation, a number of larger sites have also been put forward which are located on the edge of settlements. The intention would be to deliver high quality housing schemes in these</p> |

| Organisation | Option | Reason |
|---------------------------------------|--------|---|
| | | <p>locations, which do not significantly impact the character of the Villages. It is also considered that existing services and facilities within close proximity to the sites (either in the same village or in a village located within a 5km radius) will benefit from the additional economic contribution.</p> <p>Rebuttal to Disadvantage 2: 'Would see a greater dispersal of development- this may increase some travelling to access services and facilities at the towns'</p> <p>It is important that the sustainability of Villages with existing services is recognised. The NPPF promotes development in rural settlements in order to contribute to a settlements vitality and sustainability. Whilst we recognise that local village services can only provide for limited needs of residents, all of the villages within which sites have been put forward by the Estate, are within a 5 mile radius of a Market Town or larger service village, meaning shops and services are readily available. All of the Villages also benefit from a local bus service running to Malton, which provides sustainable travel options to the plentiful services in the Market Town.</p> <p>Rebuttal to Disadvantage 3: 'Less reliable land supply with small/ medium sites as roll out due to greater uncertainties around delivery'</p> <p>The Birdsall Estate are committed to seeing an appropriate level of growth delivered on land within their ownership which could not be a more reliable supply. Small and medium sites are more appropriate in Village locations, yet still have significant potential to contribute towards the Districts Housing Land Supply. The NPPF is clear on the benefits of Small and medium sized sites2:</p> <p>'Small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, and are often built out relatively quickly'</p> <p>The Framework suggests that small and medium sites should be encouraged, requiring 10% of a Districts housing requirements be delivered on sites no larger than 1 ha. Small and Medium sized sites should also be promoted given they can often be delivered by local housebuilders, supporting local trade.</p> |
| Savills On behalf of Hovingham Estate | 2 | <p>We strongly support Option 2, which proposes a more dispersed approach to distributing growth. Whilst we consider some growth to Market Towns to be positive and necessary, the significant levels of growth located in Malton and Norton in recent years and the subsequent capacity issues mean that Service Villages, such as Hovingham should be allocated higher levels of growth going forward, in recognition of the important contribution they can make to housing need.</p> <p>The Distribution of Development consultation paper outlines a number of infrastructure capacity issues in Malton and Norton, any significant growth in these settlements would therefore be likely to require significant infrastructure improvements to facilitate it. This will undoubtedly slow the pace of delivery in the District. The Consultation Paper also identifies that there are limited sites available for further growth in these settlements, which are constrained by Flood Risk and the Howardian Hills AONB.</p> <p>In contrast, the Hovingham Estate have put forward a number of sites within a key Service Village, which would could accommodate an appropriate scale of housing. It is considered that there is sufficient infrastructure to support the proposed level of growth and this growth distribution strategy could relieve the pressure on Market Towns.</p> |

| Organisation | Option | Reason |
|--------------------------|--------|---|
| | | <p>We have also outlined within our response to Question 1 the numerous benefits that can be realised through the distribution of growth to these Service Villages. Hovingham benefits from a number of services, such as a church, school, convenience stores, a bakery and café, a public house and a hair salon. Additional growth within the Village would make a valuable contribution to the economic viability of these local services.</p> <p>Growth in Service Villages, such as Hovingham, will also ensure that an appropriate level of affordable housing can be delivered. High house prices in the village, driven by a lack of supply, often results in existing residents having to leave in order to secure more affordable homes. The distribution of growth to these areas will contribute an appropriate mix and tenure of homes to meet the housing needs.</p> <p>It is also important that the emerging Local Plan considers the market requirement in a post-covid world. The pandemic has resulted in a shift in working practices, with more people working from home and a reduction in commuting or travelling for work. In turn, there has been an increase in demand for homes in countryside or village locations. A Savills research publication (Appendix 2) has demonstrated that the pandemic has resulted in a 'race for space' with a demand for homes in more rural location. Whilst this needs to be balanced with existing housing needs, there is the opportunity, through appropriate growth to provide a mix of homes to meet the varying needs and demand at a micro and macro scale.</p> <p>The Distribution of Development consultation paper identified some disadvantages to a focus on Service Villages, however we do not feel these are relevant to the distribution of additional growth to Hovingham.</p> |
| Savills | 2 | <p>Option 1 suggests a continuation of the current distribution strategy of Ryedale which is to concentrate new housing at the Market Towns, with a focus on Malton and Norton, and on the ten key Service Villages, including Ampleforth. Whilst we acknowledge that this strategy has allowed Ryedale to be successful in surpassing its Local Plan housing requirement (191% in Housing Delivery Test 2021), we consider the adoption of Option 2 is more realistic moving forward. Option 2 proposes a more dispersed approach to distributing growth, focussing growth in Service Villages such as Ampleforth.</p> |
| Home Builders Federation | 2 | <p>More development in the service villages will encourage the services to continue to exist.</p> |

| Organisation | Option | Reason |
|------------------------------------|--------|--|
| Member of the public | 2 | Although the present policy has certainly helped rejuvenate Malton it is so concentrated it will flood the existing infrastructure and inadvertently help kill off some villages |
| North Yorkshire Local Access Forum | 2 | <p>Amotherby PC prefer Option 2:- We do not want any other allocations foisted on us because we have been artificially linked with Swinton to be a "Service Village".</p> <p>There are other small villages where small scale development could be accommodated and would be welcomed.</p> |
| Member of the public | 2 | "Give smaller local building firms ability to build rather than huge conglomerate building 50+ houses in one development. Allow some development in the villages to keep them ""alive"" and existing services there such as pub to continue to thrive" |
| Member of the public | 2 | Option 1 difficult to do in short term due to infrastructure issues. Infrastructure is critical and shouldn't be rushed. Some of the service villages have the capacity for new housing, therefore Option 2 is better. This should be combined with a review of the development limits in these locations. |
| Member of the Public | 2 | I do not think we should exclude the other villages from any development if there is demand for new housing. This implies accepting smaller developments which would attract local builders rather than the national house builders. |

| Organisation | Option | Reason |
|----------------------|--------|--|
| Member of the Public | 2 | Both options are very controlling and do not encourage the traditional mix of young and old in the smaller villages. Option 2 is the better option but it would be sensible to consider every village having potential and not "selecting" |
| Member of the public | 2 | Having read the notes on Option 1 and Option 2 and the subsequent questions, my first reaction would be to say, do we need the amount of growth of development, as envisaged and could we use brownfield sites, where possible. Broadly, I would agree with the dispersed approach to continuing growth, with development focussing on the market towns and service villages. Also, it is critical that non-service villages are protected wherever possible from too much development with the risk of spoiling their character. Therefore, on the whole, I would agree with Option 2 but with the two provisions mentioned above. |
| Member of the public | 2 | New development should be spread evenly and proportionately across all Ryedale villages and towns in order to help sustain the economic viability of the services and facilities that exist in all those places. |

No position made

| | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|
| Children and Young People Services | - | CYPS does not have a preferred option between these two options on principle and would seek to provide sufficient school places in the areas where they are required. |
|------------------------------------|---|---|

| | | |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| Historic England | - | <p>Whilst this section of the consultation paper identifies a number of potential barriers to the allocation of further growth in Malton/Norton, or to the identification of a new settlement, these two options should still be considered as reasonable alternatives as part of the Sustainability Appraisal process, and weighed against the other available options.</p> <p>The selection of a spatial strategy for the Local Plan Review needs to be based on a consideration of the relative economic, social and environmental implications of each available option (both positive and negative), along with their deliverability within the plan period. This decision needs to be informed by an appropriate and proportionate up-to-date evidence base.</p> |
| NYCC Adult and Social Care | - | <p>From an adult social care perspective the availability of social care services tend to be concentrated across the main market towns of Ryedale which causes issues with the availability of care provision in and around the rural villages. If investment is put into these areas to attract and grow communities, this could enable the improvement of accessibility to specialist services. If the 2nd option is agreed, villages must become vibrant hubs which are accessible for all who live and work there.</p> |
| Member of the public | - | <p>I do not think we should exclude the other villages from any development if there is demand for new housing. This implies accepting smaller developments which would attract local builders rather than the national house builders.</p> |
| Pickering Town council | - | <p>Ryedale District Council admit that Option 1 has done better than the planning department has hoped for and in Pickering this has worked reasonably well. Malton and Norton have seen the development of thousands of homes and these towns should now be given time to assimilate this new housing, so there is an argument for not just focussing on Malton and Norton from now on.</p> <p>A more dispersed approach to future development allows for other towns and villages to share some of the burden of new development but development must take place where there is capacity for this.</p> |
| | - | <p>We would note that within the main advantages and disadvantages for the two potential options provided there is limited recognition or steer on the relative environmental impact of each option. We advise that this is included when considering the best balance for sustainable development.</p> <p>Fisheries, Biodiversity and Geomorphology</p> <p>We would note that within the main advantages and disadvantages for the two potential options provided there is limited recognition or steer on the relative environmental impact of each option. We advise that this is included when considering the best balance for sustainable development.</p> |

| | | |
|---------------------------|--|---|
| <p>Environment agency</p> | | <p>General Comments</p> <p>We recommend that new development should mitigate its impacts on climate change by incorporating green and blue infrastructure provisions and improvements – including areas of green space and green and/or blue corridors, ecologically sensitive landscaping, tree planting and retention of existing trees, green roofs and walls and SuDS.</p> <p>With particular reference to the blue infrastructure and SuDS we recommend that new development also incorporates water efficiency measures and Natural Flood Management (over hard-engineered / traditional methods), where possible.</p> <p>Promoting development that include techniques to intercept, slow and temporarily store water – including through the restoration and enhancement of natural features within Bradford’s river catchments – will help to provide multiple benefits for people and wildlife, including greater natural resilience to present and future climate change.</p> <p>Added to this, policies should support nature based solutions to climate change adaptation such as reconnection of floodplain wetlands to reduce downstream risk of flooding. Where new development is proposed in areas that contain existing green and blue infrastructure, such features must be protected and enhanced as part of the new development. This includes, designated areas of open space, biodiversity assets (such as designated wildlife sites, SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, Local Wildlife Sites, existing habitat networks, priority habitats, trees and woodlands), and water assets (such as rivers, canals, lakes, ponds, floodplains, wetlands, reservoirs). We also recommend that new development in such areas should always include an undeveloped buffer zone between existing blue infrastructure networks (e.g. surface water bodies – including rivers and streams) and the proposed development.</p> <p>With regards to biodiversity enhancement, we support new development that can demonstrate the delivery of measurable, at least 10%, biodiversity net gain (BNG). This should be demonstrated through the use of the Defra Biodiversity Metric – see further information below.</p> <p>Broad Growth approach</p> <p>Two options are presented in the document:</p> <p>Option 1 (Pg. 7). Focus on the Principal Town of Malton & Norton, with some Service Villages. In terms of flood risk, Malton and Norton both have varying flood risk issues. A Level 2 SFRA will help you to better understand the spatial and contextual representation of flood risk in these towns. You should use that information to investigate whether there is sufficient space to allow for development to be located in areas of lowest overall flood risk. If flood risk within the Malton and Norton areas cannot be avoided, you should use your SFRA and Local Plan to indicate the scale and nature of development that will be supported.</p> <p>Option 2 (Pg. 7). This option indicates that growth will be dispersed, with development focussing on Market Towns and specific villages, including those on Pg. 4 and mentioned within specific questions (e.g. Pickering, Kirkbymoorside and Helmsley). These locations are again at varying degrees of flood risk, in terms of the nature, likelihood and severity if flooding were to occur. With the exception of the Level 2 SFRA covering Malton & Norton, these additional locations are all likely to be covered by the Level 1 SFRA. If development is being considered within flood risk areas, you may need to consider preparing additional Level 2 SFRAs, as per the current SFRA Guidance (https://www.gov.uk/guidance/local-planning-authorities-strategic-flood-risk-assessment). The following locations are likely to have additional flood risk considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pickering • Hovingham • Thornton le Dale |
|---------------------------|--|---|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Helmsley <p>We would also highlight that changes to the NPPF make it much clearer that other sources of flood risk, including surface water, groundwater and artificial sources such as reservoirs and sewers, should be taken into account. You should therefore ensure that you consult with other relevant flood risk management authorities including the Lead Local Flood Authority, Internal Drainage Boards, service utility providers and reservoir owners.</p> <p>With respect to Pickering, the new upstream storage area and the associated storage reservoir do not appear on the recently updated Risk of Flooding from Reservoirs map. Further information on these new maps is available at https://www.gov.uk/guidance/reservoir-flood-maps-when-and-how-to-use-them.</p> <p>Given the current understanding of flood risk within Malton and Norton, Option 2 does seem to offer an opportunity to identify selected development growth areas at lower overall flood risk. If deciding to proceed with Option 2, we would highlight that the additional infrastructure demands may introduce further comments, for example new roads and/or river crossing infrastructure; or changes to local drainage pressures.</p> |
|--|--|--|

Question 3: In general, which settlements do you think could be expanded to accommodate future housing and by how much? What are the factors that you think we should consider when we are thinking about these matters?

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|--|
| ID Planning obo The Vistry Group | <p>We support the expansion of the Principal Town of Malton and Norton. Consideration should be given to the location of sites and support given to those which are well located in relation to existing facilities and which form a natural extension to the settlement. With the majority of growth directed towards Malton / Norton, this will also support the delivery of affordable homes which are needed in the top tier of the hierarchy.</p> <p>The adopted plan distributes 50% of the housing requirement to Malton and Norton. We consider that this remains an appropriate distribution for the Local Plan review to support the towns role and function. If a larger percentage of the housing requirement was to be distributed to lower tier settlements this will result in a disproportionate addition to these settlements and increase travel across the District as people have to travel to higher tier settlements to access jobs, shops and services.</p> <p>The consultation document highlights that the Council are seeking to achieve improvements to congestion and air quality but if a dispersed approach to distribution is proposed this will increase congestion and reduce air quality in the Principal Town as more people will travel longer distances to access shops and services when they can walk or use public transport if they are already living in the Principal Town.</p> <p>The scale of development sites is also an important consideration. In the context of Malton/Norton as a Principal Town, sites should be of a scale which is commensurate with the role and function of this settlement and which can be delivered in the short term to support the Council's 5 year housing land supply in the early part of the plan.</p> |
| Evolution Town Planning | <p>Malton and Norton should receive the majority of development in the Local Plan.</p> |
| Freeths LLP obo Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation | <p>Malton has significant potential for further growth with residential development at Site 264 - Land East of Rainbow Lane and south of Westgate Lane, Malton for circa. 175-245 new homes and residential development at Old Malton at Site 271 - Manor Farm Paddock and existing buildings on land north of Town Street for 30 plus new homes and Site 186 - Thackrays Yard, Town Street for circa. 30-35 new homes (promoted by Fitzwilliam Malton Estate) which would be commensurate with the role, function and scale of the settlement. As above such development would support the vitality and viability of the town centre and ensure development is delivered in close proximity to existing services and facilities.</p> <p>Additional supporting employment development of circa 20.23 hectares can be provided on Site 270a – Eden Camp East - East of A169 and Site 270 - Eden Camp East - East of A169 which is already identified as a preferred location for such uses in the adopted Ryedale Local Plan. The</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| | <p>continued allocation of this land is essential in order to support ongoing investment in physical infrastructure such as roads and services that has been made thus far in bringing forward land to the west of the A169 for employment uses.</p> <p>As is set out in the accompanying covering letter to this consultation response the combined allocation of the above referenced sites provides the opportunity to deliver a highly sustainable land use strategy (delivering homes and jobs) for the next Local Plan period with substantial associated benefits including above policy provision of affordable housing, significant space for green and blue infrastructure supporting bio diversity net gain, new recreation opportunities to relieve pressure on the River Derwent area and improved flood resilience for the area. With no insurmountable technical constraint to early delivery.</p> |
| Persimmon Homes | <p>Persimmon Homes recognise that Pickering has the infrastructure and unconstrained land opportunities which will enable it to be expanded to accommodate future housing growth. This includes the land being promoted at Firthland Road. Therefore, whilst the current Ryedale Local Plan apports only 25% of the housing requirement to Pickering compared to 50% in Malton and Norton, it is considered that this should be adjusted so that 32.5% is apportioned to each of Malton/Norton and Pickering. 20% is then apportioned to Kirkbymoorside and then 15% to Helmsley and the Service Villages.</p> <p>The proportionate distribution needs to be based on recent evidence covering the infrastructure and environmental capacities and constraints, together with changing consumer demands for housing types and locations.</p> |
| Rural Solutions obo Castle Howard | <p>Castle Howard Estate considers that the following settlements could be expanded to accommodate future housing: Welburn, Slingsby, Bulmer and Ganthorpe.</p> <p>Reference should be had to the research information provided in section four of this response in relation to each settlement, as well as the notes below on each settlement.</p> <p>Welburn: Welburn is a relatively large village which, it is understood, only narrowly missed out on being allocated as a Local Service Centre in the adopted Ryedale Local Plan. There are clear opportunities for growth to the east of the village. New development can help to maintain and enhance the vitality of this rural community through the provision of new housing and services and arrest the ageing demographic of the village. The village has limited or no sports and recreation facilities it is understood, and these can be provided through new development.</p> <p>Slingsby: Slingsby is a Local Service Centre that has a good level of service provision but has an ageing demographic. There are clear opportunities for new development to the south and north west of the village to help enhance the vitality of the rural community. New development can provide for a village shop, enhanced sports facilities and a significant amount of affordable housing. Opportunities to enhance education infrastructure can also be reviewed in the delivery of new growth.</p> <p>Bulmer: Bulmer is closely related to Welburn and has opportunities for growth, particularly to the east. The village has an ageing demographic and relatively limited service provision, having historically lost services. New development can provide affordable housing and other housing to enhance the vitality of this</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--|--|
| | <p>rural community, as well as providing new services and facilities. The village has limited or no sports and recreation facilities it is understood, and these can be provided in new development.</p> <p>Ganthorpe: Ganthorpe is at present a small hamlet, with a number of estate owned properties. It is considered to hold opportunities for growth on a disused farmyard site and surrounding land. At present Ganthorpe has no services and facilities or public open space but these can be provided in new development. An off-road cycling and walking path to Terrington can be provided which will benefit new and existing residents. New development at Ganthorpe can help to enhance the vitality of nearby Terrington and help to meet affordable housing needs in the village, with benefits to both settlements.</p> <p>It should be noted that Castle Howard has not promoted in its answer to this question all settlements in which it owns land, and which could have the capacity for some development. It has only promoted settlements to accommodate new housing.</p> |
| KVA Planning | The ten key service villages listed in the consultation document as well as considering key infill sites in villages and altering development boundaries to include small parcels of land within settlement to join up existing built form |
| Steve Murray Associates Ltd | "Pickering would be a good location and could probably sustain further development of maybe 200 new and affordable homes over the plan period ! Ability to deliver" |
| Barton Willmore obo Barratt David Wilson Homes | Two thirds of the District is covered by national landscape designations such as Howardian Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the North Yorkshire Moors National Park. A vast majority of the remainder of the District is covered by a local designation of area of high landscape value. The parts of the district covered by the national landscape designations should be afforded the greatest protection and growth directed away from these areas. Elsewhere, new growth should have regard to the areas of high landscape value but this local designation should not preclude growth in these areas. The Principal Town of Malton and Norton along with Market Towns of Pickering and Kirkbymoorside should be expanded to accommodate the majority of future housing. A high proportion should be directed to Pickering in particular given it is not constrained by national landscape designations and is the main service centre serving northern Ryedale. The Market Town of Helmsley will only be able to accommodate a small amount of new development given its growth is constrained by its location within the North Yorkshire Moors National Park. |
| Barton Willmore obo Tim Parkinson | Appleton-le-Street should be expanded to accommodate housing commensurate to the size of the settlement, located within or adjacent to the built form of the settlement. The settlement benefits from limited constraints. The village is located fully in Flood Zone 1, not within a conservation area with four listed buildings in the village. There are no ecological designations in, or within the vicinity of, the village. The |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|--|
| | <p>Howardian Hills AONB lies to the south of the village. As such, land exists to the south of the settlement outside of the AONB and to the north to accommodate residential development of a scale that is proportionate to the size of the village.</p> <p>Appleton-le-Street is located approximately 1.8km west of the Service Villages of Amotherby and Swinton. The 2018 SHLAA indicates that since 2011, 21% of housing delivery has been in Service Villages. Table 3 of the SHLAA also shows that between 17/18, 2 dwellings were delivered in Amotherby and Swinton, which is one of the lowest figures of housing delivery of all the Service Villages. Proportionate housing development in Appleton-le-Street would support the facilities and sustainability of this combined Service Village given the low delivery of housing in these settlements.</p> <p>As such, the constraints of a settlement and its proximity to other villages, particularly service villages to support the sustainability of these settlements as well as the smaller villages should be considered when redistributing development. Our Client has land interest in Appleton-le-Street which is available, achievable and deliverable for high quality small scale housing development on a site with limited land constraints. The high quality carefully designed development would reflect the character of the settlement whilst significantly improving the visual appearance and environmental conditions at the site which lies at the heart of the village.</p> |
| <p>ELG Planning obo Malton Fitzwilliam Estate</p> | <p>FME consider the most appropriate approach to be new housing development focused on the Principal Town of Malton & Norton, in line with the current local plan, and further housing allocations in the town will further contribute to the delivery of infrastructure improvements and will enable a choice of new homes in the most sustainable location. FME have presented the site at Castle Howard Road as being able to provide a sustainable extension to Malton, which is capable of delivering up to 500 new homes, including a potential retirement community and small-scale local centre. FME have also put forward other smaller sites in Malton & Norton for residential development, these include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Norton Road, Malton (Call for Sites Ref: 138); • Land at Bark Knotts, Norton (Call for Sites Ref:139); • Thackrays Yard, Old Malton (Call for Sites Ref: 186); and • Land at Sheepfoot Hill (Call for Sites Ref: 149) <p>Furthermore, Malton & Norton is the largest settlement in the District, and therefore should be the focus for growth as they could easily accommodate a continued growth in size, without any detrimental impacts on its character, as demonstrated by the table below.</p> <p>Malton & Norton 12,275 Pickering 6,830 Kirkbymoorside 3,040 Amotherby 399 Slingsby 665 Total Ryedale Population 51,000</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--|---|
| ArkleBoyce obo Andrew Pern | Harome. The sites put forward by our client (Refs 216 and 218) are for bespoke, high-quality dwellings with a strong environmental emphasis. By creating sites for self-build, smaller and medium housebuilders not only aligns with national policy, but also allows for a unique housing product that the district can be proud of. |
| Pegasus Planning Group | We believe there is scope to consider more development within the service villages to increase their sustainability. In particular, in Sherburn as it boasts a good range of services and facilities as well as opportunities for employment, making it a highly sustainable location to live. It will provide young families with more choice of housing and allow them to remain in the area. |
| Edwardson Associates obo Lutton landowners | Our clients have land in Terrington and Bulmer villages. Development of a small scale would help support local services in both the settlements mentioned and nearby settlements. Para 79 of the NPPF supports development in villages which support services in nearby villages too. |
| Savills obo the Church Commissioner for England | <p>As set out above, a less concentrated, more dispersed approach to distributing growth supports the vitality and viability of more communities, not just the Market Towns and 'Service Villages' of the district. With regard to which settlements are considered suitable for future growth, our client, as a landowner in the area, supports modest growth and future development in Sand Hutton, Claxton and Gate Helmsley.</p> <p>These settlements are located in the southern half of the District and south west of the Market Towns of Malton and Norton but in close proximity to the City of York (all settlements less than 10 miles away from York). These are essential settlements in the area with an important role to play in the provision of a range and choice of dwellings across a wide price range.</p> <p>These villages could accommodate new small scale development without having a detrimental impact on the character of the existing village and surrounding countryside. The villages have seen very little progression over the last decade and therefore to support existing and future residents/ families, additional new homes are likely to be welcomed.</p> <p>We note in the consultation document that in relation to a greater amount of housing going to the villages, the Council will be considering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Their distance and relationship to neighbouring settlements; • The site specific constraints around some of our villages such as higher flood risk, designated heritage assets, national biodiversity designations; • What wider opportunities may be presented by specific development for environmental or historic environment considerations; • Sustainable building considerations; and, |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|------------------------------------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What services and facilities they already have or have access to within a walkable distance. <p>In response to these matters, in respect of Sand Hutton, Claxton and Gate Helmsley, we can confirm that, as mentioned above, they are in close proximity to other larger settlements such as Malton and Norton, and York City (with its wide range of services and facilities). As such, it is considered that these settlements are sustainable when considering them in their wider context.</p> <p>Furthermore, whilst Sand Hutton and Claxton have Conservation Areas, this should not be a reason to preclude development. As per paragraphs 206 and 207 of the NPPF state, local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Not all elements of a Conservation Area will necessarily contribute to its significance. Appropriate development of suitable and careful design can actually enhance a conservation area. It is important to balance the importance of the heritage asset along with natural progression of the village over time.</p> <p>Development in villages could be argued to put pressure on their character or some of their existing services, however, it is considered that the opposite can actually occur. Unless some modest growth takes place, there is greater pressure on services and facilities closing due to restricting new residents and service / facility users.</p> <p>In terms of character, the impact of development can very much be addressed during the planning application process where the detailed design would be subject to appropriate assessment and consultation with the relevant Council departments (e.g. conservation officers).</p> <p>Furthermore, these villages also have several existing services and facilities whereby additional new homes / residents would help support their upkeep / use. Please see our answer to question 7 below for further detail on this matter.</p> <p>In short, it is considered that Sand Hutton, Claxton and Gate Helmsley could all accommodate modest residential development over the next plan period to help sustain the viability and vitality of the village and its community, and in particular, Sand Hutton and Claxton could be considered to be a cluster settlement as they already share local services and facilities which are connected by existing public transport.</p> |
| Savills obo the Settrington Estate | <p>As set out above, a less concentrated, more dispersed approach to distributing growth supports the vitality and viability of more communities, not just the Market Towns and 'Service Villages' of the district.</p> <p>With regard to which settlements are considered suitable for future growth, our client, as a resident and landowner in the area, supports modest growth and future development in Settrington.</p> <p>Settrington is located in the southern half of the District and is in close proximity to the Market Towns of Malton and Norton and other neighbouring 'Service Towns' such as Rillington and Amotherby and Swinton. Settrington is an essential settlement in the area with an important role to play in the provision of a range and choice of dwellings across a wide price range. Settrington could accommodate new small scale development without having a detrimental impact on the character of the existing village and surrounding countryside. The village has</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--------------|--|
| | <p>seen very little progression over the last decade and therefore to support existing and future residents / families, additional new homes are likely to be welcomed.</p> <p>The reason for such limited development in the past is due to existing adopted local planning policy and the settlement boundaries being drawn extremely tight around the existing built form. Creating flexibility and widening the settlement limits would help support modest development to Settrington. Please see our comment to question 17a below for future detail no this matter.</p> <p>We note in the consultation document that in relation to a greater amount of housing going to the villages, the Council will be considering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Their distance and relationship to neighbouring settlements; • The site specific constraints around some of our villages such as higher flood risk, designated heritage assets, national biodiversity designations; • What wider opportunities may be presented by specific development for environmental or historic environment considerations; • Sustainable building considerations; and, • What services and facilities they already have or have access to within a walkable distance. <p>In response to these matters, in respect of Settrington, we can confirm that, as mentioned above, Settrington is in close proximity to other larger settlements such as Malton and Norton, Rillington and Amotherby and Swinton. As such, it is a sustainable village in terms of considering the settlement in its wider context.</p> <p>Furthermore, whilst Settrington has a Conservation Area, this should not be a reason to preclude development. As per paragraphs 206 and 207 of the NPPF state, local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Not all elements of a Conservation Area will necessarily contribute to its significance.</p> <p>Appropriate development of suitable and careful design can actually enhance a conservation area. It is important to balance the importance of the heritage asset along with natural progression of the village over time.</p> <p>Development in villages could be argued to put pressure on their character or some of their existing services, however, it is considered that the opposite can actually occur. Unless some modest growth takes place, there is greater pressure on services and facilities closing due to restricting new residents and service / facility users.</p> <p>In terms of character, the impact of development can very much be addressed during the planning application process where the detailed design would be subject to appropriate assessment which would include, for example, assessment of the scheme in accordance with the Village Design Guide.</p> <p>Furthermore, Settrington also has several existing services and facilities whereby additional new homes / residents would help support their upkeep / use. Please see our answer to question 7 below for further detail on this matter.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--|--|
| | <p>In short, it is considered that Settrington could accommodate modest residential development over the next plan period and beyond to help sustain the viability and vitality of the village and its community.</p> |
| <p>Johnson Mowat obo KCS Development</p> | <p>KCS consider that Kirkbymoorside is capable of being expanded to accommodate future housing. The current Ryedale Plan apportions 10% of the housing requirement to Kirkbymoorside, significantly less than Pickering (25%) and Malton (50%). It is considered a reapportionment is appropriate, reducing the proportion in Malton and Pickering and increasing the proportion in Kirkbymoorside.</p> <p>Based on the information of completions contained in Appendix 2 of the consultation document Kirkbymoorside has delivered considerably less new housing (3.5%) than the other market towns and less than the 10% apportionment contained in the Ryedale Plan. Whilst we are aware of commitments in the pipeline in Kirkbymoorside which may increase the percentage, it is considered that further additional and proportionate growth in Kirkbymoorside is justifiable.</p> <p>The proportionate distribution needs to be based on up-to-date evidence and we would welcome sight of the updated evidence on infrastructural and environmental constraints before commenting in more detail on the Council's proposed distribution at later Plan Review stages.</p> |
| <p>Johnson Mowat obo Yorkshire Land Ltd</p> | <p>It is considered that Pickering is capable of being expanded to accommodate future housing. The current Ryedale Plan apportions 25% of the housing requirement to Pickering, which is significantly less than Malton (50%). It is considered a reapportionment is appropriate, reducing the proportion in Malton and increasing the proportion in Pickering.</p> <p>The proportionate distribution needs to be based on up-to-date evidence and we would welcome sight of the updated evidence on infrastructural and environmental constraints before commenting in more detail on the Council's proposed distribution at later Plan Review stages.</p> |
| <p>Paul Butler obo Barratt Taylor Wimpey</p> | <p>Malton/Norton is the largest settlement in the District by population and the Council's SHMA identifies that the settlement area has the largest current and future demand for market and affordable housing in the District. This was a factor that was taken into account when the Council determined the distribution of development strategy for the current Ryedale Plan and which corroborates the grounds for maintaining at least 50% of new housing growth to be delivered to the settlement area within the emerging Ryedale Plan.</p> <p>The number of facilities, services and employment opportunities available within Malton/Norton render it the most sustainable settlement in the District by some distance. Its accessibility to the strategic road and rail network is also not shared by any other settlement in the District. Accordingly, the settlement area's sustainability credentials not only render it the most appropriate location for the delivery of 50%+ of the District's housing land requirements, but it also renders it as one of very few settlement areas in the District which can sustain large new</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-----------------------------|--|
| | <p>housing developments of 300+ homes in scale. The delivery of new housing developments at this scale will increase the pace of housing delivery in the District, ensuring housing targets are met within the plan period, but they will also importantly lead to the delivery of enhanced socio-economic benefits in respect of: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Affordable housing. o Delivering a wider range of mix of new homes to meet identified housing needs. o CIL payments. o Highways and drainage infrastructure improvements. o Community infrastructure provision including new school places, new public open space and biodiversity gain. o Direct and indirect construction employment opportunities. <p>Malton/Norton is less constrained in respect of environmental protection areas than other parts of the District. Whilst the River Derwent SAC runs through the centre of the settlement area; the Howardian Hills AONB is located to the west; and the Yorkshire Wolds are located to the south, there are large areas of the settlement which are located to the east of Norton (and specifically our client's land interest at site Ref. 253) which could be developed and which would not impact on these important biodiversity and landscape areas. Particularly when site specific mitigation would be delivered as part of their development in a similar vein to that being proposed by our client's current application at the Norton Lodge site (Allocation Ref. SD3).</p> <p>With regard to sustainability, accessibility and environmental constraints, the same points made above could also be said in respect of future employment growth opportunities in the District. Meaning that the Malton/Norton settlement area has the opportunity to become even more sustainable in the future and accordingly new homes will need to be delivered to ensure that the labour supply required to deliver future employment growth is met within sustainable travel distances (including walking and cycling).</p> <p>On account of the above, whilst there is robust evidence to support maintaining the current strategy for the distribution of housing growth in the District, the same evidence would also support an increase in the distribution of housing growth in Malton/Norton. Particularly when the ability of the District's other larger settlements to deliver housing growth is considered. Indeed, Helmsley's potential for future growth is constrained by the National Park and other environmental designations, and Kirkbymoorside has not as of yet established that it can meet and/or sustain the delivery of its current housing requirement, with the latest Annual Monitoring Report confirming that only 30 homes (or 10% of its current Ryedale Plan housing target) have been delivered in the period 2012-2020.</p> <p>Accordingly, there is an argument that the distribution of housing development to Malton/Norton could increase to 60% to ensure that the District's future housing needs are met in its most sustainable, accessible, and deliverable location for new homes.</p> |
| Savills obo Birdsall Estate | We strongly support the sensitive expansion of the following villages: |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---------------------------------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cropton - Duggleby - Leavening - North Grimston - Scagglethorpe - Settrington - Wharram-le- Street <p>As outlined above, we feel that each of the above listed settlements could accommodate appropriate levels of future housing growth. There are a number of suitable sites within the settlements and growth would present the opportunity to support the vitality and viability of these rural settlements and any existing businesses or facilities within the village or within the functional cluster of rural settlements.</p> <p>Important considerations, which are fully recognised by the Estate are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential landscape impact of any scheme - Potential heritage impact of any scheme - Potential impact on the character of a settlement - Ability to secure safe access to the site - Potential highways implications - Proximity of the development site to sustainable transport options <p>Any sites which are ultimately allocated for development, will be informed by a high quality design framework and a full suite of technical assessments which demonstrate that there are no insurmountable constraints to development. The Estate is committed to ensuring that the sites put forward for consideration are the most appropriate locations for growth in each Village, and can accommodate high quality schemes which respect the character of the settlement and its local area.</p> |
| Savills obo Hovingham Estate | <p>We strongly support the sensitive expansion of Hovingham. Hovingham is identified as a Service Village in the Local Plan and benefits from a number of services including local shops, school, GP practice, a church, a pub, a bakery and a café. There are a number of suitable sites within the settlement and growth would present the opportunity for expansion of local businesses to better serve the community.</p> <p>Important considerations, which are fully recognised by the Estate are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential landscape impact of any scheme - Potential heritage impact of any scheme - Potential impact on the character of a settlement - Ability to secure safe access to the site |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential highways implications - Proximity of the development site to shops and services - Proximity of the development site to sustainable transport options <p>We have previously outlined the Estates aspirations for Hovingham and the importance of delivering sensitive residential development which does not detract from the character of the village, or nearby heritage assets. Any sites which are supported for development in the village, will be informed by a full suite of technical assessments which identify and seek to mitigate against any negative impacts on existing highways and minimised harm to heritage assets.</p> <p>It is considered that the sites put forward for consideration within the Vision Document are the most appropriate locations for growth in the Village, and can accommodate high quality schemes which respect its character and that of the local area.</p> |
| Savills obo Louise Kirk (Ampleforth) | <p>Service Villages such as Ampleforth have deliverable and developable sites available which could make a vital contribution to the Districts Land Supply in the short term. These representations are made in respect of the Land at Back Lane, Ampleforth and the Land at Station Road, Ampleforth. Which have capacity to deliver circa 25 new dwellings and community parking facilities.</p> <p>The NPPF outlines that in rural areas, planning policies and decisions should be responsive to local circumstances and support housing developments that reflect local needs. Clearly locating development in service villages such as Ampleforth can deliver benefit to these settlements. Ampleforth is an active rural village, which benefits from a number of shops and services, including a GP and two schools. Growth in Ampleforth will contribute to creating a strong, vibrant and healthy community, improving vitality and increasing support for existing local facilities, services and businesses through increased footfall, developer contributions and visitor income. The ability to be able to truly enhance the vitality and viability of villages such as Ampleforth should be taken into account when determining the future growth strategy.</p> <p>In a Ryedale context, settlements such as Ampleforth are sustainable locations for growth. Ampleforth is located a short distance from the abundant shops and services in Helmsley, located circa 3.5 miles north east of Ampleforth. The Market Town can be accessed by bus service, as can York and Kirkbymoorside. The size of the village also means that all of the shops and services at the village core, are within walking distance of dwellings in the area. Paragraph 105 of the NPPF seeks to support sustainable development, which includes actively managing patterns of growth in support of sustainable travel objectives and focussing development in locations which are (or can be made) sustainable, through limiting the need to travel.</p> <p>Growth in Service Villages, such as Ampleforth, will also ensure that an appropriate level of affordable housing can be delivered. High house prices in the village, driven by a lack of supply, often results in existing residents having to leave in order to secure more affordable homes. The distribution of growth to these areas will contribute an appropriate mix and tenure of homes to meet the housing needs.</p> <p>It is also important that the emerging Local Plan considers the market requirement in a post-covid world. The pandemic has resulted in a shift in working practices, with more people working from home and a reduction in commuting or travelling for work. In turn, there has been an</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--|--|
| | <p>increase in demand for homes in countryside or village locations. A Savills research publication (attached) has demonstrated that the pandemic has resulted in a ‘race for space’ with a demand for homes in more rural location. Whilst this needs to be balanced with existing housing needs, there is the opportunity, through appropriate growth to provide a mix of homes to meet the varying needs and demand at a micro and macro scale.</p> <p>Finally, the distribution of growth to settlements such as Ampleforth is encouraged given the support such smaller sites in more rural village locations provide the opportunity for high quality developments delivered by local tradespeople. The Framework suggests that small and medium sites should be encouraged, requiring 10% of a Districts housing requirements be delivered on sites no larger than 1 ha. Small and Medium sized sites should also be promoted given they can often be delivered by local housebuilders, supporting local trade.</p> |
| <p>Spawforths obo Keyland Developments</p> | <p>Keyland consider Pickering is an appropriate sustainable settlement to accommodate future development. Pickering in the current Local Plan is one of the highest order settlements being a Market Town and is the second largest town in the district. It already has schools, health facilities, leisure centre services, shops and other services and facilities, including employment opportunities with business parks/industrial estates and public transport provision.</p> <p>It is evident that Pickering is one of the main towns in the district and is the main town for northern Ryedale. The town lies at the cross roads of the east-west A170 and the north-south A169. The current Local Plan describes Pickering as an important public transport node with north-south connections between Malton and Whitby and east-west connections between Helmsley and Scarborough.</p> <p>The current Local Plan strategy supports the identification of a supply of land for 750 new homes at Pickering, reflecting its status as the largest town in the north of the District, and a key provider of services, facilities and employment opportunities. The Council’s vision for Pickering is for its local facilities and services to be improved and the towns’ historic fabric and wider historic setting to be retained. Pickering is an important visitor destination in its own right and a gateway to the North York Moors National Park.</p> <p>Therefore, the delivery of new homes supports this Vision. There is also evidence of an affordability issue within Ryedale, which is constraining younger households from forming and in particular from buying their home. In relation to size and mix of new housing the greatest need is for 2 and 3 bed housing, which is towards meeting the needs of newly forming households and younger families. This perhaps indicates ones of the reasons for an increase in the over occupation of housing, growth of private renting and levels of concealed households. The delivery of new homes and a substantial increase in delivery of affordable housing to meet local needs and requirements is therefore recognised.</p> <p>The strategy for Pickering is therefore to ensure that the scale of development reflects the role of the town and the range of services/facilities it offers. Pickering provides one of the greatest range of shops, services and employment opportunities in the District. Therefore, as one of the most sustainable settlements in the Ryedale District it is currently identified as a prime location for development, which should continue going forward.</p> <p>Pickering should therefore continue to accommodate at least the current Local Plan strategy of 25 percent of new homes and a housing figure of 750 new homes. However, Keyland consider that given Pickering’s size and status within the District as the second largest settlement in the</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------------------|---|
| | district by some margin, the settlement can accommodate in excess of 25 percent of new homes. Therefore, Pickering could accommodate over 30 to 40 percent of new homes and well above 750 new homes over the emerging Plan period. |
| Heslerton Parish Council | Malton and Pickering. |
| Wintringham Parish Council | The towns and larger villages with facilities, infrastructure and services to support growth. |
| Malton Town Council | Service villages and additional villages. |
| Chair Wintringham Parish Council | Brown field sites in the larger service villages and market towns. |
| Amotherby Parish Council | Market towns - where access to services is readily available. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| Member of the public | Consider any settlements where there are shops, schools, doctors, social and leisure facilities, proximity to places of work and existing public transport |
| Member of the public | Malton could accommodate at least 1500 houses particularly to the west and north. Important to consider access to roads and railway, flood risk, demand, opportunities for pedestrian access to town centre. Fewer houses should be built in Norton |
| Member of the public | Expansion of Market towns and Service Villages is a sensible approach. Flood risk with predicted climate changes plus traffic and infrastructure implications. Many rural villages have no local facilities to support expansion. |
| Member of the public | There is scope for limited expansion to the service villages, but the main growth should be for Malton, Norton, Pickering and Kirkbymoorside. |
| Member of the public | Limited amount in most villages |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|--|
| Member of the public | Pickering - suitable for smaller scale development driven by local builders/companies to relieve pressure on Malton. Kirkbymoorside - larger scale development as delivered less completions compared to target. |
| Member of the public | "Beadlam and Nawton Amotherby and Swinton Proximity to existing Secondary Schools" |
| Member of the public | any existing village or town - it just needs a development strategy which is balanced and recognises the needs of each individual community |
| Member of the public | "Malton within the A64 by-pass. Transport connections and effect on rural communities" |
| Member of the public | Malton, Norton, Pickering, Kirkbymoorside |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|--|
| Member of the public | <p>These villages have existing infrastructure that can support and sustain growth - increased housing in smaller less serviced villages will simply increase road usage at a time when we should be seeking to use less resources see above - I think the 10 have been chosen with these factors in mind</p> |
| Member of the public | <p>The service villages</p> |
| Member of the public | <p>Rillington has space for development, good local services, a good regular bus route which is also located on a major A major road in the A64. This means short journeys to it if people are commuting to York, Leeds or Scarborough. Equally there are other villages eastwards. Hard to how much more housing, but development limits could be extended without much disruption.</p> |
| Member of the public | <p>"Malton and Norton Depending on availability of brown field sites Road & rail infrastructure already in place. Secondary education & sports facility, medical care Boost to high street economy/ greater variety of work opportunities and supermarkets"</p> |
| Member of the public | <p>Scagglethorpe comes to mind. The quantity would be dependent on demand.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|--|
| Member of the public | I don't know enough about other towns. |
| Member of the public | <p>The number of houses that could or should be built across the district will be dictated, in the main, by central government. The above question is not one that the public can answer. The general public does not know (has not been told) the number of housing units that have been proposed through the site submissions for either the service villages or Ryedales wider settlements. The general public, therefore, cannot be expected to provide an evidence based response to the consultation question.</p> <p>As I stated in my answer to the first question in this document, I believe new housing should be distributed across all the villages and towns in Ryedale. I do not consider the hierarchical designation service villages and other villages has served any purpose other than to prevent unencumbered small-scale development in Ryedales other villages which has stymied their natural expansion since the adoption of the current Ryedale Local Plan in September 2013.</p> <p>New Ryedale planning policy should, in line with the NPPF 2021, encourage and support the creation of strong, vibrant and healthy communities, and promote the future economic prosperity and sustainability of ALL Ryedale's village communities. This can only be done by paying careful attention to the existing villages maps and their current (albeit outdated) development limits. It is clear to me that every village in Ryedale could accommodate a modest amount of new housing which would introduce the new blood and oxygen that these small communities need to survive.</p> |
| Member of the public | <p>It would seem sensible to consolidate development in Malton, Norton and Pickering for the reasons already stated for Q1. The preference should be for infilling within existing broad building envelopes and natural existing boundaries such as key roads rather than extending ever outwards. Flood risk should clearly also be a consideration in these locations.</p> <p>I am not a planner – so I will leave it to them to consider how many houses can be accommodated on sites put forward.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|---|
| Environment Agency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood risk will form an integral part of your decisions as to where to locate development, and to what scale and distribution. This should principally be informed by the SFRA(s) that are in preparation, ensuring that all sources of flood risk are taken into account and assessing flood risk now and in the future. • Your Local Plan policies should be used to make it clear how flood risk within the authority area will be used to inform development proposals. We have made separate comments against the existing policy SP17 (Natural Resources). • Through the above, you will be able to use the Sequential and Exception Tests (where they apply) to help identify suitable sites for development. We draw your attention to the latest SFRA Guidance (https://www.gov.uk/guidance/local-planning-authorities-strategic-flood-risk-assessment), and also the recently published SFRA best practice guide (https://adeptnet.org.uk/system/files/documents/FRS18204%20SFRA%20Good%20Practice%20Guide_Final_Nov2021.pdf). Further specific commentary for towns and villages against the other questions are listed below. |
| NYCC Children and Young People's Services | <p>Responding to this purely with reference to Educational provision there are some settlements where the existing schools currently have existing surplus school places and are projected to continue to have spaces going forward. See Appendix 1 for the table which shows the current position in Ryedale schools and the projected surplus or shortfall of places going forward.</p> <p>NYCC use a pupil yield calculation from new developments of one primary pupil per every four dwellings of two bedrooms or more.</p> <p>For secondary pupils the projected pupil yield is calculated at one pupil per every eight new dwellings.</p> <p>Therefore as an example if a school has a surplus of 25 primary places then it is projected that an additional 100 houses would place that school at capacity. For any settlement where the level of housing proposed is higher than the projected capacity we would expect the CIL strategy to include the provision of developer contributions towards Education infrastructure.</p> <p>Appendix 1 List of the schools with projected surplus capacity available</p> |
| NYCC Adult and Social Care | <p>When considering future accommodation for people who require health and/ or social care services, the following factors should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to local health services – GP, hospital, mental health or learning disability services. • Access to local amenities – schools, transport, activities (social), groceries etc. • Access to good quality and local services. • Integration and socialisation – to avoid social isolation and loneliness and to reduce stigma / hate crime etc • Access to workforce – decline in working age population and an increase in aging population. Ryedale district currently has access to approximately: |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-------------------------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21 supported living accommodation, the majority of which is shared accommodation. 16 of which are in the Malton / Norton areas, 3 in Pickering and 2 in surrounding villages • 3 extra care housing schemes with a total of 135 affordable units • Deansfield Court, Norton (50 affordable units) • Mickle Hill, Pickering (24 affordable units – total 168 units) • Bransdale View, Helmsley (61 affordable units) – total 64 units) • ☒ 14 care homes with 434 beds, 5 of which are in Malton/ Norton, 7 in Pickering, 2 surrounding villages. |
| Northminster Properties | <p>All settlements should be considered to accommodate new housing development. The scale of development should be assessed when considering sites that are appropriate in that location for development. A well located site in a smaller village may be more suitable for more units than a less well located site in a larger settlement.</p> |
| Pickering Town Council | <p>All settlements should be considered for future housing. Proportional development across the whole of Ryedale is the way forward.</p> |

Question 3a: For Malton and Norton- what further development (other than the existing allocations) can take place, and if so where is this?

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------------------|--|
| ID Planning obo The Vistry Group | <p>The Vistry Group are promoting land for residential allocation to the west of Welham Road which lies adjacent to the settlement limits of Norton. The site is available and is being promoted by a national housebuilder who can facilitate the delivery of this site in the short term.</p> <p>The site was submitted to the Council as part of the Call for Sites in July 2021. The site extends to 5.3 hectares and lies in a sustainable location close to the centre of Norton. The site would form a natural extension to the settlement as there is residential development immediately to the north and east of the site and is of a scale that is in keeping with the role and function of Norton as a Principal Town. The following supporting technical reports were provided which evidenced deliverability of the site, with no technical constraints being identified:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preliminary Ecological Appraisal/Biodiversity Impact Assessment - Technical Note prepared by Santec addressing Access and Highways, Ground Contamination & Flood Risk and Drainage - Heritage Technical Note <p>An indicative masterplan was also prepared which showed the site could deliver between 111-148 dwellings based on a net developable area of 3.7ha. At a density of 30 dph the site could deliver 111 dwelling. However, the site could deliver 148 dwellings based on a density of 40 dph through the provision of an increased proportion of 2 and 3 bed dwellings, which would reflect the demand for market housing identified in the Council’s Strategic Housing Market Assessment.</p> <p>The site is of a sufficient size to be able to make a meaningful contribution to boosting the supply of housing in the District and assisting the Council in meeting its identified needs whilst being of an appropriate scale in the context of the settlement. The site can deliver much needed market and affordable housing in a sustainable location adjacent to the Principal Town where</p> |
| Evolution Town Planning | <p>Development could take place to the south of Malton and Norton where there is land that is well connected to the town and which is well contained from the wider countryside.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|--|
| Freeths LLP obo Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation | <p>Malton has significant potential for further growth with residential development at Site 264 - Land East of Rainbow Lane and south of Westgate Lane, Malton for circa. 175-245 new homes and residential development at Old Malton at Site 271 - Manor Farm Paddock and existing buildings on land north of Town Street for 30 plus new homes and Site 186 - Thackray's Yard, Town Street for circa. 30-35 new homes (promoted by Fitzwilliam Malton Estate) which would be commensurate with the role, function and scale of the settlement. As above such development would support the vitality and viability of the town centre and ensure development is delivered in close proximity to existing services and facilities.</p> <p>Additional supporting employment development of circa 20.23 hectares can be provided on Site 270a – Eden Camp East - East of A169 and Site 270 - Eden Camp East - East of A169 which is already identified as a preferred location for such uses in the adopted Ryedale Local Plan. The continued allocation of this land is essential in order to support ongoing investment in physical infrastructure such as roads and services that has been made thus far in bringing forward land to the west of the A169 for employment uses.</p> <p>As is set out in the accompanying covering letter to this consultation response the combined allocation of the above referenced sites provides the opportunity to deliver a highly sustainable land use strategy (delivering homes and jobs) for the next Local Plan period with substantial associated benefits including above policy provision of affordable housing, significant space for green and blue infrastructure supporting bio diversity net gain, new recreation opportunities to relieve pressure on the River Derwent area and improved flood resilience for the area. With no insurmountable technical constraint to early delivery.</p> |
| Persimmon Homes | <p>Subject to further technical assessment, the land situated between Beverley Road and Langton Road to the south of Norton represents the most logical location for future growth, away from the town centre, flooding risks and sensitive landscapes.</p> |
| Steve Murray Associates Ltd | <p>Probably infill / brownfield sites</p> |
| ELG Planning obo Malton Fitzwilliam Estate | <p>As part of the recent call for sites exercise, FME have presented a number of sites which would be suitable for further development, and we would further reiterate that these sites are available, suitable and achievable within the next plan period, and FME are eager to work with the Council to achieve a high-quality development of traditional design and scale, which complements the existing built environment.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|---|
| | <p>The site at Castle Howard Road (Call for Sites Ref 181 and 181a) lies on the western edge of Malton, and as such is well linked to the existing urban area of Malton, with residential properties bounding the site to the east. Malton itself occupies a strategic location between York (29 miles south) and Scarborough (39 miles north) and both are accessible via the A64, which lies to the west of the site. Malton also has good transportation links, being the only settlement in Ryedale with a railway station, with both York and Scarborough accessible by train in approximately 25 minutes.</p> <p>Furthermore, the majority of post-war housing growth across the towns has occurred in Norton, and the current Local Plan Strategy sought to address this by placing a greater focus on locating new development in and around Malton, with an immediate focus on the release of Greenfield sites around Malton. However, in actual fact, the majority of development was focused in Norton, with two sites totalling 639 dwellings. The allocations in Malton solely featured housing commitments, totalling 483 dwellings, however many of these had already been completed when the Local Plan Allocations Document was adopted.</p> <p>Moreover, the existing housing allocations/commitments in the Malton have all been delivered, whereas the housing allocation at Beverley Road Norton is yet to come forward.</p> <p>There is therefore a need for further housing allocations in Malton.</p> |
| <p>Carter Jonas obo Nawton, Nunnington, Place Newton, Thorpe Bassett and Westow Estates</p> | <p>We have no response at this time.</p> |
| <p>Paul Butler obo Barratt Taylor Wimpey</p> | <p>Malton/Norton is the largest settlement in the District by population and the Council's SHMA identifies that the settlement area has the largest current and future demand for market and affordable housing in the District. This was a factor that was taken into account when the Council determined the distribution of development strategy for the current Ryedale Plan and which corroborates the grounds for maintaining at least 50% of new housing growth to be delivered to the settlement area within the emerging Ryedale Plan.</p> <p>The number of facilities, services and employment opportunities available within Malton/Norton render it the most sustainable settlement in the District by some distance. Its accessibility to the strategic road and rail network is also not shared by any other settlement in the District. Accordingly, the settlement area's sustainability credentials not only render it the most appropriate location for the delivery of 50%+ of the District's housing land requirements, but it also renders it as one of very few settlement areas in the District which can sustain large new housing developments of 300+ homes in scale. The delivery of new housing developments at this scale will increase the pace of housing delivery in the District, ensuring housing targets are met within the plan period, but they will also importantly lead to the delivery of enhanced socio-economic benefits in respect of: -</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable housing. • Delivering a wider range of mix of new homes to meet identified housing needs. • CIL payments. • Highways and drainage infrastructure improvements. • Community infrastructure provision including new school places, new public open space and biodiversity gain. • Direct and indirect construction employment opportunities. <p>Malton/Norton is less constrained in respect of environmental protection areas than other parts of the District. Whilst the River Derwent SAC runs through the centre of the settlement area; the Howardian Hills AONB is located to the west; and the Yorkshire Wolds are located to the south, there are large areas of the settlement which are located to the east of Norton (and specifically our client's land interest at site Ref. 253) which could be developed and which would not impact on these important biodiversity and landscape areas. Particularly when site specific mitigation would be delivered as part of their development in a similar vein to that being proposed by our client's current application at the Norton Lodge site (Allocation Ref. SD3).</p> <p>With regard to sustainability, accessibility and environmental constraints, the same points made above could also be said in respect of future employment growth opportunities in the District. Meaning that the Malton/Norton settlement area has the opportunity to become even more sustainable in the future and accordingly new homes will need to be delivered to ensure that the labour supply required to deliver future employment growth is met within sustainable travel distances (including walking and cycling).</p> <p>On account of the above, whilst there is robust evidence to support maintaining the current strategy for the distribution of housing growth in the District, the same evidence would also support an increase in the distribution of housing growth in Malton/Norton. Particularly when the ability of the District's other larger settlements to deliver housing growth is considered. Indeed, Helmsley's potential for future growth is constrained by the National Park and other environmental designations, and Kirkbymoorside has not as of yet established that it can meet and/or sustain the delivery of its current housing requirement, with the latest Annual Monitoring Report confirming that only 30 homes (or 10% of its current Ryedale Plan housing target) have been delivered in the period 2012-2020.</p> <p>Accordingly, there is an argument that the distribution of housing development to Malton/Norton could increase to 60% to ensure that the District's future housing needs are met in its most sustainable, accessible, and deliverable location for new homes.</p> |
| Savills obo Louise Kirk (Ampleforth) | <p>The Distribution of Development consultation paper outlines a number of infrastructure capacity issues in Malton and Norton, any significant growth in these settlements would therefore be likely to require significant infrastructure improvements to facilitate it. This will undoubtedly slow the pace of delivery in the District. The Consultation Paper also identifies that there are limited sites available for further growth in these settlements, which are constrained by Flood Risk and the Howardian Hills AONB.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--------------------------|---|
| Malton Town Council | None. The traffic is ridiculous. The air quality is suffering. Why can something not be done about either Bypass or consider appropriate slip roads. The infrastructure, for Schools, Doctors need expanding and residential rat runs are outrageous. |
| Amotherby Parish Council | "Police & Ambulance station sites when vacated. Part of Ryedale House area. Cattle market area." |
| Member of the public | Need to look around the town boundaries and gaps in existing brownfield sites |
| Member of the public | Castle Howard Road, Rainbow Lane/Old Malton, Langton Road, Welham Road. No more than 2000 houses ideally. The influx of newcomers in recent years has added vitality to the town and improved businesses like shops, cafes, etc |
| Member of the public | Some areas of Malton are now constrained by infrastructure, future development will be influenced by this. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|--|
| Member of the public | There is no harm in Malton & Norton continuing to expand - as long as the council makes developers improve the infrastructure. the towns need a proper ring road and link bridge between the two that can take modern vehicle density |
| Member of the public | Between the A64 and existing housing boundaries |
| Member of the public | I think any further development in Malton and Norton should be very carefully considered. Personally I could not suggest anywhere to place another large housing estate without making the area very urban which would be detrimental. |
| Member of the public | The planning period covered by this is a long one and the disruption caused by the pandemic will have changed the pattern of demand quite significantly so an open mind on the scale of future development should be taken and this could include development along the Scarborough Road |
| Member of the public | My view is that no new large-scale housing development should take place in Malton and Norton until critical new infrastructure has been provided. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|--|
| Member of the public | See site submissions put forward. |
| Environment Agency | <p>Flood risk</p> <p>Flood risk is likely to continue to be a factor when considering any existing or additional allocation sites. This should be informed by the conclusions of the Level 2 SFRA that has been commissioned. As part of this, we also recommend that you review any existing allocated sites and ensure that they remain compatible with the Local Plan policies, and in light of any new contextual flood risk information.</p> <p>Ground water protection</p> <p>To the south east of Norton is the Norton SPZ. This is for a groundwater abstraction that is used for public water supply. We would not wish to see any new development that could detrimentally affect this potable water supply.</p> |
| NYCC Children and Young People's Services | As shown in the table in Appendix 1, at present there is projected to be some capacity within the existing primary provision within Malton to accommodate some further allocations without requiring expansion of primary provision. Additional development in Norton would support the demand for the proposed new school on the existing Local Plan site at Broughton Road. Any additional secondary provision that is required would need to be provided through the two existing secondary schools. |
| NYCC Adult and Social Care | NYCC's Care and Support Where I Live Strategy identifies Malton as a settlement which would support the development of an extra care housing scheme in addition to those already in the District mentioned above. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|--|
| Member of the public | My main concerns would be over development, in particular the non-service and protecting their individual village character. |

Question 3b: Do you think that there are any opportunities to grow the Town of Pickering and if so where and why?

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--|---|
| Steve Murray Associates Ltd | Yes more specifically land south of Ings garth Grid reference SE 79210 83594. The land is held in one ownership. There are no constraints or barriers to deliver. Design & technical work completed. |
| Persimmon Homes | <p>As noted in the consultation document, Helmsley is constrained predominantly by the National Park, and heritage and flood risk issues, and therefore it should not be a focus for further housing growth as a result of a reduced focus on Malton and Norton. Pickering is therefore the most logical location for the delivery of more housing.</p> <p>There are two existing housing Allocations in Pickering, one east of Whitby Road which is currently under construction for 239 dwellings and land west of Malton Road for 110 dwellings which is yet to be started.</p> <p>The Local Plan Review will extend the end of the plan period from 2027 to 2038, which requires additional 11 years' worth of housing allocations. Even if the 25% proportion is maintained, Pickering will inevitably require additional housing sites and there are sites that are not constrained by flood risk, sensitive landscapes and biodiversity interests, amongst other considerations, that are available now.</p> |
| Barton Willmore obo Barratt David Wilson Homes | There are opportunities to grow the town of Pickering. Please refer to attached representations. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--|---|
| <p>Spawforths obo Keyland Developments</p> | <p>Keyland has submitted through the Call for Sites their site at Whitby Road, Pickering (Site Ref 217). Keyland has previously submitted the attached Vision Report, which shows the availability, suitability and achievability and therefore deliverability of the site. Keyland has also undertaken a full suite of technical assessments on the site to demonstrate its deliverability.</p> <p>The Vision Report highlights the key benefits of the site and masterplan strategies, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating a green link to invite nature, wildlife and biodiversity into the town through a new green corridor. • Creating connectivity in this part of Pickering through enhancing pedestrian and cycle routes. • Integrating blue and green infrastructure and managing water in a responsible way. <p>The Whitby Road site therefore presents an opportunity to make a significant contribution to the housing need in Ryedale. The site creates an opportunity with Keyland’s Six Capitals philosophy to bring forward an exemplar residential scheme to meet a diverse range of occupiers and stakeholders.</p> <p>The Vision Report shows that the Whitby Road site provides a unique opportunity for the delivery of a diverse range of new homes developed within the context of Keyland’s Six Capitals philosophy. The proposed scheme will deliver a mix of housing to address an identified need in the area, which will include Custom and Self Build homes. This approach will diversify the housing market and accelerate delivery</p> <p>The Six Capitals approach has therefore shaped the illustrative masterplan. As the starting point of the proposed scheme is different this leads to a different outcome. The development has been designed from the outset to meet the differing housing needs in the area.</p> <p>Furthermore, to meet the social, human and environmental ambitions a significant proportion of the site has been identified for a range of environmental, recreational and water management activities.</p> <p>Keyland control the site, which is therefore available in accordance with national guidance. The site is suitable, being located in a sustainable location on the edge of an established residential area.</p> <p>The technical work undertaken to date has influenced the indicative masterplan for the site. It has been shown that there are no known constraints that could not be suitably mitigated that would prevent this site coming forward within the plan period. As such the development of the site, as shown in the indicative masterplan, is considered achievable.</p> <p>Furthermore the development of the site will bring forward additional economic benefits to the area. The relationship between economic performance in an area and housing development is complex, however having the right quantity, quality and balance of housing is necessary for economic growth. The development of the Whitby Road scheme can therefore support local economic growth, both through direct job creation through the construction phase and indirectly through creating sustainable local jobs opportunities.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--|--|
| Johnson Mowat obo Yorkshire Land Ltd | <p>Given the constraints in Helmsley (predominantly within the National Park, and heritage and flood risk constraints) and the reduced focus to Malton and Norton as part of preferred Option 2, it is logical that Pickering should be the preferred first location to deliver more housing.</p> <p>Site 250 off Outgang Lane provides a logical, sustainable opportunity to grow Pickering to meet the future housing needs required across the extended plan period. The development of Site 250 will form an appropriate and sustainable extension to the south eastern edge of Pickering, adjoining existing built form. The growth of Pickering will align with whichever distribution option the Council choses, albeit, the preference is for Option 2, which disperses a lesser proportion of development to Malton and Norton.</p> |
| Heslerton Parish Council | Access by road and public transport needs to be enhanced as this town is a bottle neck at the best of times. |
| Wintringham Parish Council | Pickering seems to have has much less focus on development than Malton and Norton |
| Malton Town Council | They have the smaller percentage of development. |
| Chair Wintringham Parish Council | It seems that near on 50% of all devt. has been in Malton/Norton so it would seem appropriate for Pickering to take more |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| Member of the public | Need to look around the town boundaries and gaps in existing brownfield sites |
| Member of the public | More limited development than Malton. There is no rail link, road access is poor, no hospital, limited local employment opportunities, etc. |
| Member of the public | Already huge traffic problems getting through the town |
| Member of the public | Pickering would be suited to smaller site i.e. less than 1Ha development to meet the 10% requirement for smaller plots. Many such sites are available through the call for sites. |
| Member of the public | if there is demand then expanding along the existing roads & in-fill |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|--|
| Member of the public | yes |
| Member of the public | I am not sufficiently well acquainted with the opportunities in Pickering, and i think this question is better left to Pickering residents |
| Member of the public | Pickering has grown outwards in the same timeframe as Malton and seems to be suffering a lot of traffic congestion near the Lidl. Every time I drive through Pickering there seems to be building work further and further out from the heart of the settlement. Generally it is not an area I know well though. |
| Member of the public | The answer to the question should be sought from the people of Pickering specifically and its Town and District and new North Yorkshire council elected members. |
| Member of the public | See site submissions and my response to Q3 above. Some sites put forward appear to extend the settlement too far: e.g 13, 23, 45, 217 |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|---|
| Environment Agency | <p>Flood risk</p> <p>Flood risk is likely to continue to be a factor when considering any existing or additional allocation sites. This should be informed by the conclusions of the Level 1 SFRA that is being produced. Of specific note to Pickering is that we expect there to be some residual risk from the upstream storage reservoir. Risk of flooding from reservoirs should be shown within your SFRA. At time of writing, new reservoir flood maps have been published, however the reservoir upstream of Pickering has not been mapped.</p> <p>Ground water protection</p> <p>Part of Pickering and the surround area to the north is located within the Keld Head SPZ1 and SPZ2. This is for a groundwater abstraction that is used for public water supply. SPZ1 and SPZ2 represent the most sensitive groundwater setting and risk to groundwater quality. Ideally, we would not wish to see any new development within these zones. We would also not wish to see any new developments that would involve either the discharge to ground, or underground storage of either surface waters or treated effluents within these zones. Local Plans should consider the capacity and quality of water supply systems and any impact development may have on the environment, including understanding the supply and demand patterns now and in the future across the LPA area. Projected water availability should take account of the impact of a changing climate. Water companies hold information and data to help with this and LPAs should work closely with water companies when they are producing their Local Plans. This information should be reflected in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Local Plan. We encourage LPAs to ensure emerging Local Plans and major developments identify and plan for the required levels of water efficiency and water supply infrastructure to support growth, taking into account costs and timings/phasing of development. Water Cycle Studies and Infrastructure Delivery Plans can help with understanding of what is needed and are therefore an important part of the evidence base. Local Plans should consider the environmental capacity of the water environment using evidence sources such as the RBMPs. The quality and capacity of the existing wastewater treatment works and sewerage network should also be considered. Water companies hold information and data to help with this. Additional capacity may be required to serve increased housing numbers. Where this is the case LPAs should work with water companies and us to understand the impact increased development would have on the receiving water environment, and the practicalities of water companies providing necessary upgrades.</p> |
| NYCC Children and Young People's Services | <p>As shown in the table in Appendix 1 there is surplus capacity in the primary schools within Pickering and there projected to be some limited surplus capacity going forward. There is also projected to be surplus capacity in the secondary school in Pickering. Therefore there may be opportunity for some further development in Pickering without the need for further education provision.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| <p>NYCC Adult and Social Care</p> | <p>There is certainly development opportunities for Pickering when you consider the lack of supported living / accommodation for people with Learning disability / Physical Disability. or older living in the area. Currently there is only access to 2 supported living. Due to the nature of supported living, people have their own tenancy and therefore, don't often move on, meaning that turnover in supported living is low.</p> |
| <p>Pickering Town Council</p> | <p>There is potential to continue to grow the town of Pickering with careful and proper consideration. The council has already commented on suitable locations for development through the consultation on site submissions process, and the council would hope that these comments would be considered when agreeing suitable sites for development.</p> <p>Pickering is an attractive place to live and work and has a range of facilities to offer residents. The town should take on a share of the required housing allocations, but to be able to accommodate a significant increase in housing there must be investment in infrastructure and services in the town.</p> <p>Pickering also has scope for smaller developments which often fit well with existing settlements and give an opportunity for local builders.</p> |

Question 3c: Do you think that there are any opportunity to grow the Town of Kirkbymoorside and if so where and why?

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Steve Murray Associates Ltd | Possibly |
| Johnson Mowat obo KCS Development | <p>Given the constraints in Helmsley (predominantly within the National Park, and heritage and flood risk constraints), the constraints in Pickering (flood risk and known congestion issues), and the reduced focus to Malton and Norton as part of preferred Option 2, it is logical that Kirkbymoorside should deliver more housing.</p> <p>There is an existing housing commitment currently under construction on the western edge of the town, north of the A170 for 225 dwellings. The expansion of the western edge of the town south of the A170 would align with the approved development to the north and form a logical rounding off to the approach into Kirkbymoorside from the west. The delivery of circa 75 dwellings south of the A170, will form an appropriate moderate extension to the west of the existing settlement edge.</p> <p>Furthermore, the allocation of land adjacent to main roads (such as land south of the A170) will avoid congestion on the local highway roads within towns and villages for road users gaining access to the main roads for non-local trips.</p> |
| North Yorkshire Police | The current developments within Kirkbymoorside are outpacing the current infrastructure including transport and education facilities. |
| Wintringham Parish Council | Yes there has been very little development |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| Malton Town Council | Same reason as Pickering less % development to Malton and Norton. |
| Member of the public | Need to look around the town boundaries and gaps in existing brownfield sites |
| Member of the public | Very limited based on local demands as amenities are limited and it is remote from hospitals, railway station, etc |
| Member of the public | Kirbymoorside appears to have delivered a low number of housing during the previous 5 years. Option 1 will require the town to provide larger scale development |
| Member of the public | if there is demand then expanding along the existing roads & in-fill |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| Member of the public | yes |
| Member of the public | I am not sufficiently well acquainted with the opportunities in Kirbymoorside, and i think this question is better left to its residents |
| Member of the public | Kirbymoorside is very similar to Pickering in the sense that the boundary of the settlement seems to be extending further outwards from the centre. Similar to above it is generally an area I do not know well definitively. |
| Member of the public | The answer to the question should be sought from the people of Kirbymoorside specifically and its Town and District and new North Yorkshire council elected members. |
| Member of the public | See site submissions and my response to Q3 above. Some sites put forward appear to extend the settlement too far: e.g. 117 |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|--|
| NYCC Children and Young People's Services | NYCC are currently developing a proposal to expand Kirkbymoorside Primary school to 1.5 forms of entry. If this is successful then there would be some further capacity for development in Kirkbymoorside without requiring further Education provision. |
| NYCC Adult and Social Care | There is certainly development opportunities for Pickering when you consider the lack of supported living / accommodation for people with Learning disability / Physical Disability. or older living in the area. Currently there is only access to 2 supported living. Due to the nature of supported living, people have their own tenancy and therefore, don't often move on, meaning that turnover in supported living is low. |

Question 4a: Thinking about Malton and Norton- are there places where you would not want to see development take place- and why?

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--|--|
| ID Planning obo The Vistry Group | Development should not take place on sites which are subject to flood risk in accordance with the NPPF. Development should also not take place on sites within Areas of High Landscape Value or Visually Important Undeveloped Sites as shown on the adopted Local Plan proposals map. |
| Evolution Town Planning | The best locations for development are to the south of the town on the edge of the existing built up area. These areas are well connected to the town and are contained from the wider countryside by the roads and woods to the south. |
| Steve Murray Associates Ltd | In greenbelt |
| ELG Planning obo Malton Fitzwilliam Estate | FME do not want to rule out development on any specific site at this stage but would point out that Malton itself is a fairly constrained town, with the Howardian Hills AONB to the north of the town, historic Old Malton to the east and areas which has previously been identified as 'Visually Important Underdeveloped Areas'. FME would suggest that development in these locations is avoided, in line with the current Local Plan. The site at Castle Howard Road (Call for Sites Ref 181 and 181a) is therefore the least constrained site, and the most appropriate area to focus further development and the accompanying masterplan for the site (See Appendix One) shows how the site could be developed, without impacting upon the nearby Howardian Hills AONB, as the development would be scaled back from that which was previously sort, and set behind existing hedgerows, which would minimise the impact on long distance views to/from the AONB to the west. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|--|
| Network Rail | It is understood that there is congestion on the road over the Malton Level Crossing when it is closed for the passage of a train. To mitigate the impact of development in the vicinity of this crossing, opportunities to provide a new grade-separated access route across the railway line should be considered. |
| Malton Town Council | Both towns. Too much traffic, pollution and a lack infrastructure. |
| Member of the public | Not that I can identify |
| Member of the public | Open space should be protected along Old Malton Road. Old Malton village should not have to accommodate the larger housing estates. Land beyond the bypass should be protected apart from commercial development at Eden Camp east |
| Member of the public | Around the railway station (on Norton side) towards the golf course |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|--|
| Member of the public | No |
| Member of the public | Anywhere in open countryside outside of Malton and Norton is off limits for me. Building in these areas would be too much without proper infrastructure improvements whether it be cycle lanes, road junctions linking to the A64 and improved town services. Houses in these locations would also be a long way from the centre of town. Requiring more car journeys. |
| Member of the public | Green field sites that provide amenities for residents, such as playing fields and access to the wider countryside |
| Member of the public | My view is that no new large-scale housing development should take place in Malton and Norton until critical new infrastructure has been provided. |
| Environment Agency | Flood risk areas, as informed by the updated Level 2 SFRA (when available) should be avoided, where possible. For sites at flood risk under consideration, they should apply the Sequential and Exceptions Test where required. We have made some recommendations with regards strengthening the Local Plan Policies where they interact with flood risk issues. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| Member of the public | Central apartments - create a more European feel, increases potential for new/better restaurants and cafes to enhance Malton claim of the food capital of Yorkshire. |
| Member of the public | Beyond the A64 on NE and N, beyond the line of Whitewall on S and W of Beverley Road as I prefer the consolidation of towns within reasonable limits rather than excessive expansion of these limits. |

Question 4b: Thinking about Pickering- are there places where you would not want to see development take place- and why?

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Steve Murray Associates Ltd | North of Pickering due to its high visual importance |
| Persimmon Homes | In accordance with the adopted Ryedale Policies Map, future development in Pickering should avoid areas of high flood risk, visually important undeveloped areas, and areas of high landscape value. |
| Spawforths obo Keyland Developments | Keyland has undertaken an independent review of other sites put forward through the Call for Sites and will submit comments in due course. |
| Johnson Mowat obo Yorkshire Land Ltd | Development in Pickering should avoid areas of high flood risk, visually important undeveloped area, and areas of high landscape value. Crucially, Site 250 avoids all these criteria. |
| North Yorkshire Police | The current developments within Pickering are outpacing the current infrastructure including transport and education facilities. the current road network is reaching capacity with the A170 and A169 interchange at choking point already. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| Malton Town Council | Fair share of Ryedale % development. |
| Member of the public | Not that I can identify |
| Member of the public | The strip fields surrounding Pickering are of historical importance and are likely to constrain expansion of the town. Selection of sites within Pickering and adjacent to these fields will overcome this constraint |
| Member of the public | none in particular |
| Member of the public | No |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|------------------------|--|
| Member of the public | Extending along Whitby Road & only limited northwards. They would be too visible in the landscape – especially approaching the Moors. Also – it should not expand much further than the existing building line in the south, making sites 23 and 45 unacceptable. |
| Environment Agency | Areas suitable for consideration will need to take flood risk into account. This should principally be informed by the results of the Level 1 SFRA. |
| Member of the public | I don't know Pickering and its surrounds well enough. |
| Pickering Town Council | <p>There is potential to continue to grow the town of Pickering with careful and proper consideration. The council has already commented on suitable locations for development through the consultation on site submissions process, and the council would hope that these comments would be considered when agreeing suitable sites for development.</p> <p>Pickering is an attractive place to live and work and has a range of facilities to offer residents. The town should take on a share of the required housing allocations, but to be able to accommodate a significant increase in housing there must be investment in infrastructure and services in the town.</p> <p>Pickering also has scope for smaller developments which often fit well with existing settlements and give an opportunity for local builders.</p> |

Question 4c: Thinking about Kirkbymoorside- are there places where you would not want to see development take place- and why?

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Steve Murray Associates Ltd | Not sure |
| Malton Town Council | Fair share of Ryedale % development. |
| Member of the public | Not that I can identify |
| Member of the public | On the outskirts of the town in order to maintain the rural aesthetic character of the town |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|--|
| Member of the public | None in particular |
| Member of the public | Kirkbymoorside development questions should be answered by the people of Kirkbymoorside in conjunction with Town and District and new North Yorkshire council elected members. |
| Member of the public | I believe there should be a green barrier between Keldholme and Kirkbymoorside. |

Question 5a: Could growth of Malton/Norton in a particular way/location deliver wider, key infrastructure?

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|---|
| ID Planning obo The Vistry Group | <p>The growth of Malton / Norton needs to be approach in a balanced manner. Whilst very large sites have the potential to deliver other infrastructure, because of their scale and the need for infrastructure to be delivered upfront such sites are longer term options with delivery taking place towards the end of the plan period and beyond. To ensure that houses can be delivered consistently over the plan period, the Council should therefore identify sites which do not require significant infrastructure improvements and can deliver dwellings in the short to medium term. This will support the Council in identifying a 5 year supply over the whole of the plan period.</p> |
| Freeths LLP obo Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation | <p>Malton has significant potential for further growth with residential development at Site 264 - Land East of Rainbow Lane and south of Westgate Lane, Malton for circa. 175-245 new homes and residential development at Old Malton at Site 271 - Manor Farm Paddock and existing buildings on land north of Town Street for 30 plus new homes and Site 186 - Thackray<asc>39</asc>s Yard, Town Street for circa. 30-35 new homes (promoted by Fitzwilliam Malton Estate) which would be commensurate with the role, function and scale of the settlement.</p> <p>Additional supporting employment development of circa 20.23 hectares can be provided on Site 270a – Eden Camp East - East of A169 and Site 270 - Eden Camp East - East of A169 which is already identified as a preferred location for such uses in the adopted Ryedale Local Plan. The continued allocation of this land is essential in order to support ongoing investment in physical infrastructure such as roads and services that has been made thus far in bringing forward land to the west of the A169 for employment uses.</p> <p>As is set out in the accompanying covering letter to this consultation response the combined allocation of these sites provides the opportunity to deliver a highly sustainable land use strategy (delivering homes and jobs) for the next Local Plan period with substantial associated benefits including above policy provision of affordable housing, significant space for green and blue infrastructure supporting bio diversity net gain, new recreation opportunities to relieve pressure on the River Derwent area and improved flood resilience for the area. With no insurmountable technical constraint to early delivery.</p> |
| Steve Murray Associates Ltd | <p>Duelling of the A64 between York and Scarborough</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|--|
| Network Rail | It is understood that there is congestion on the road over the Malton Level Crossing when it is closed for the passage of a train. To mitigate the impact of development in the vicinity of this crossing, opportunities to provide a new grade-separated access route across the railway line should be considered. |
| Malton Town Council | No it has grown to its full capacity. |
| Member of the public | Roads already quite congested but better public transport and improved rail services would help. Seems to make sense to develop services at Malton Hospital and the Derwent Medical Practice |
| Member of the public | Yes. Large scale housing should incorporate link road access. For example - Broughton Road-Castle Howard Rd-York Road. Or Beverley Rd-Langton Rd-Welham Rd. Wool growers/river corridor should have rail/river bridges |
| Member of the public | Retail park and park and ride facilities on the outskirts of the town allowing for possible relocation of larger retail outlets such as supermarkets. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|--|
| Member of the public | No |
| Member of the public | yes - around the railway station (on norton side) towards the golf course |
| Member of the public | There needs to be a proper ring road around Malton and Norton to reduce the traffic through the centres, allowing businesses to flourish. |
| Member of the public | Yes |
| Member of the public | For any future development in Malton and Norton the infrastructure should come first. In recent developments it has invariably been part of the development of a site (or done afterwards) rather than the precursor. Maybe if infrastructure improvements were front loaded into the equation and signed off before the houses were built the system would work better. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|--|
| Member of the public | "Could lead to a more frequent and better used rail system to York and Scarborough, taking pressure off the A64 Upgrading of the A64" |
| Member of the public | At some time a new Doctors surgery with related services should be planned on the Norton side of the railway tracks as most of the population of the two towns live on the south side of the railway. |
| Member of the public | <p>The growth of Malton and Norton should only be considered AFTER the delivery of previously promised critical (key) infrastructure including new slip roads on/off the A64 at the B1257 Broughton Road, and a new roundabout at Musley Bank.</p> <p>This new infrastructure should be completed prior to any new housing development in Malton and Norton.</p> |
| Member of the public | Keeping towns compact presumably makes new infrastructure development more efficient as it can serve more properties – both new and existing. |
| Environment Agency | If a site can be shown to pass the Sequential and Exceptions Tests, and therefore be developed safely without increasing flood risk elsewhere, we would be supportive of considerations given to contributions that may be required for flood risk and drainage infrastructure. This may be on a case-by-case basis. Development sites that are likely to be reliant on existing or additional infrastructure are likely to be at high flood risk and therefore less likely to be suitable for development. We would recommend that you consider how any contributions to flood and drainage infrastructure may be linked with development – for example if there are direct or indirect benefits. By indirect, we mean aspects that may provide wider community benefit and therefore potentially contribute to overall |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| | reduction in flood risk. Contributions to infrastructure may therefore be financial or non-financial; and direct or indirect with respect to any specific site. |
| Member of the public | Yes, more incomes and spending. |
| NYCC Highways | <p>Malton and Norton Infrastructure and Connectivity Improvements Study (2017) WSP were also commissioned in December 2017 by Ryedale District Council (RDC) and North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) to undertake a study into potential options for improvements (both highway and non-highway) to infrastructure and facilities in the towns of Malton and Norton. The aim of any improvements was to minimise the adverse impact of congestion and poor connectivity in the towns, which are primarily considered to result from the railway level crossing, limited crossing points over the river and the traffic-signalled crossroad junction of B1248/B1257; known locally as Butcher Corner. The study also considered the impacts that poor connectivity and existing congestion may have on future development plans for the area, although this may have changed since the report was published.</p> <p>This Options Assessment Report provided a summary of the existing evidence base – analysis relating to the issues and problems experienced in the study area. It considered existing conditions in addition to the forecasted future situation, culminating in an initial view on the need for intervention. By reviewing the current and future issues, the Options Assessment Report sought to identify potential options for addressing the adverse impacts relating to congestion in and around Malton and Norton.</p> <p>Depending on the options selected within the Distribution of Development Consultation, this report may be useful and help steer decision making when preferred sites are assessed.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|------------------------|--|
| Pickering Town Council | <p>Addressing these three questions as one, it is a deeply held belief that Ryedale and the wider area has been poorly served by infrastructure delivery. The Plan needs to address the problems caused by poor rail links and congestion on the A64 which hinders the development of Ryedale as an attractive place to live and discourages businesses from investing in the area and providing new job opportunities. Without this investment towns like Pickering will just become commuter towns with an increasing number of houses but few local employment opportunities.</p> |

Question 5b: Could growth of Pickering in a particular way/location deliver wider, key infrastructure?

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--|---|
| Persimmon Homes | <p>Persimmon Homes believes that development in Pickering should be harmoniously integrated into character and appearance of the village, and should not be located in areas of high landscape value, flood risk or that of biodiversity importance.</p> <p>Land closely related to the settlement limits, to the south of the town, should be preferred for development. New housing should deliver a quantum of affordable housing and provide a package of contributions which the wider community will ultimately benefit from (which could include section 106 contributions for public open space, health facilities, education and highway infrastructure). Additional housing in Pickering will have significant economic benefits, with increased expenditure contributing to the vitality and viability of services in Pickering Town centre.</p> |
| Steve Murray Associates Ltd | <p>Possibly although there is a good infrastructure already in place to support development</p> |
| Carter Jonas obo Nawton, Nunnington, Place Newton, Thorpe Bassett and Westow Estates | <p>We have no response at this time.</p> |
| Spawforths obo Keyland Developments | <p>Keyland has highlighted within their Vision Statement and indicative masterplan the opportunity to positively contribute to the urban fabric of Pickering and enhance biodiversity and landscape opportunities by enhancing connectivity around Pickering through a publically accessible green corridor, which will link the Community Park to the north of the town towards the town centre through the Whitby Road site.</p> |
| Johnson Mowat obo Yorkshire Land Ltd | <p>The delivery of additional housing at Site 250 west of Outgang Lane will deliver a quantum of affordable housing and provide a package of contributions which the wider community will ultimately benefit from (which could include contributions for POS, education, Highways and health provision). Additional housing in Pickering will have significant economic benefits, with increased expenditure contributing to the vitality and viability of services in Pickering town centre.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Heslerton Parish Council | Improve public transport provision. |
| Malton Town Council | Yes |
| Member of the public | No personal knowledge to add |
| Member of the public | A170 bypass is essential |
| Member of the public | Insufficient local information. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|------------------------|---|
| Member of the public | not particularly - other than a scheme that would help improve/contribute towards traffic management easing away from the centre of town |
| Member of the public | Yes |
| Member of the public | I am not sure what infrastructure improvements would help Pickering, |
| Environment Agency | As with any new infrastructure, flood risk should be taken into account. If there are options being prepared then we would encourage you to think about how it interacts with flood risk early on, and seek any relevant comments from the Environment Agency and other risk management authorities. |
| Pickering Town Council | Addressing these three questions as one, it is a deeply held belief that Ryedale and the wider area has been poorly served by infrastructure delivery. The Plan needs to address the problems caused by poor rail links and congestion on the A64 which hinders the development of Ryedale as an attractive place to live and discourages businesses from investing in the area and providing new job opportunities. Without this investment towns like Pickering will just become commuter towns with an increasing number of houses but few local employment opportunities. |

Question 5c: Could growth of Kirkbymoorside in a particular way/location deliver wider, key infrastructure?

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--|--|
| Carter Jonas obo Nawton, Nunnington, Place Newton, Thorpe Bassett and Westow Estates | We have no response at this time. |
| Johnson Mowat obo KCS Development | The expansion of the western edge of Kirkbymoorside, in particular the KCS controlled land south of the A170 will provide the opportunity to deliver an enhanced area of publicly accessible open space with significant biodiversity enhancement opportunities. The provision of additional housing will deliver a quantum of affordable housing and provide a package of contributions which the wider community will ultimately benefit from (e.g. POS, education, highways, health). |
| Malton Town Council | Yes |
| Member of the public | Insufficient local information. |
| Member of the public | Development of housing for first time buyers |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|------------------------|---|
| Member of the public | Not particularly |
| Member of the public | Yes |
| Member of the public | I don't know Kirkbymoorside well enough. |
| Pickering Town Council | Addressing these three questions as one, it is a deeply held belief that Ryedale and the wider area has been poorly served by infrastructure delivery. The Plan needs to address the problems caused by poor rail links and congestion on the A64 which hinders the development of Ryedale as an attractive place to live and discourages businesses from investing in the area and providing new job opportunities. Without this investment towns like Pickering will just become commuter towns with an increasing number of houses but few local employment opportunities. |

Question 6a: What infrastructure improvements are needed to support additional development at Malton/Norton?

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|--|
| ID Planning obo The Vistry Group | <p>The consultation document suggests that major investment in infrastructure would be required to support large scale growth in Malton and Norton. The consultation document does not set out exactly what the infrastructure constraints are or provide options for how constraints could be addressed.</p> <p>At this stage it is therefore impossible to set out what improvements might be needed. This information should form part of the evidence base at the next consultation stage and the Council should look to identify solutions which will support the growth of Malton and Norton given these towns are the most sustainable and should be where the majority of growth is location.</p> <p>We are not aware of any specific infrastructure improvements that are required to support additional development in Malton / Norton at this stage. Any improvements required will depend on the quantum of new dwellings proposed in the settlement and the cumulative impact of the sites proposed which will be considered as part of the Council's evidence base in the future.</p> <p>The land being promoted by the Vistry Group to the west of Welham Road in Norton is of a scale that should there be an any impact on existing infrastructure such as school capacity or the local highway network, it is expected that these matters could be addressed and mitigated through the development proposals and planning obligations secured as part of any future planning permission.</p> |
| Freeths LLP obo Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation | <p>The Call for Sites submission on behalf of Commercial Development Projects and Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation provides a substantial amount of supporting information as to the ability to deliver growth on the promoted sites in Malton (and Old Malton) - principally sites 186, 264, 270, 270a and 271 noting that there is no material constraint in the form of infrastructure requirements (or otherwise).</p> <p>As above the continued allocation of sites 270 and 270a for employment uses is essential in order to support ongoing investment in physical infrastructure such as roads and services that has been made thus far in bringing forward land to the west of the A169 for employment uses.</p> |
| Steve Murray Associates Ltd | Decent infrastructure already in place |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--|--|
| ELG Planning obo Malton Fitzwilliam Estate | Further assessment would be needed to fully determine what infrastructure improvements would be required, however, as set out above, the proposed development of the Castle Howard Road site would include a link road between York Road and Middlecave Road, and highways modelling for the previous application on site (which included employment uses which are no longer proposed) concluded that the traffic associated with the development could be accommodated on the surrounding road network, and the provision of the link road would be a benefit to the operation of the Castle Howard Road/York Road junction. This link road is also an aspiration of the draft Malton & Norton Neighbourhood Plan to assist in alleviating wider congestion in Malton. |
| Network Rail | A new grade-separated access route across the railway line should be considered - it is understood that the road over the Malton Level Crossing (a key access route between Malton and Norton) experiences traffic congestion when the crossing is crossed for the passage of a train. |
| Malton Town Council | Schools, Doctors, Dentists and proper Bypass. |
| Amotherby Parish Council | Link B1257 to bypass. Ring road on Norton side of river. |
| Member of the public | Enhanced road system (long term ring road?). Expansion of Medical Services |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| Member of the public | 1 or 2 primary schools, additional health centre, link roads as outlined above, railway station and crossing improvements |
| Member of the public | Much better traffic management or increase in public transport to local villages to help support existing. |
| Member of the public | A new multi-directional junction between the A64 and B1257 Broughton Road would alleviate traffic build-up at Butchers Corner. A new river crossing south of Talbot hotel would help eastbound traffic into Norton. |
| Member of the public | a new bridge & ring road around Norton, over the river and linking onto York road |
| Member of the public | Derwent Surgery and Malton hospital. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| Member of the public | None |
| Member of the public | traffic flow and parking |
| Member of the public | For more development there needs to be a segregated Cycle network implemented with traffic free bridges over the river and railway. There also needs to be new junctions on to the A64. The capacity of some services such as the Surgery, the Hospital and all schools should be increased as well. All this should be done before houses are built. |
| Member of the public | Road and rail links |
| Member of the public | "At some time a new Doctors surgery with related services should be planned on the Norton side of the railway tracks as most of the population of the two towns live on the south side of the railway. Yorkshire Waters services to the area need to be upgraded" |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|--|
| Member of the public | More toilets, parking |
| Member of the public | <p>Minimum improvements needed to support additional development at Malton / Norton includes the provision of new slip roads on/off the A64 at the B1257 Broughton Road, and a new roundabout at Musley Bank.</p> <p>This new infrastructure should be completed prior to any new housing development in Malton and Norton.</p> |
| Member of the public | I will leave it to those more expert than I to address this. |
| Environment Agency | <p>In Malton, further improvements may be required for the River Derwent flood defences, to increase the Standard of Protection offered; and to associated pumping stations on tributaries. The specific details of improvements are not yet known. There are known issues in relation to surface water, groundwater and sewer flooding during times of flood that often require the deployment of multi-agency infrastructure. Varying proposals are in development to address these known issues and existing constraints. It will therefore be important to ensure that sufficient space is provided in the vicinity of watercourses and flood risk infrastructure to allow for existing operational and maintenance requirements; and future improvements (where required). The current 6 year capital programme (2021-2027) is available at https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/programme-of-flood-and-coastal-erosion-risk-management-schemes. Beyond this, additional projects and schemes may be identified within the lifetime of this Local Plan (identified as 2023 – 2038 on Pg.3).</p> <p>Other Risk Management Authorities may also have plans for future improvements to flood and drainage infrastructure that interact with those currently maintained or operated by the Environment Agency. We recommend that you also speak to the Lead Local Flood Authority and Yorkshire Water.</p> <p>Planned and prospective flood and drainage infrastructure improvements could be identified and link with the existing Local Plan policies in relation to identification or safeguarding of land (SP9) that may be required, and/or contributions that may be expected (SP17). This could also utilise potential links with upstream flood storage and Natural Flood Management.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--|--|
| | <p>With regards infrastructure, consideration will also need to be given to any future requirements relating to key bridge crossings (whether existing or new), ensuring that they consider the implications of present day and future flood risk. This may also need to include, for example, the interaction between raising flood defences and existing bridges; ensuring that flood risk is not increased.</p> |
| <p>NYCC Highways</p> | <p>Malton and Norton Infrastructure and Connectivity Improvements Study (2017) WSP were also commissioned in December 2017 by Ryedale District Council (RDC) and North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) to undertake a study into potential options for improvements (both highway and non-highway) to infrastructure and facilities in the towns of Malton and Norton. The aim of any improvements was to minimise the adverse impact of congestion and poor connectivity in the towns, which are primarily considered to result from the railway level crossing, limited crossing points over the river and the traffic-signalled crossroad junction of B1248/B1257; known locally as Butcher Corner. The study also considered the impacts that poor connectivity and existing congestion may have on future development plans for the area, although this may have changed since the report was published. This Options Assessment Report provided a summary of the existing evidence base – analysis relating to the issues and problems experienced in the study area. It considered existing conditions in addition to the forecasted future situation, culminating in an initial view on the need for intervention. By reviewing the current and future issues, the Options Assessment Report sought to identify potential options for addressing the adverse impacts relating to congestion in and around Malton and Norton. Depending on the options selected within the Distribution of Development Consultation, this report may be useful and help steer decision making when preferred sites are assessed.</p> |
| <p>NYCC Children and Young People's Services</p> | <p>At present some growth is projected to be possible within Malton and Norton without requiring additional Educational infrastructure at primary phase, although additional secondary places may be required.</p> |
| <p>NYCC Adult and Social Care</p> | <p>There are likely to be improvements/ capacity required within GP access and social care services (domiciliary care, residential/ nursing and specialist services).</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|------------------------|--|
| Pickering Town Council | Addressing these three questions as one, the question of infrastructure should really be looked at on a District level. Improving the A64 is key to any future development and the road infrastructure into Malton, Norton and Pickering needs improvement and this important issue should be addressed by the Local Plan. |

Question 6b: What infrastructure improvements are needed to support additional development at Pickering?

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Steve Murray Associates Ltd | Don't think any major infrastructure would be required |
| Spawforths obo Keyland Developments | Keyland notes that the Pickering Background Paper (October 2017) for the current Local Plan identifies the desire for more open space provision, especially for children and young people and enhanced green infrastructure. Keyland's site at Whitby Road includes green/blue infrastructure and pedestrian/cycle provision to connect the green spaces and enhance this area of Pickering. |
| North Yorkshire Police | Improved road network at A170/A169 although i have no idea how this could realistically be achieved. |
| Heslerton Parish Council | A by-pass would improve the town's environment and de-clog the central area. |
| Member of the public | No personal knowledge |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|--|
| Member of the public | By pass |
| Member of the public | Insufficient local information. |
| Member of the public | roads |
| Member of the public | None |
| Member of the public | I don't know Pickering well enough to know what is needed in detail. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|--|
| Member of the public | I will leave it to those more expert than I to address this. Extension of evening bus services from York would improve sustainability of new development. |
| NYCC Children and Young People's Services | At present some growth is projected to be possible within Pickering without requiring additional Educational infrastructure. |
| NYCC Adult and Social Care | There are likely to be improvements/ capacity required within GP access and social care services (domiciliary care, residential/ nursing and specialist services). |
| Pickering Town Council | Addressing these three questions as one, the question of infrastructure should really be looked at on a District level. Improving the A64 is key to any future development and the road infrastructure into Malton, Norton and Pickering needs improvement and this important issue should be addressed by the Local Plan. |

Question 6c: What infrastructure improvements are needed to support additional development at Kirkbymoorside?

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Steve Murray Associates Ltd | Not sure |
| Member of the public | No personal knowledge |
| Member of the public | No views |
| Member of the public | Insufficient local information. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|---|
| Member of the public | Larger Supermarket |
| Member of the public | None |
| Member of the public | I don't know Kirkbymoorside well enough to know what is needed in detail. |
| Member of the public | I will leave it to those more expert than I to address this. |
| NYCC Children and Young People's Services | The expansion of the Primary school to 1.5 forms of entry would be required to support any further development. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------------|--|
| NYCC Adult and Social Care | There are likely to be improvements/ capacity required within GP access and social care services (domiciliary care, residential/ nursing and specialist services). |
| Pickering Town Council | Addressing these three questions as one, the question of infrastructure should really be looked at on a District level. Improving the A64 is key to any future development and the road infrastructure into Malton, Norton and Pickering needs improvement and this important issue should be addressed by the Local Plan. |

Question 7: If you live in a village, what would you say are the most important local village services/facilities to your community?

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Steve Murray Associates Ltd | Shops, schools, amenity space, transport |
| Evolution Town Planning | Pub, bus service, village shop. |
| Rural Solutions obo Castle Howard | <p>Whilst this question is perhaps aimed at residents, Castle Howard, as a custodian of large parts of some villages, and with staff residing in these villages, offers a response to it.</p> <p>Reference should also be had to section four of this response which includes information on each settlement where Castle Howard is promoting land.</p> <p>Primary schools at Slingsby, Welburn and Terrington are considered to be important village services and facilities. It is important that these schools maintain a healthy roll, however, it is also important that the majority of this roll is from the village or area immediately surrounding it; if conversely this were not the case and the majority of the school roll was from further afield, they would lose their role as 'village schools'.</p> <p>It is considered important that retail facilities are available to residents of villages. On the basis of the scale of its development proposals for Slingsby, the Estate intends to create a new village shop (either on a development site or in an existing property) to compensate for the loss of the small shop in the village in recent years. The Estate considers that not every village in the area needs its own shop and as confirmed by Paragraph 79 of the NPPF, development in one village can support services in another. It is highly likely that the existing shop within Welburn village will be supported by Bulmer residents and the shop in Terrington by Ganthorpe residents, with an off-road walking and cycling link between the villages to be provided.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|--|
| Carter Jonas obo Nawton, Nunnington, Place Newton, Thorpe Bassett and Westow Estates | We have no response at this time. |
| ArkleBoyce obo Andrew Pern | The Star Inn and Pheasant Public Houses are the heart of the village and valued community assets. They create a vibrancy to the locality and are well used by existing residents, but the modest growth of the village will ensure that these vital community assets can be supported and sustained for many generations to come. |
| Edwardson Associates obo Lutton landowners | Bus route, village shop, doctors surgery, schools, public house, Village Hall (all located in the village of Terrington and walking distance |
| ELG Planning obo Mandale Homes | <p>The need to support and enhance rural communities is a key aim of national policy. Services and facilities play a key role in this. There is no single service or facility that should automatically mean a village is capable of accommodating additional development. Instead, the LPA need to recognise that sense of community is on the increase, with growing demand and recognition of the need for local produce, services and facilities. The delivery of new housing appropriate to the scale of the Service Villages will help retain and enhance these important rural communities.</p> <p>The Council's recent Village Services Audit identified a wide range of services and facilities in Ampleforth, including schools, pubs, a café, church, doctor's surgery, village hall and sports centre (Ampleforth College). A housing development of comparable scale to the previous allocation will evidently be able to benefit from and support these.</p> |
| Savills obo the Church Commissioner for England | <p>It is considered that educational facilities are extremely vital in a rural district but these are not the only important local village services/facilities to a community.</p> <p>Sand Hutton and Claxton would benefit from some modest development to help sustain the likes of St Mary's Church, the Sand Hutton and Claxton village hall, and more importantly Sand Hutton Church of England Primary School. The villages also have a regular bus service passing through them (the Castleline) with services running to Malton and York, which without use, would be subject to review.</p> <p>Similarly, Gate Helmsley, albeit is subject to Green Belt protection in parts, would benefit from some modest development to help sustain St Mary's Church, Gate Upper Helmsley Village Hall as well as the public transport connections via the existing bus services.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Savills obo the Settrington Estate | Settrington would benefit from some modest development to help sustain the likes of All Saints Church, the village hall, the Bowls, Cricket and Tennis Clubs and more importantly Settrington All Saints' Church of England Primary School. The village also has a regular bus service (Service 190 ran by North Yorkshire County Council) and without use would be subject to review. |
| Savills obo Hovingham Estate | <p>Hovingham benefits from a number of local services/ facilities, all of which play an important role in village life and are well used by the community and visitors. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hovingham GP Surgery - Hovingham Primary School - Hovingham Village Hall - Supermobile Library (alternate Monday evenings) - Mobile Post Office - Hovingham Inn - Park Street Café, Hairdresser and Beauty Salon - Hovingham Bakery and Café - Village Shop - Self-catering properties - Worsley Arms Hotel - Wath Court Nursery - Hovingham Fireplaces - Park/ Recreational Ground - Allotments |
| Savills obo Louise Kirk (Ampleforth) | In contrast, Service Villages such as Ampleforth have deliverable and developable sites available which could make a vital contribution to the Districts Land Supply in the short term. These representations are made in respect of the Land at Back Lane, Ampleforth and the Land at Station Road, Ampleforth. Which have capacity to deliver circa 25 new dwellings and community parking facilities. |
| KVA Planning | access to public transport, public house, post office, shop, doctors, church |
| North Yorkshire Local Access Forum | community hub (could be shop, pub, village hall, church, school etc), access to countryside, broadband, maintenance of utilities (including road, power, rights of way, car & cycle parking , public lavatories etc) |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Heslerton Parish Council | Better public transport services to reduce car reliance. |
| Wintringham Parish Council | Our only remaining facility is the Community Hall. The Church is no longer used for services. |
| Chair Wintringham Parish Council | We only have a village hall, no other services apart from a request bus on a Friday |
| Amotherby Parish Council | Bus service |
| Member of the public | Public transport, shops, doctors, school, pavements, leisure activities eg pub/restaurant/Gym, street lighting, play area for children. |
| Member of the public | Shops and public transport. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|--|
| Member of the public | There are no local facilities in Wintringham. |
| Member of the public | Wintringham only has one facility, which is our Village Hall |
| Member of the public | "Primary and Secondary Schools Public House Farm Shop and Cafe" |
| Member of the public | the ability for any village to provide good housing to both the young + older generations - otherwise housing just gets bought up by the elder cash rich demographic (who are then surprised the village dies sociologically).village hall. playground |
| Member of the public | Shop church post office pub |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| Member of the public | Doctors, shop, pub, public transport, primary school, village hall. |
| Member of the public | Good internet and phone signal |
| Member of the public | Shop |
| Member of the public | Grocery shop, doctor, village hall |
| Member of the public | "Village shop Mobile post office Village Hall Doctors surgery" |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| Member of the public | <p>"We don't have one but a pub/restaurant is important for community bonding. Potential to bring more visitors to see the town and take advantage of walks in the area. Village hall"</p> |
| Member of the Public | <p>By choosing to live in a village one makes the decision that there is going to be some travel to reach most services. The key is a thriving community whether based around Village Hall/Pub or something else. Other than mains water, electric and access to the internet there are no other essential services.</p> |
| Member of the public | <p>Within walking distance of the village shop.</p> |
| Member of the public | <p>The Post Office (which is also a bank). Brawby and Great Barugh are served by the mobile Post Office. Also, the village buses (Community buses) which enable non-car drivers / owners to access the market towns (on market days) for shopping and social activities. Brawby village hall is a well used and a well known facility. We (by which I mean my family) buy bread from the village bakery in Hovingham. We eat and drink at the Worsley Arms Hotel, Hovingham, the Grapes Inn, Slingsby and attend art events in Hovingham and Brawby and Kirbymisperton village halls, and Helmsley Arts Centre and Milton Rooms, and Gilling East village hall. The list is long and we use facilities in an array of other Ryedale villages, including the Chinese restaurant in Amotherby and Indian restaurants in Pickering and Nawton Beadlam.</p> <p>Brawby is served by all the major supermarkets and shops including Next. My new jeans arrived today (ordered yesterday) and delivery cost £3.99. We buy fish and chips from the mobile fish and chip van and also in Malton and Kirkby Moorside.</p> <p>Not forgetting the milkman who also delivers the Gazette & Herald and our window cleaner who comes from Great Habton. Eggs from Steve at Norfolk Lodge. This list could easily double in size. Hard to say which facility would be the most important to another person.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|--|
| | <p>Superfast Broadband is a hugely important facility and in Ryedale we are lucky. In Brawby we can receive Superfast Fibre Broadband from BT and Superfast Radio Broadband from Beeline Broadband based in Brawby. High speed internet enables people living in villages like Brawby to work and/or run their businesses from home if they so wish.</p> |
| Member of the public | <p>Access to the countryside Beautiful rural landscape – not ruined by over development Uncongested roads Limits on extent of on road parking by non residents</p> |

Question 8: What services and facilities do you consider to be essential/need sustaining, please explain your answer?

| Individual/Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Steve Murray Associates Ltd | Good transport links, educational facility, local shops, play area. Ability to come and go to the wider area, education for local children. Areas to play & relax. Shop for local products |
| Evolution Town Planning | Pub, bus service and village shop. |
| Rural Solutions obo Castle Howard | <p>Castle Howard address below the 'need sustaining' part of the question. Question 9 deals with matters of whether or not specific services and facilities are essential.</p> <p>Castle Howard notes that NPPF Paragraph 79 states that: "housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services."</p> <p>Castle Howard notes that there are a number of different services and facilities within the villages where the Estate owns land. In many cases services are shared between villages and as confirmed below in relation to question 9, development in one village can help to sustain services in another.</p> |
| ArkleBoyce | As outlined within the response to Q7, we consider that The Star Inn and Pheasant Public Houses are the heart of the village, valued community assets and important employers within the area. They create a vibrancy to the locality and are well used by existing residents. |
| Edwardson Associates | Even if a particular settlement does not have any services of its own, settlements nearby with services that need to be supported and sustained. Local Planning Authorities need to adopt Paragraph 79 of the NPPF approach to housing delivery - development in one village can support services in a village nearby - such as local school, pub, village store/Post office. |

| Individual/Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|---|
| ELG Planning | <p>The need to support and enhance rural communities is a key aim of national policy. Services and facilities play a key role in this. There is no single service or facility that should automatically mean a village is capable of accommodating additional development. Instead, the LPA need to recognise that sense of community is on the increase, with growing demand and recognition of the need for local produce, services and facilities. The delivery of new housing appropriate to the scale of the Service Villages will help retain and enhance these important rural communities.</p> <p>The Council's recent Village Services Audit identified a wide range of services and facilities in Ampleforth, including schools, pubs, a café, church, doctor's surgery, village hall and sports centre (Ampleforth College). A housing development of comparable scale to the previous allocation will evidently be able to benefit from and support these.</p> |
| Savills obo the Church Commissioner for England | <p>As per our comments to question 7 above, guiding new housing to villages will help to sustain communities and their services in the longer term. For example, Sand Hutton Church of England Primary School, play groups help in village halls, local sports clubs and public transport will only survive if there is community to support and use them.</p> |
| Savills obo the Settrington Estate | <p>Guiding new housing to villages will help to sustain communities and their services in the longer term. For example, Settrington All Saints' Church of England Primary School, the sports clubs and public transport will only survive if there is community to support and use them.</p> |
| Savills obo Hovingham Estate | <p>The mix of services and facilities listed in response to Question 7 are essential and need sustaining in recognition of the valuable contribution they make to village life in Hovingham.</p> <p>The beauty of Hovingham lies within its special village character as an Estate Village, which Hovingham Hall forms the centrepiece. First and foremost, it is crucial that this heritage is preserved and conserved for future generations to enjoy, like the many visitors to Hovingham do today.</p> <p>It is the Estate's intention to not only support and sustain all the existing facilities that exist, but to improve and enhance the offer as part of its wider masterplan through expansion of existing facilities and provision of new visitor facilities, such as a dedicated car park for the village.</p> <p>The growth proposed within the village, will therefore not only support and sustain those services and facilities that exist, but also create the opportunity for additional facilities that there is great demand for.</p> <p>The Vision Document proposes a holistic vision for the future of the village that puts businesses, the community and design at its heart.</p> |

| Individual/Organisation | Answer to Question |
|------------------------------------|---|
| | <p>Housing growth is clearly a key component in sustaining such services, with Paragraph 79 of the NPPF recognising that housing development can be used to enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities and calls on plan makers to identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive.</p> <p>The sites put forward through this Local Plan consultation represent the most appropriate sites within the village and coupled with the Estate's dedication to high quality design and leaving a positive legacy, represent a key opportunity for the sensitive growth of the village.</p> |
| KVA Planning | public transport, doctors, post office/shop and pub - in order for communities to be able to access basic services without the need to commute |
| North Yorkshire Local Access Forum | <p>all of the below:</p> <p>community hub (could be shop, pub, village hall, church, school etc), access to countryside, broadband, maintenance of utilities (including road, power, rights of way, car & cycle parking , public lavatories etc)</p> |
| Wintringham Parish Council | The community hall as our only facility is essential to the village |
| Chair Wintringham Parish Council | Access to a Drs surgery, already difficult in Sherburn and Rillington. Sewerage infrastructure is also struggling and our unclassified country road is already overused by traffic in particular HGVs |
| Member of the public | <p>Public transport, shops, doctors, school, pavements, leisure activities eg pub/restaurant/Gym, street lighting, play area for children.</p> <p>All of the above. We currently have none of these in Wintringham where we live.</p> |

| Individual/Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-------------------------|--|
| Member of the public | Shops and public transport. As above. My village has no services. I am reliant on my car to access any facilities in Ryedale. |
| Member of the public | Improved traffic management; electric charge points to enable required switch to electric vehicles; better public transport |
| Member of the public | We accept limited services because we are a small village. No development should take place until there is a shop, public transport, healthcare services |
| Member of the public | "Public Transport links Many people, especially the elderly, do not have access to cars" |
| Member of the public | Community buildings, sports facilities, playgrounds. to help the quality of life personally & for the village/towns sake |

| Individual/Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-------------------------|--|
| Member of the public | Shop and post office - to enable daily life to continue |
| Member of the public | Doctors surgery and Village shop. |
| Member of the public | Good internet and phone signal |
| Member of the public | shop - bus service - village hall |
| Member of the public | <p>"Grocery shop - provides a service to residents and is a locus for visitors Doctor - provides access to healthcare for those without transport (no bus service in Terrington) Village hall - much used and appreciated by residents. Also provides entertainment opportunities to people from beyond the village"</p> |

| Individual/Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------------|--|
| Member of the public | All of the above - to create a community and help the less mobile residents who live in a rural location that is not served by a bus service |
| Member of the public | <p>"Village hall Sports facilities for kids, a flat playing field, playground that is available in the weekends, i.e. not out of bounds to kids as dogs are being trained on it or a car boot sale takes place."</p> |
| Member of the public | All facilities in villages need sustaining to enable village life to continue to be a rich and good life. |
| Member of the public | <p>The beauty of the landscape and easy access to the countryside Good agricultural land</p> |
| NYCC Adult and Social Care | <p>As stated previously:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to local health services – GP, hospital, mental health or learning disability services. • Access to local amenities – schools, transport, activities (social), groceries etc. • Access to good quality and local services. • Integration and socialisation – to avoid social isolation and loneliness and to reduce stigma /hate crime etc • ☒ Access to workforce – decline in working age population and an increase in aging population |

| Individual/Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-------------------------|--------------------|
| | |

Question 9: Are there specific facilities/ services that a village should have before we consider allocating land for housing at the village?

| Individual/Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Steve Murray Associates Ltd | Yes - Good transport links / bus service |
| Evolution Town Planning | Pub, shop, bus service, and primary school. |
| Rural Solutions obo Castle Howard | <p>Castle Howard does not consider that there should be a prescribed list of facilities and services that a village should have before new land is allocated, for a number of reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The NPPF (para. 79) states that: “To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. (emphasis added)” There is an acknowledgement at a national level that services and facilities are often spread across different villages. Creating a prescribed list of facilities and services would not be in accordance with the more nuanced views of rural geographies as set out in national policy. 2. The NPPF’s acknowledgement of services being ‘shared’ between settlements, and an acceptance that development can take place in settlements without a prescribed list of services and facilities is seen to be based on the findings of the Living Working Countryside: The Taylor Review of Rural Economy and Affordable Housing (DCLG) 2008. This introduced the concept of a ‘sustainability trap’ for smaller settlements (and thereby those without a prescribed list of services and facilities, whereby they were considered too small to accept new development, and therefore entered a spiral of decline, where the demographic of the village would continue to age (without new development, including affordable housing) and existing services and facilities are placed under threat. The introduction of a prescribed list of services and facilities in all villages to receive allocation could leave some villages in this situation. 3. The specific geography of the Castle Howard area creates a hub and spoke type relationship with a number of villages on the periphery of the Estate corresponds to the national approach. Services are shared between villages in some cases, for example the village of Terrington has no public house but does have a GP surgery and sports facilities (tennis courts). The village of Welburn has a public house, but no GP service and it is anticipated the residents |

| Individual/Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-------------------------|---|
| | <p>could use the tennis courts at Terrington. All villages in the area around Castle Howard can make use of the retail (farmshop), social space (café) and recreation facilities (extensive walks) that the centre of the Estate provide.</p> <p>4. The requirement for specific facilities/services to be in place before consideration is even given to allocating land for housing, overlooks the potential for the allocation of land to provide these services. For example, if Ryedale considered that a pub or café and village hall was a requirement for land to be allocated, this would overlook the opportunity that some of the Estate's sites hold to provide (if considered essential) these types of services.</p> <p>5. Changing retail, working and socialising patterns, means that increasingly people use services and facilities in a different way. Services can also be provided in a different way, for example, Castle Howard has considered the use of an 'electric shop' facility to serve some of the villages which do not currently have a shop.</p> |
| Persimmon Homes | <p>Persimmon Homes believe that unlike larger urban areas, villages do not necessarily have to accommodate all the necessary infrastructure and services in order for housing allocations to be considered in that village. However, there should be relevant infrastructure and services within a sustainable distance from the village, and any new housing development within it. New development should be of a size and scale which is proportionate to the village, and the infrastructure and services available.</p> |
| Carter Jonas | <p>No</p> |
| Edwardson Associates | <p>Yes - Not necessarily. There may be small scale sites worth allocating which can deliver planning gain to a particular settlement and help to support services in settlements nearby. Just because a particular village has no or limited services, development can still be sustainable if it can support facilities in settlements nearby.</p> |
| ELG Planning | <p>The need to support and enhance rural communities is a key aim of national policy. Services and facilities play a key role in this. There is no single service or facility that should automatically mean a village is capable of accommodating additional development. Instead, the LPA need to recognise that sense of community is on the increase, with growing demand and recognition of the need for local produce, services and facilities. The delivery of new housing appropriate to the scale of the Service Villages will help retain and enhance these important rural communities. The Council's recent Village Services Audit identified a wide range of services and facilities in Ampleforth, including schools, pubs, a café, church, doctor's surgery, village hall and sports centre (Ampleforth College). A housing development of comparable scale to the previous allocation will evidently be able to benefit from and support these.</p> |

| Individual/Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|---|
| Savills obo the Church Commissioner for England | It is considered that for a settlement to accommodate some growth it should have some facilities and services, albeit perhaps limited if it could be considered as part of a cluster of settlements. This ensures that development is located in sustainable locations as much as possible whilst still providing a housing choice to residents throughout the district. Examples of important services and facilities to quantify sustainable development could include educational facilities and access to public transport. For example, whilst Claxton does not have as many services as Sand Hutton, they do rely on shared facilities such as the village hall. As such, the development in one village would help support that of another in line with paragraph 79 of the 2021 NPPF. |
| Savills obo the Settrington Estate | It is considered that for a settlement to accommodate some growth it should have some facilities and services, albeit perhaps limited if it could be considered as part of a cluster of settlements. This ensures that development is located in sustainable locations as much as possible whilst still providing a housing choice to residents throughout the district. Examples of important services and facilities to quantify sustainable development should include educational facilities and access to public transport. |
| Savills obo Birdsall Estate | <p>Yes –</p> <p>We have previously set out the services and facilities available in each settlement. As previously mentioned and in the context of the rural character of much of Ryedale, we would support the progression of ‘Functional Cluster Model’ which would recognise that development in settlement can support the vitality and sustainability of that settlement, as well as services and facilities in settlements nearby.</p> <p>2.28. This approach would be in line with Paragraphs 78 of the NPPF which recognises that where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.</p> |
| Savills obo Hovingham Estate | <p>Yes - We would support the distribution of large levels of growth to villages which benefit from existing services and facilities, such as Hovingham. As we have already outlined within these representations, Hovingham is an active rural community which benefits from a large number of key shops and services which are located within walking distance of homes in the Village. The village is also served by a bus service which provides sustainable travel options to Malton.</p> <p>Growth in such villages will also support appropriate levels of growth within smaller villages in the locality. The adoption of a ‘Functional Clusters Model’ would allow the Council to realise the more broad distribution of growth in line with Option 2 as set out in the Distribution of Growth Consultation Paper. This approach is also supported by paragraph 79 of the NPPF which states that ‘where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby’.</p> |
| KVA Planning | <p>Yes -</p> <p>At least one of the services above should be within the settlement (infill sites should be included albeit size dependent) prior to allocation</p> |
| Heslerton Parish Council | <p>Yes -</p> <p>Availability of local shops, medical services, schools etc.</p> |

| Individual/Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Wintringham Parish Council | Yes - Public transport to reduce vehicle dependency, a shop and pub are very important. |
| Chair Wintringham Parish Council | Yes - Good public transport, good sewerage provision, a post office or shop. Local surgeries that have capacity |
| Amotherby Parish Council | Yes - A good size shop with a wide range of products and reasonable prices that saves journeys to a supermarket - eg. Hovingham, or such a shop within easy access/close proximity. |
| Member of the public | Yes - All of the above but with the emphasis being on public transport, shops, doctors and school. Given that many villages are remote a good and safe road system is important as people will have to travel to reach amenities. |
| Member of the public | Yes - Good public transport and road links, superfast broadband |

| Individual/Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-------------------------|---|
| Member of the public | Yes - Needs shops, public transport, employers. |
| Member of the public | Yes - Improved mains facilities particularly drainage and sewage; update of electricity and telecommunications; improved traffic management to cope with increased road usage. |
| Member of the public | Yes - The only roads into Wintringham from the A64 are too narrow for increased traffic (two HGVs can't pass each other at present) |
| Member of the public | Yes - Public Transport links |
| Member of the public | No |

| Individual/Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-------------------------|---|
| Member of the public | Yes - shop |
| Member of the public | Yes - Public transport, pub, etc as above |
| Member of the public | No |
| Member of the public | Yes - Shop - Bus service and school |
| Member of the public | Yes - Bus service |

| Individual/Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-------------------------|---|
| Member of the public | <p>Yes - Good communications, including bus service and more than single track roads as main access</p> <p>Leisure opportunities for young people</p> |
| Member of the public | No |
| Member of the public | <p>Yes -</p> <p>Restaurant/cafe/bar,</p> |
| Member of the public | <p>No.</p> <p>I do not mean that I do not want to see housing land allocated in a particular village. My answer simply means that I'm not in the slightest bit interested or concerned if a village currently has services or facilities or not. There are services and facilities in and around all Ryedale villages, in our cluster villages, and local towns and almost everything imaginable is available to purchase or access online.</p> |
| Member of the public | <p>As indicated in my response to Q1 and 2, for truly sustainable development and delivery of our climate change objectives, a very high level of services and facilities is required. These include:</p> <p>Public transport – at least hourly from 7am to 10am to and from nearest large towns</p> <p>Full range of leisure and sports facilities for all ages within the village itself – no need to travel elsewhere</p> <p>GP surgery</p> <p>Shop capable of doing a weekly food shop using fresh ingredients – at a competitive price</p> <p>Gas mains – so hydrogen can be used once developed</p> |

| Individual/Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|---|
| | <p>Electricity infrastructure capable of handling the needs of all existing oil fuel and LPG households converting to heat pumps in future (they will be inefficient) – and also electric car charging – so huge expansion in green electricity required Primary and secondary school sustainable by local children only – no commuting in from elsewhere Wide opportunities for work Sufficient off road parking Uncongested roads</p> <p>These could not be justified in a village unless the extent of development was so large as to turn it into a town – which is unacceptable in that it destroys valuable agricultural land and urbanises the rural landscape. Small primary schools, very limited bus services and expensive small shops which can only be used for the occasional top up are wholly inadequate. New development should therefore be limited to existing towns and cities.</p> <p>No housing should be allocated to villages without full consultation with and a majority agreement of residents.</p> |
| NYCC Children and Young People's Services | <p>As stated in response to question 1 from the perspective of the CYPS ensuring that developments are able to be supported with appropriate sustainable Education provision is a very important factor. In addition it is preferable if pupils are able to live close enough to Educational establishments that they can easily access on foot.</p> <p>It is preferable that development occurs where school places are available or where the impact of the development can be mitigated for example by expansion of an existing school or by providing a new school.</p> |
| NYCC Adult and Social Care | <p>For specialist accommodation we would want some infrastructure so people can live independently (shops, leisure etc. if possible) as well as good public transport to bigger centres for work, socialising etc. as many people we support do not drive.</p> |

Question 10: If you live in a village, would you like to see more housing development if it brought wider improvements such as public open space, biodiversity enhancements as well as address as a minimum any infrastructure requirements of the development?

| Individual/Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|---|
| Steve Murray Associates Ltd | No |
| Carter Jonas | Yes |
| ArkleBoyce | Yes |
| Edwardson Associates | Yes |
| Savills obo the Church Commissioner for England | Yes – Our client is a landowner in the district, in and around a range of villages, and would support the delivery of more housing in Sand Hutton, Claxton and Gate Helmsley. Subject to viability of a scheme, particularly if it was small in scale, our client would support future development if it brought wider improvements to the area. |
| Savills obo the Settrington Estate | Yes – Our client is a resident and landowner in the village and would welcome more housing in Settrington. Subject to viability of a scheme, particularly if it was small in scale, the Settrington Estate would support future development if it brought wider improvements to the area. |

| Individual/Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Savills obo Hovingham Estate | <p>These representations are made in the context of the Estate’s wider development ambitions for Hovingham, which seeks to make Hovingham a high quality place to live and visit. The Worsely family have also demonstrated a wider commitment to environmental stewardship, as part of their custodianship of the Estate. This commitment will be carried forward to any development in order to enhance biodiversity and address infrastructure requirements of a development.</p> <p>Sustainability benefits of any proposed development will be carefully considered through each development, including consideration of how the site will adopt the energy hierarchy of the Local Plan Strategy and deliver biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>The holistic development strategy presented within the Vision Document at Appendix 1 also identifies a number of key locations for tree planting and for delivering additional community facilities, which are focussed around the natural environment, such as a forest school, planting and allotments. The Hovingham Estate are taking a high-level, long-term view to the evolution of the village, which allows for the consideration of matters such as Public Open Space and biodiversity enhancements from the outset.</p> |
| Savills obo Louise Kirk (Ampleforth) | <p>The distribution of growth to settlements such as Ampleforth is encouraged given the support such smaller sites in more rural village locations provide the opportunity for high quality developments delivered by local tradespeople. The Framework suggests that small and medium sites should be encouraged, requiring 10% of a Districts housing requirements be delivered on sites no larger than 1 ha. Small and Medium sized sites should also be promoted given they can often be delivered by local housebuilders, supporting local trade.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt, we strongly support the distribution of growth to Service Villages such as Ampleforth, which will realise a number of benefits for the village whilst also contributing to the housing supply of the District in a sensitive manner.</p> |
| Heslerton Parish Council | Yes |
| Wintringham Parish Council | No |
| Chair Wintringham Parish Council | No |

| Individual/Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--------------------------|--------------------|
| Amotherby Parish Council | No |
| Member of the public | No |
| Member of the public | No |
| Member of the public | No |
| Member of the public | No |

| Individual/Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-------------------------|--------------------|
| Member of the public | Yes |
| Member of the public | Yes |
| Member of the public | Yes |
| Member of the public | No |
| Member of the public | No |

| Individual/Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-------------------------|---|
| Member of the public | No |
| Member of the public | No |
| Member of the public | No |
| Member of the public | <p>No. By answering NO I simply mean I think it wholly unnecessary for small scale developments or small builders to have to address or get tangled-up with the provision of providing new open spaces. Ryedale's rural villages tend to be just that - rural - and in the middle of open countryside. I think the question is appropriate to the towns and maybe the very large, so-called 'service villages'.</p> |
| Member of the public | <p>I do not wish to see more development under any circumstances. There is no need for public open spaces if the existing open spaces and wider countryside are not ruined by over-development. Biodiversity enhancements should be mandatory in any case – without the bribe of allowing extra housing development.</p> |

Question 10a: Following on from the above question, if you are as an individual or as a community answered yes to the above question what is the village called, and what type (market housing/ affordable housing/ self-build housing) and size of housing development would be likely to be supported?

| Individual/Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|--|
| Carter Jonas | We have no response at this time. |
| ArkleBoyce | Harome. |
| Edwardson Associates | Yes, even small scale housing schemes can make a contribution to improving the sustainability of settlements such as Terrington. A flexible approach which, subject to appropriate scale, allows for market housing. Market housing can provide contributions to local projects such as a new community centre, playing pitches, affordable housing and biodiversity enhancements etc. |
| Savills obo the Church Commissioner for England | <p>Our client is a landowner in Sand Hutton, Claxton and Gate Helmsley and would support future housing development in these villages. As part of the Call for Sites consultation in 2021, we submitted several sites (12 to be exact) that are considered suitable for small scale development. These sites include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site 238 – Land to the north of Clematis Cottage Sand Hutton • Site 239 – Land to the West of Upper Helmsley Road Sand Hutton • Site 240 – Land at White Syke Farm Sand Hutton • Site 241 – Land to the Northwest of Pine Wood Lodge Sand Hutton • Site 242 – Land to the North of Claxton Ings Farm Claxton • Site 243 – Land north of Whinny Lane Ings Farm Claxton • Site 244 – Land to the south of Whinny Lane Claxton • Site 245 – Land west of Claxton Ings Farm Claxton • Site 246 – Land east of Green Hills Claxton • Site 247 – Land north of Risewood Gate Helmsley |

| Individual/Organisation | Answer to Question |
|------------------------------------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site 248 – Land east of the Lane Gate Helmsley • Site 249 – Land to the rear of 10-14 Sand Hutton <p>It can be confirmed that these sites continue to be available, suitable, achievable and deliverable for development over the Local Plan Review period and we would welcome the opportunity to discuss these sites further with the Council when deemed appropriate.</p> |
| Savills obo the Settrington Estate | <p>Our client is a resident and landowner in Settrington and would support future housing development in the village. As part of the Call for Sites consultation in 2021, we submitted three sites that are considered suitable for small scale development in the village. These sites include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at the Mill Yard- Settrington (Call for Sites Reference - Site No. 272) • The Old Orchard Site, Settrington (Call for Sites Reference - Site No. 273) • Francis Johnson Close, Settrington (Call for Sites Reference - Site No. 274) <p>It can be confirmed that these sites are available, suitable, achievable and deliverable for development over the Local Plan Review period and we would welcome the opportunity to discuss these sites further with the Council when deemed appropriate.</p> |
| National Trust | NT is supportive of an approach which allows for affordable housing within the village of Nunnington. |
| Heslerton Parish Council | People live in villages to avoid urban sprawl. Development would destroy this. |
| Member of the public | "Beadlam and Nawton Market housing/affordable housing. 30 to 50 houses" |

| Individual/Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-------------------------|--|
| Member of the public | Barton-le-street & Newton-on-Rawcliffe. well designed and built open market housing which can be bought by young locals (and i don't just mean those from the village - the Ryedale area as a whole). OM so the banks will lend & they can be sold |
| Member of the public | Terrington – would only support the conversion of existing buildings not new building on green field sites |

Question10b: If you answered no, is this in relation to a specific settlement? If so, please identify the settlement and your reasons for why you would not wish to see new housing delivered there.

| Individual/ Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Steve Murray Associates Ltd | Pickering which is well serviced |
| Wintringham Parish Council | In Wintringham there has been a lot of infill development within the development limit of the village. Proposals are seeking to build outside this limit which would change the character of the village |
| Chair Wintringham Parish Council | Yes Wintringham. There are no services. The proposals are outside the development limits of the village and 3 are in areas of high landscape value. The other lies adjacent to An SSSI and several water courses/wetland areas. |
| Amotherby Parish Council | Amotherby - These improvements are easily "fiddled" in a planning application and may actually bring no benefit to the village. We have already been allocated an unacceptable number of dwellings for the size of the village and available facilities |

| Individual/ Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Member of the public | Wintringham has absolutely no amenities at all and is serviced by one single already overused and dangerous narrow road. |
| Member of the public | Wintringham...it is a conservation area and would be spoilt by further development. |
| Member of the public | Wintringham. Development would have a negative impact on biodiversity as it supports a wide variety of habitats for rare and uncommon bird and amphibian species. The Wolds Way goes through the village providing an important public space. |
| Member of the public | The only roads into Wintringham from the A64 are too narrow for increased traffic (two HGVs can't pass each other at present) |

| Individual/ Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Member of the public | Terrington, we do not have the infrastructure in our village to accommodate more housing. |
| Member of the public | "TERRINGTON Please see attached letter pdf" |
| Member of the public | Terrington. The current public open space, biodiversity are sufficient. The road infrastructure would require improvement |
| Member of the public | "Building houses on green field sites takes away biodiversity and public open space Terrington - building on a paddock used as a local amenity, accessed by a single track road. Access to both ends of the village is also by a single track road" |

| Individual/ Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Member of the public | As the village is small, it has the open spaces for walking which should be advertised/marketed more. If you turn all the small villages into not so small villages then you lose potential visitors and thus spend in the area. |
| Member of the public | We reside in Leavening and my answers to Qu. 9 and 10 refer to this. Also, my wife and I recently moved to Leavening and we bought a house next to a site designated by the Council in 2018 as 'in an area of High Landscape Value'. |
| Member of the public | No – this relates to all villages including service villages. |

Question 11: Would you like to see development in the smaller villages? If so, what would be your reasons for this?

| Organisation | Full Answer to Question |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Steve Murray Associates Ltd | Yes. For local people to continue to live where they were born/brought up. |
| Evolution Town Planning | No. |
| Persimmon Homes | Yes |
| Rural Solutions obo Castle Howard | <p>Castle Howard considers it very important that some smaller villages below Local Service Centre level receive new development. If new development is not directed to these villages, then their demographics will continue to age and services and facilities will be lost. Information provided in section four points to this conclusion.</p> <p>Paragraph 79 of the NPPF states that:</p> <p>“To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.”</p> |

| Organisation | Full Answer to Question |
|---|---|
| | <p>The first two sentences of the policy wording do not distinguish between smaller or larger rural settlements but acknowledges that all settlements have scope for growth and villages of different scale may grow and thrive. The final sentence acknowledges that development in smaller settlements can support services in nearby villages, which is the case in the villages where Castle Howard owns land.</p> |
| <p>Barton Willmore obo Tim Parkinson</p> | <p>Our client supports development in the smaller villages. The council acknowledge that there is currently a limited supply of sites at the service villages and therefore development in smaller villages would support the overall growth of the district and ensure housing development continues to be delivered where there is a limited supply of sites in the towns and service villages.</p> <p>Appleton-le-Street is located approximately 1.8km west of Amotherby and Swinton, which are both allocated as service villages. However, with limited sites available in these settlements, the Council should place greater emphasis on the way villages interact with each other to help secure their future sustainability and therefore, accommodate for housing provision in some of the smaller settlements to support the sustainability of services and facilities located in the larger service villages, particularly where there is a limited supply of sites in the service villages.</p> |
| <p>Carter Jonas obo Nawton, Nunnington, Place Newton, Thorpe Bassett and Westow Estates</p> | <p>Yes. The Estates represented by Carter Jonas LLP would welcome the benefits of development in the smaller villages to be acknowledged within policy formulation.</p> <p>If the latter approach were not to be adopted, it will mean the distribution of housing would be inequitable and would lead to no or very limited development taking place in villages over the Plan period, resulting in a lack of housing opportunity, keeping prices high and constraining the viability of local services. We consider that rather than ignoring villages and settlements such as Nunnington, Pockley, Thorpe Bassett, Westow and Wintringham, a far more effective way of providing for local housing needs would be to allocate modest and appropriate sites for residential development within them, thereby providing for certainty and managed growth at the outset, rather than being left to ad hoc windfall development.</p> |
| <p>ArkleBoyce obo Andrew Pern</p> | <p>Yes. It is imperative, particularly in smaller villages with access to facilities, such as Harome, that some growth is directed there. The NPPF is supportive of this approach. Paragraph 78 of the Framework supports development which will provide the opportunity for rural communities to 'grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services'.</p> |

| Organisation | Full Answer to Question |
|---|---|
| Edwardson Associates obo Lutton landowners | Yes. Yes to enhance and maintain the vitality of rural communities; responding positively to Para 79 of the NPPF. Small scale high quality development can provide a mix of much needed housing in rural settlements. |
| Savills obo the Church Commissioner for England | Yes. |
| Savills obo the Settrington Estate | Yes. |
| KVA Planning | Yes. If this met a specific local need and could be offered as such. |
| Heslerton Parish Council | Yes. |
| Wintringham Parish Council | No. Not unless there is actual infrastructure investment. |
| Chair Wintringham Parish Council | No. Unless they had the services to support them. |

| Organisation | Full Answer to Question |
|--------------------------|--|
| Amotherby Parish Council | Yes. Some have been asking for small scale development for many years. More people living there would possibly help to maintain bus services, local pubs etc. |
| Member of the public | No. Only if the requisite amenities exist. |
| Member of the public | No. Nothing beyond local needs to protect their identity. |
| Member of the public | No. There is no infrastructure to support development. |
| Member of the public | No. Many have insufficient infrastructure and facilities but sit in areas of high landscape value and are more appropriate for concentrating biodiversity improvements such as tree planting and habitat improvements. |

| Organisation | Full Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| Member of the public | No. Ryedale's rural character must be protected. |
| Member of the public | Yes. So housing stock here does not become so limited its price excludes local families staying there. |
| Member of the public | No. Likely to be unsustainable and not in character. |
| Member of the public | No. Maintain rural character. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Not all development is bad. villages need to expand for their own population and provide themselves with better facilities - which can usually only come from development charges. |

| Organisation | Full Answer to Question |
|----------------------|--|
| Member of the public | No. To maintain the character of the villages. |
| Member of the public | No. Could attract second home buyers. |
| Member of the public | No. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Growth can be accommodated in small projects to keep villages sustainable. |
| Member of the public | No. The relative impact of a parcel of new housing on smaller villages is greater than that on larger settlements. |

| Organisation | Full Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| Member of the public | Yes. I think villages always benefit from continuous development and new blood, clearly if it is a smaller village without services this will be tougher to justify, but where there are some services there is maybe scope for more to be added. The services such as village shops, post offices, pubs, fish and chip shops and butchers always require custom. |
| Member of the public | No. Maintain the character of the villages and the surrounding countryside (AONB). Increased road traffic, including more residents commuting, home deliveries which has already dramatically increased. Concerned about the number of second homes in Howardian villages. |
| Member of the public | Yes. I do not think it should be barred. I think a small development of a few dwellings could be designed to meet local interests. |
| Member of the public | No. Spoil the character and beauty – these little villages brings visitors and spend into the area. |
| Member of the public | Yes, As previously stated. The current policy makes for stagnant and aging communities. |

| Organisation | Full Answer to Question |
|---|---|
| Member of the public | <p>I do not believe that smaller villages should be further developed for the reasons as given above. - By their very nature, non-service villages have green areas either to explore, walk or cycle and further development would only diminish this asset. I believe that we need to find ways of protecting the wildlife and the green areas. Perhaps incentivising local people to work with the farming community, charities and the local Council on various environmental projects could be a way forward.</p> |
| Member of the public | <p>Yes.</p> <p>New housing development should be spread evenly and equitably across all Ryedale villages and towns to support sustainable, vibrant and healthy rural communities. Allocating appropriate numbers of new houses to all Ryedale villages, both large and small, will also share the load with our market towns and 'service villages' which are all threatened with overdevelopment.</p> <p>All people (including Ryedale people) should be able enjoy the same basic human right to live where they choose, with whom they choose, without being forced to artificially justify their choice, or somehow qualify' their suitability to live in one Ryedale house or village or another. The discriminatory and unfair use of the Local Needs Occupancy Condition in Ryedale as a blunt tool to control a/ where houses get built, and b/ who qualifies to live in them, I believe is both disgraceful and discriminatory and a violation of a person's basic human rights.</p> <p>The Local Needs Occupancy Condition devalues a person s private property and renders the development of small scale housing in Ryedale s small villages unviable. It is an unpopular and unreasonable planning policy that is not fit for purpose.</p> |
| Member of the public | <p>No – it is not sustainable in any circumstances and so should not be allowed – except in very limited circumstances for very local needs which are well supported by evidence.</p> |
| NYCC Children and Young People's Services | <p>Yes. In smaller villages which have schools, some development could provide additional pupil numbers which may help with sustainability. A list of the schools with projected surplus capacity is provided in Appendix 1.</p> |

| Organisation | Full Answer to Question |
|----------------------------|--|
| NYCC Adult and Social Care | Yes. To enable people with disabilities to have access to their own accommodation within their own village, without having to move locality or out of area. |
| Northminster Properties | Yes. It is important that there should be a more dispersed approach to distributing growth across all settlements within the district. This is for the following reasons: Small scale new development in the smaller settlements will attract new investment into areas where local services are reducing. New development will help to sustain local services and assist in bring in new services and local jobs. Since the Covid pandemic working practices have changed substantially. With more home working opportunities people do not need to be living in the main settlements. With a more dispersed development strategy people will have a greater choice of where they would like to reside. Bringing new development to smaller settlements will bring in new people into these settlements helping sustain them for the future. There will be enhanced opportunities for smaller housebuilders and also for self-build opportunities across the district. It will be easier to meet the housing numbers required by having the ability to include a wider range and number of sites. By having a greater number of smaller sites in smaller settlements the district will not be reliant on the delivery of larger single sites. Thus diversifying the delivery of new housing and ensuring that delivery will take place as if the delivery of a single large site is delayed this will have a large impact on the district. It will bring a greater amount of choice to the population and requires less land to be released in towns which will struggle to identify large deliverable sites. |

Question 12: Land allocations at the villages have been made to help provide affordable housing in the rural area and to help sustain local services. They could also be used to help support our local landed estates in conserving important heritage assets and landscapes. Do you think that this is something we should be looking to directly support in Ryedale, through the review of the Plan?

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--|--|
| Steve Murray Associates Ltd | Yes. For local people to remain. |
| Persimmon Homes | Yes. |
| Rural Solutions obo Castle Howard | <p>Castle Howard agrees with this approach. The international importance of its heritage assets, some of which are on the heritage at risk register is well known. Estate-led development will not provide heritage benefits (and affordable housing and local service benefits as the question acknowledges). It also provides economic benefits as many of those involved in the management and conservation of heritage assets will be based locally, creating a circular economy type pattern. Landed estates in multi-generation ownership are also very concerned with delivering development of the highest quality so the support of development by them will result in enhancement of the future built environment.</p> |
| Carter Jonas obo Nawton, Nunnington, Place Newton, Thorpe Bassett and Westow Estates | <p>Carter Jonas LLP knows first-hand from the Estates represented in this consultation that the release of small housing sites within the villages mentioned above can provide a vital source of revenue, which is an important element in ensuring their long-term viability, recognising the role of diversification of activities and assets.</p> <p>However, restricting development to affordable housing schemes can sometimes act as a disincentive to sites coming forward for residential development due to the reduced returns associated with this form of development, having a negative impact on housing supply.</p> |
| Edwardson Associates obo Lutton landowners | Yes. Landed estates are an important asset with various land and buildings. There should also be this approach to agricultural holdings which are owned and are capable of delivering a variety of developments including market and affordable housing. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|--|
| Savills obo the Church Commissioner for England | <p>Rural Exception Sites are small sites used for affordable housing in perpetuity where sites would not normally be used for housing. Rural exception sites seek to address the needs of the local community by accommodating households who are either current residents or have an existing family or employment connection.</p> <p>A proportion of market homes may be allowed on the site at the local planning authority's discretion, for example where essential to enable the delivery of affordable units without grant funding. Whilst we support such proposals, as these are in line with national policy, Rural Exception Sites should not be the only form of residential development supported in the smaller settlements. For vitality and viability some modest market growth should be supported across the district. This would provide a greater housing choice to all residents in Ryedale and by supporting some larger scale housing sites across the District, by virtue of policy would require a proportion of such housing to be affordable in tenure in any event.</p> |
| Savills obo the Settrington Estate | <p>Rural Exception Sites are small sites used for affordable housing in perpetuity where sites would not normally be used for housing. Rural exception sites seek to address the needs of the local community by accommodating households who are either current residents or have an existing family or employment connection.</p> <p>A proportion of market homes may be allowed on the site at the local planning authority's discretion, for example where essential to enable the delivery of affordable units without grant funding. Whilst we support such proposals, as these are in line with national policy, Rural Exception Sites should not be the only form of residential development supported in the smaller settlements. For vitality and viability some modest market growth should be supported across the district.</p> <p>In terms of enabling development, this is development that would not be in compliance with local and/or national planning policies, and not normally be given planning permission, except for the fact that it would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset. Whilst only applicable in certain circumstances, enabling development can be a useful tool. Making the case for enabling development can involve a considerable investment as there are inevitably a number of detailed information requirements. Again, while we support such proposals in principle, having greater flexibility in the Local Plan will be beneficial to such circumstances.</p> |
| Savills obo Birdsall Estate | <p>Yes. The allocation of sites which are located to support local landed estates can provide an extremely important source of secure income which can be used for the upkeep and conservation of important heritage assets and landscapes and so this approach is very much supported. There are a number of important estates within Ryedale which attract visitors from across the country, supporting the tourism industry, generally in rural areas. Many of the estates include heritage assets which are of local or national importance. The duty to protect and conserve these assets, in a manner appropriate to their significance, is placed upon the landowner and often their upkeep can require a significant sum of money. The support through allocations of land will be a great support in delivering conservation efforts.</p> <p>As part of their Enabling Development Programme, the Birdsall Estate have calculated that around £78 million will be required for conservation projects over the next 20 years. This is on top of the £3.5 million spent on conservation and restoration works since 2010. Agriculture is the</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---------------------------------|--|
| | <p>principal industry and revenue stream for the Estate currently, with land farmed and let to tenants. Increasing costs, legislation changes and forestry in decline, the Estate needs to find alternative streams of income to continue to meet its conservation obligations. The allocation of sites on estate owned land, which falls in a number of villages surrounding Birdsall, will provide a secure source of income to contribute towards the heritage deficit.</p> <p>This approach would also align with the Option 2 Growth Strategy outlined within the Distribution of Development Consultation Paper. We have already outlined that growth distributed to villages can also deliver benefits for local communities and local services.</p> <p>In seeking to support landed estates, it is important that any allocations in villages include market housing in order to maximise the land receipt, which can be re-invested into the upkeep of the Estate. This should be balanced with a policy compliant level of affordable units, subject to viability. These affordable units are often much needed in a village context, but cannot form the full extent of any allocation (ie. rural exception), otherwise the land receipt will be significantly reduced.</p> <p>Recognising the policy support required by these landed estates is an important consideration for the Local Plan, and this approach is supported by Paragraph 190 of the NPPF, which requires plans to set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. The NPPF also recognises that this approach can also bring social, cultural, economic benefits and deliver developments which make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. The allocation of sites presented in our supporting Vision Document, would therefore have a number of benefits, not only supporting the long term conservation efforts of the Estate, but also supporting any local shops and services nearby, and create more active rural communities.</p> |
| Savills obo Hovingham Estate | <p>The allocation of sites which are located to support local landed estates can provide an extremely important source of secure income which can be used for the upkeep and conservation of important heritage assets and landscapes and so this approach is very much supported. There are a number of important estates within Ryedale which attract visitors from across the country, supporting the tourism industry, generally in rural areas. Many of the estates include heritage assets which are of local or national importance. The duty to protect and conserve these assets, in a manner appropriate to their significance, is placed upon the landowner and often their upkeep can require a significant sum of money. The support through allocations of land will be a great support in delivering conservation efforts.</p> <p>Given the location of many historic landed estates, such as the Hovingham Estate, much of the housing allocations required to support the conservation efforts will be placed in village locations like Hovingham. This would also align with the Option 2 Growth Strategy outlined within the Distribution of Development Consultation Paper. We have already outlined that growth distributed to villages can also deliver benefits for local communities and local services.</p> <p>In seeking to support landed estates, it is important that any allocations in villages include market housing in order to maximise the land receipt, which can be re-invested into the upkeep of the Estate. This should be balanced with a policy compliant level of affordable units, subject to viability. These affordable units are often much needed in a village context, but cannot form the full extent of any allocation (ie. rural exception), otherwise the land receipt will be significantly reduced.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------------------|---|
| | <p>Recognising the policy support required by these landed estates is an important consideration for the Local Plan, and this approach is not only welcomed, but supported by Paragraph 190 of the NPPF, which requires plans to set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. The NPPF also recognises that this approach can also bring social, cultural, economic benefits and deliver developments which make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. The allocation of sites within Hovingham, as presented in our supporting Vision Document, would therefore have a number of benefits, not only supporting the long term conservation efforts of the Estate, but also supporting local shops and services in the Village, to allow the community of Hovingham to remain the active rural community it currently is.</p> |
| KVA Planning obo CPRE | <p>Yes. Several estates within the area have historically relied upon workers to ensure landscape/farmland is maintained etc. Often these workers are required to live locally to their employment and traditional roles should be preserved if poss.</p> |
| Heslerton Parish Council | <p>No. Affordable housing for local people yes. Estate owners are well able to finance the properties that they own without public financial support.</p> |
| Wintringham Parish Council | <p>No.</p> |
| Chair Wintringham Parish Council | <p>No. Allowing our local landed estate to develop these sites is not conserving the heritage and landscape it is trashing it!</p> |
| Amotherby Parish Council | <p>Yes. Worth examining the possibilities.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|--|
| Member of the public | Yes. Where existing facilities exist or could be easily and quickly developed then this would be fine but I expect that not to be possible in many small villages. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Local estates are a vital part of village success in many cases. |
| Member of the public | Not sure I understand what you mean by this. |
| Member of the public | No. Allocating land in local villages is unlikely to achieve these aims. Further development of land in these areas is more likely to worsen, rather than conserve landscapes and heritage assets. |
| Member of the public | No. The landed estates should follow the same planning rules as everyone else. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| Member of the public | Yes. To support local families staying in their area of birth. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Protecting the countryside. |
| Member of the public | Yes. To support & diversify – however the concept of affordable housing is so flawed it needs to be revamped and become useful in promoting small dwelling development. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Would only support the conversion of existing buildings not building on green field sites. |
| Member of the public | No. Clearly there is no need for affordable housing based on Castle Howard selling off most of their rented housing which initially was for estate workers. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| Member of the public | No. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Seems a sensible approach. |
| Member of the public | No. I think the landed estates should be responsible for conserving heritage assets and landscapes without resorting to selling parcels of land for housing development. |
| Member of the public | No. I find the link between affordable housing in villages and helping conserving important heritage in landed estates a little incongruous. I don't think it is something that should be supported in the review of plan and seems to be diverting away at a tangent from the real issues. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Affordable housing is important in any community – but more so where work is available. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|--|
| Member of the public | Yes. Sustaining local services, improving and upgrading the buildings in AONB whilst being careful about the environment seem worthwhile, but should not be done with the intention of helping landed estates. |
| Member of the public | <p>No. There is one family that owns a lot of land in the area, the facility at Castle Howard is relatively expensive, I don't see how people in affordable housing will be in a position to take advantage of this heritage asset/landscape.</p> <p>There seems to be a lot of land surrounding this facility – it's a shame this can't be utilised!</p> |
| Member of the public | Yes |
| Member of the public | The requirement for the provision of affordable housing is a good point to raise and should be supported, especially if the need is found. However, the development in non-service villages for affordable housing could be difficult because of the lack of infrastructure and public transport. The point regarding helping the landed estates in conserving important heritage assets could be welcomed with some innovative ideas. |
| Member of the public | Sadly, once again this is several questions in one that requires several separate answers. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|--|
| Member of the public | <p>No. Landed estates should have no special treatment. Rural landscapes in one area should not be urbanised and ruined in the name of protecting such assets. You do not preserve historic landscapes by developing huge tracts of land around the estate villages. Indeed, the extent of land put forward by estates such as Castle Howard for this review shows just how little they can be trusted to maintain the rural landscape and it may be a better solution if these properties were put in the hands of the National Trust. Indeed, the fact that the Estate admits to having neglected maintenance to the extent that it now needs £50m to restore the historic buildings and also admits that the Mausoleum is one of the UK's most important historic structures – yet they have allowed it to decay to a point where it is on the at risk register, suggests that neither the historic buildings nor the rural landscape are safe in their hands. The vistas toward Castle Howard in villages such as Welburn were carefully designed by ancestors of the current owners as part of the heritage setting and should not be destroyed by increasing the size of villages by a multiple of four or more. In particular, no such development should be allowed in a National Park or AONB.</p> <p>Any such development in villages would be completely unsustainable for the reasons stated in Q1 and 2 above.</p> <p>Estates claim they need some development to provide housing for employees. This is a nonsense as most villages had adequate amounts of housing in the 19th C to accommodate the vastly greater rural working population pre the mechanisation and automation of farming. The small extent of development already allowed in villages using the local occupancy condition could be used by these estates to provide housing for local need such as this if proven to be required - with no need for further provision. After all, they already own the land so could offer such properties to rent to employees at an attractive rate. However, despite protestations about the need for houses for employees, one local estate is currently selling houses in Slingsby while claiming to need new houses for employees!</p> <p>In many cases, the owners of these estates own a considerable amount of agricultural land which will become increasingly important to retain as such following the necessary shift in global food production away from states such as Russia which can currently hold the world to ransom.</p> <p>The owners of these estates should look to maximising the return from other assets such as buildings which they have allowed to fall into disrepair or converting existing disused agricultural buildings into homes for staff and should not be allowed to spoil the remainder of the countryside and agricultural land simply because of poor maintenance regimes and bad management in the past.</p> |

Question 13: Do you think we should deliver more housing than the Government requires in its 'Standard Method' to deliver other aspirations such as more affordable housing (including social rent), infrastructure, and support wider economic development in the district?

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| ID Planning obo The Vistry Group | Yes. We support the identification of a housing requirement figure in excess of the standard method figure in order to support the delivery of affordable housing and to ensure the economic and housing strategies in the District are aligned. |
| Evolution Town Planning | Yes. The delivery of affordable housing should be given significant weight and that requires more market housing to ensure delivery. |
| Persimmon Homes | Yes. |
| Rural Solutions obo Castle Howard | <p>Castle Howard considers that Ryedale District Council should consider delivering more housing than the current 'standard method' would dictate (184 dwellings per year, with a land supply buffer). The reasons for this are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The delivery of option 2 would help to deliver on a 'once in a generation' need and opportunity faced by rural communities and their populations. This follows a period where development in the district has followed a more urban-centric approach. The restriction on the needs and communities being met across the district by a standard calculation method being employed is not considered to be justified. • The restriction of housing numbers in the area's settlements on the basis of a national government formula could impact on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Affordable housing need being met, as inferred by the question. - The delivery of a greater level of services and facilities as part of new development. Development sites of scale provide opportunities for new services and facilities to be provided; the delivery of these services and facilities on smaller sites is unlikely to be viable. - The delivery of specialist housing types such as accessible single storey properties, which can help to meet the housing needs of communities. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At Castle Howard there is considered to be a clear capacity to deliver housing development at scale. Landscape Significance Study assessment work and consultation with key stakeholders, both of which Ryedale Officers are aware of, suggests that there is capacity for large scale development in the area without unacceptable impacts and this therefore reduces the emphasis on restricted housing numbers. • The scale of new housing delivered over the Local Plan Review period will be factored into the amount of housing required in future local plans. Therefore any 'overprovision' during the upcoming plan period, could reduce the requirement for housing in a future Local Plan, so there would be no inherent negative implications from additional provision. |
| Steve Murray Associates Ltd | Yes. More housing creates more jobs through the construction and supply chain whilst enhancing the local economy, also bringing much needed finance to local government and benefits to the community. |
| Barton Willmore obo Barratt David Wilson Homes | <p>Yes.</p> <p>The standard method uses a formula to identify the minimum number of homes expected to be planned for. It identifies a minimum annual housing need figure rather than a housing requirement figure.</p> <p>The standard method is a minimum starting point and the Council should deliver more housing than the standard method identifies. The minimum figure which Ryedale is required to plan for is 184 dwellings per annum, which is almost 20 dwellings per annum lower than the requirement set out in the existing Local Plan.</p> <p>We reserve the right to provide more detailed representations once the Council has finalised its Strategic Housing Market Assessment which will establish local housing needs and once the OAN for the District has been established.</p> |
| Barton Willmore obo Tim Parkinson | <p>Yes.</p> <p>The standard method uses a formula to identify the minimum number of homes expected to be planned for. It identifies a minimum annual housing need figure rather than a housing requirement figure.</p> <p>The standard method is a minimum starting point and the Council should deliver more housing than the standard method identifies. The minimum figure which Ryedale is required to plan for is 184 dwellings per annum, which is almost 20 dwellings per annum lower than the requirement set out in the existing Local Plan.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--|---|
| | We reserve the right to provide more detailed representations once the Council has finalised its Strategic Housing Market Assessment which will establish local housing needs and once the OAN for the District has been established. |
| ELG Planning obo Malton Fitzwilliam Estate | Yes. FME would [therefore] suggest that additional housing sites should be allocated (over and above the current Local Plan requirement), which would deliver more market housing, and in turn provide additional affordable housing to meet the needs of the District, subject to the Council updating their evidence base. They would encourage the Council to consider a wide range of evidence to determine the future employment growth of Ryedale, which would also inform the future housing growth of the District. |
| ArkleBoyce obo Andrew Pern | Yes. We would support a more ambitious housing target to enable economic growth in the district. |
| Pegasus Planning Group | Yes. To encourage economic development and to maintain/enhance the services and facilities in the area. Delivering more housing would also provide opportunities to accommodate a larger choice of housing in the area, including increased affordable housing provision. |
| Edwardson Associates obo Lutton landowners | Yes – if the Local Authority has certain aspirations then it should be clear and justify the approach it feels is best and most valuable. |
| ELG Planning obo Mandale Homes | Yes. It is important that the Local Plan supports and delivers growth in the service villages to ensure that the villages like Ampleforth continue to thrive and support local services in line with the NPPF. This growth delivers a mix of housing including affordable units to meet current housing needs which continue to change. Therefore we would support the delivery of more housing than the Government requires in its standard method in order to deliver these important benefits. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|---|
| Savills obo the Church Commissioner for England | <p>Yes. It is considered that it is appropriate to plan for a higher figure than the standard method indicates if exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated in that the figure identified within the Standard Methodology does not, for example, take into account projected growth.</p> <p>As required by the NPPF, the Local Plan must define the overall level of growth over the Plan period, based on the requirement to meet the Districts objectively assessed needs (OAN). The standard method alone could have implications for housing targets in some areas of the country (principally in the north of England), where economic growth strategies may not be supported by local authorities that plan for the minimum number of additional dwellings as indicated by the standard methodology. By only using the proposed methodology it could lead to the District not planning enough homes to support any economic growth strategy. If the Council does not seek to meet the most appropriate level of development needed it is considered that the District would suffer significantly from out-migration, reduced / limited employment opportunities and have a detrimental impact on the existing supply of local services and facilities.</p> <p>Our Client therefore supports an approach to identify and meet an objectively assessed housing need in Ryedale rather than solely relying on the standard method figure.</p> |
| Savills obo the Settrington Estate | <p>Yes. It is considered that it is appropriate to plan for a higher figure than the standard method indicates if exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated in that the figure identified within the Standard Methodology does not, for example, take into account projected growth.</p> <p>As required by the NPPF, the Local Plan must define the overall level of growth over the Plan period, based on the requirement to meet the Districts objectively assessed needs (OAN). The standard method alone could have implications for housing targets in some areas of the country (principally in the north of England), where economic growth strategies may not be supported by local authorities that plan for the minimum number of additional dwellings as indicated by the standard methodology. By only using the proposed methodology it could lead to the District not planning enough homes to support any economic growth strategy. If the Council does not seek to meet the most appropriate level of development needed it is considered that the District would suffer significantly from out-migration, reduced / limited employment opportunities and have a detrimental impact on the existing supply of local services and facilities.</p> <p>Our Client therefore supports an approach to identify and meet an objectively assessed housing need in Ryedale rather than solely relying on the standard method figure.</p> |
| Johnson Mowat obo KCS Development | <p>Yes. The Standard Method establishes the minimum number of homes needed and should be considered as the starting point rather than the housing target of the Plan. Given the acute affordable housing need in the District it is anticipated that evidence would justify the Ryedale Plan</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|---|
| | <p>Review to plan for the delivery of more housing than the Standard Method minimum need. A flexible policy approach is recommended, seeking a minimum housing requirement.</p> |
| <p>Johnson Mowat obo Yorkshire Land Ltd</p> | <p>The Standard Method establishes the minimum number of homes needed and should be considered as the starting point rather than the housing target of the Plan. Given the acute affordable housing need in the District it is anticipated that evidence would justify the Ryedale Plan Review to plan for the delivery of more housing than the Standard Method minimum need. A flexible policy approach is recommended, seeking a minimum housing requirement.</p> |
| <p>Savills obo Birdsall Estate</p> | <p>Yes.</p> <p>Appendix 3 of the Distribution of Development Paper identifies a housing requirement of 184 dwellings per annum calculated using the Standard Methodology. This is 16 dwellings per annum lower than the existing requirement as set out within the adopted Local Plan. Paragraph 61 of the NPPF clearly sets out that the minimum number of homes needed in a Local Authority Area should be driven by the standard method in National Planning Guidance- ‘unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach which also reflects current and future demographic trends and market signals’.</p> <p>In accordance with PPG this minimum annual figure should reflect current and future demographic trends and market signals. The 2021 Housing Delivery Test results demonstrates that Ryedale have consistently delivered over their annual housing requirement, with 191% of the Districts housing need delivered over the past 3 years (2018 – 2021). Clearly, the market in Ryedale is strong and we urge the Council to be ambitious in their growth targets in line with Paragraph 16(b) of the NPPF.</p> <p>The existing over delivery of housing in Ryedale demonstrates that the Standard Methodology figure may be too low. In progressing with a more ambitious housing target, the Council have the opportunity to support economic growth in the District, whilst also ensuring that market requirements are met and housing needs (including affordable housing needs) are fulfilled.</p> <p>The most recent available Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) for Ryedale (2016) suggests that there is a net annual deficit of 79 affordable homes (2014-2035). This represents 43% of the annual housing need for the District. Adopted Policy SP3 (Affordable Housing) requires 35% on site provision of affordable dwellings on new developments. Should the Council choose to progress using the housing requirement set out in the Standard Method, clearly there will be a shortfall in affordable housing delivered and needs will go unmet. Paragraph 11 of the NPPF requires plan makers to meet the development needs of their area. The likely under delivery of affordable homes will should therefore be considered to be an exceptional circumstance to justify a higher housing requirement in the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>Notably, Appendix 3 of the Distribution of Development consultation paper identifies that an estimated 2,500 homes will be needed between 2027 and 2038. This equates to 227 dwellings per annum, an increase on the Standard Method calculations. This approach is supported in order to meet the housing needs and ensure economic growth for the District.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|--|
| Savills obo Hovingham Estate | <p data-bbox="394 177 443 201">Yes.</p> <p data-bbox="394 248 2119 419">Appendix 3 of the Distribution of Development Paper identifies a housing requirement of 184 dwellings per annum calculated using the Standard Methodology. This is 16 dwellings per annum lower than the existing requirement as set out within the adopted Local Plan. Paragraph 61 of the NPPF clearly sets out that the minimum number of homes needed in a Local Authority Area should be driven by the standard method in National Planning Guidance- ‘unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach which also reflects current and future demographic trends and market signals’.</p> <p data-bbox="394 467 2119 600">In accordance with PPG this minimum annual figure should reflect current and future demographic trends and market signals. The 2021 Housing Delivery Test results demonstrates that Ryedale have consistently delivered over their annual housing requirement, with 191% of the Districts housing need delivered over the past 3 years (2018 – 2021). Clearly, the market in Ryedale is strong and we urge the Council to be ambitious in their growth targets in line with Paragraph 16(b) of the NPPF.</p> <p data-bbox="394 647 2119 743">The existing over delivery of housing in Ryedale demonstrates that the Standard Methodology figure may be too low. In progressing with a more ambitious housing target, the Council have the opportunity to support economic growth in the District, whilst also ensuring that market requirements are met and housing needs (including affordable housing needs) are fulfilled.</p> <p data-bbox="394 791 2119 999">The most recent available Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) for Ryedale (2016) suggests that there is a net annual deficit of 79 affordable homes (2014-2035). This represents 43% of the annual housing need for the District. Adopted Policy SP3 (Affordable Housing) requires 35% on site provision of affordable dwellings on new developments. Should the Council choose to progress using the housing requirement set out in the Standard Method, clearly there will be a shortfall in affordable housing delivered and needs will go unmet. Paragraph 11 of the NPPF requires plan makers to meet the development needs of their area. The likely under delivery of affordable homes will should therefore be considered to be an exceptional circumstance to justify a higher housing requirement in the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p data-bbox="394 1046 2119 1142">Notably, Appendix 3 of the Distribution of Development consultation paper identifies that an estimated 2,500 homes will be needed between 2027 and 2038. This equates to 227 dwellings per annum, an increase on the Standard Method calculations. This approach is supported in order to meet the housing needs and ensure economic growth for the District.</p> |
| Spawforths obo Keyland Developments | <p data-bbox="394 1214 443 1238">Yes.</p> <p data-bbox="394 1286 2119 1350">The Framework (paragraph 35) is clear that to be considered positively prepared and therefore ‘sound’. The Plan must, as a minimum, meet the Plan Area’s objectively assessed needs, Footnote 21 confirms for housing, that such needs should be assessed using a clear and justified method.</p> <p data-bbox="394 1398 2119 1493">The Framework, paragraph 61, is clear when determining the ‘minimum’ number of homes strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment, with reference to the standard methodology. However policy and guidance is clear that the standard methodology is a starting point for preparing the housing requirement. The PPG explicitly</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--------------|---|
| | <p>states that the standard methodology does not produce a housing requirement figure¹. It is also clear that the affordability adjustment within the standard methodology is just to ensure that the minimum housing need starts to address affordability of homes. It therefore does not fully address affordability issues².</p> <p>PPG goes on to identify the circumstances when it is appropriate to plan for a higher housing need figure than the standard methodology identifies.</p> <p><i>'The Government is committed to ensuring that more homes are built and supports ambitious authorities who want to plan for growth. The standard method for assessing local housing need provides the minimum starting point in determining the number of homes in an area...it does not predict the impact of future government policies, changing economic circumstances or other factors that might have an impact on demographic behaviour. Therefore there will be circumstances where it is appropriate to consider whether actual housing need is higher than the standard method indicate. This will need to be assessed prior to and separate from considering how much of the overall need can be accommodated. Circumstances where this may be appropriate include, but are not limited to situations where increases in housing need are likely to exceed past trends because of:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Growth strategies for the area that are likely to be deliverable, for example where funding is in place to promote and facilitate additional growth;</i> • <i>Strategic infrastructure improvements that are likely to drive an increase in the homes needed locally; An authority agreeing to take on unmet need from neighbouring authorities, as set out in a statement of common ground. There may occasionally be situations where previous levels of housing delivery in an area, or previous assessments of need (such as a recently produced SHMA) are significantly greater than the outcome from the standard method. Authorities will need to take this into account when considering if it is appropriate to plan for a higher level of need that the standard model suggests'</i>³. <p>It is important to recognise that the development of new housing will bring forward additional economic benefits to the area. The relationship between economic performance in an area and housing is complex, but having the right quantity, quality and balance of housing in an area is necessary for economic growth. This is recognised within the Framework, paragraph 82.</p> <p>The development of new housing can therefore support local economic growth, both through direct job creation through the construction phase of the scheme, but also through the increased population which will create sustainable local jobs from the increased demand for goods and services. This provides an important sustainable development opportunity for Ryedale.</p> <p>Importantly the HBF released in July 2018 its report on the Economic footprint of house building in England and Wales, which shows that housebuilding in England and Wales was worth £38bn a year, supporting 700,000 jobs. House building activity contributes economically in different ways including providing jobs, tax revenues and contributing funding for local infrastructure and communities. House building supports the economy in a wider sense through being a driver for economic growth; delivering jobs and economic value; supporting labour market mobility; creating skills and employability; enhancing place competitiveness; creating quality of place and reusing brownfield land.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--------------|---|
| | <p>An important conclusion of the report and the wider economic benefits is that a healthy, well-functioning labour market requires a good supply of housing that is affordable for local people to enable them to move jobs freely and match up skills supply with employer demand. A dysfunctional housing market can inhibit labour market mobility, in turn stifling economic growth. This relationship is recognised within the regional strategies, the North Yorkshire LEP economic strategy and in particular the circular economy, which notes the importance of attracting and retaining a working age population, and ensuring there is sufficient housing to support the needs of existing residents and new residents.</p> <p>The Government published the revised standard methodology for assessing local housing need on 16th December 2020. The approach changed partly in response to the Covid-19 pandemic, however the aims of the revisions remain as set out in the ‘changes to the current planning system’. The Government reaffirm their commitment ‘to the delivery of 300,000 new homes a year, a focus on achieving more appropriate distribution of homes, and targeting more homes in areas where there are affordability challenges’. The Government has indicated that they are committed to seeing 300,000 homes per year delivered by the mid 2020’s and has reiterated that the local housing need figure ‘does not present a ‘target’ in plan-making, but instead provides a starting point for determining the level of need for the area’. Local authorities remain responsible for determining how many homes to plan for, and this should take account of local circumstances.</p> <p>Keyland maintains that there are clear circumstances in Ryedale which demonstrate that housing need in is higher than the figure that results from the ‘Standard methodology’. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The growth strategy and investment; • Infrastructure improvements; • Past delivery rates; and • Affordable housing need; <p>In relation to historical delivery rates Ryedale has been consistently above 200 dwellings per annum since 2012. Provision since 2014/15 has been at least 25 percent above the housing requirement. This shows that housing can be delivered at higher levels. Indeed, Appendix 2 of the consultations paper shows that Ryedale has sustained the delivery of new homes above the plan requirement at an average of 257 new homes per year. Therefore, evidence is available for the delivery of new homes to continue at least at this rate for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>Furthermore, affordability is a significant issue in Ryedale with the affordability ratio being one of the highest in the north. The SHMA (2016) indicates a need for 78 affordable dwellings per annum, whilst affordable housing delivery has been consistently below this since 2013/14. The SHMA also shows there is a particular need for older person accommodation within the District.</p> <p>Growth and investment is critical. The North Yorkshire Strategic Economic Plan “Better Jobs, More Homes, New Investment” highlights the ambition to grow the economy strongly, create jobs and deliver major economic opportunities for the future. The Strategic Economic Plan that housebuilding is “real priority for our area”. The five priorities being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Profitable and ambitious small businesses • A global leader in the bio-economy • Inspired people |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful and distinctive places • A well-connected economy <p>It is recognised within the SEP that without action, North Yorkshire could become an economy characterised by high living costs, low wages and an ageing population. A positive approach is therefore needed to “unlock the housing growth the area needs” and diversify the housing offer and delivery model. The SEP highlights the ambition for 21,900 more jobs and 1,900 more homes a year, which is a 71 percent increase in homebuilding. Combining these ambitions with the LEP’s campaign for a circular economy in North Yorkshire will build stronger communities and more inclusive connections and businesses.</p> <p>Therefore, Ryedale needs to increase the number of new homes above the standard methodology for affordable housing, past delivery and economic growth.</p> |
| KVA Planning | Yes. This needs to be based on a properly evidenced OAN in order to deliver the number of homes and affordable homes needed. The SM is a starting point but may alter. RDC need to be flexible but also realistic given landscape constraints. |
| Home Builders Federation | Yes. The HBF considers that the Council should deliver more housing than the Government requires in its Standard Method to deliver other aspirations such as more affordable housing, infrastructure, and support wider economic development. The HBF considers that this would be in line with the Government’s objective to boost the supply of housing. The Council should consider the circumstances where housing need may be higher than the Standard Method identified Local Housing Need (LHN) as set out in the PPG these include where there are growth strategies; strategic infrastructure improvements; meeting an unmet need; where previous levels of housing delivery are higher; or previous assessments of need, which may mean that housing requirement should be a higher figure than the LHN indicated by the standard method. |
| Wintringham Parish Council | No. The beauty of Ryedale is its sparsity of population very rare in England today. To over deliver would be criminal. |
| Malton Town Council | No. We have enough. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--------------------------|---|
| Amotherby Parish Council | This is a predominantly rural area and should remain so. Affordable housing should be part of permitted developments in accordance with policy & developers not allowed to wriggle out of this obligation by paying to do so. ACTUAL housing/affordable housing need should be investigated by carrying out a NEW Ryedale-wide Housing Needs questionnaire. |
| Member of the public | Yes. To overachieve would be good but I expect that to do so would be neither achievable or realistic. |
| Member of the public | Yes. It is vital to allow towns to grow and develop in order to sustain and grow local services and amenities. There is currently a shortage of housing stock for sale in Malton – this is driving up prices. |
| Member of the public | No. Ryedale currently exceeds its housing target. |
| Member of the public | No. As a primarily agricultural district, Option 1 concentrating on the Market towns and key villages with existing services and infrastructure meets Government requirements. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|--|
| Member of the public | No. |
| Member of the public | Yes. First time buyers. |
| Member of the public | The authority should establish its own needs not just mill along with the national standard – it is too vague. |
| Member of the public | No. |
| Member of the public | No. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| Member of the public | No. |
| Member of the public | Yes. To diversify our communities. |
| Member of the public | No. Planners should be careful the accumulated money from bigger sites over the next few years benefits locally once the Council takeover happens. It would be a colossal aberration if sites were built locally in Ryedale producing money for infrastructure, then seeing the money spent somewhere far away like Harrogate on their road projects. |
| Member of the public | No. Policy of build, build, build isn't sustainable in the present climate – a more environmental approach needs to be taken. |
| Member of the public | Yes. We should not be restricted by the Government's suggestion and we should have our own views on the opportunities and plans for the local area. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------------|--|
| Member of the public | Yes. There is a real need for affordable housing, and looking at the rising living costs, then will continue to be needed. |
| Member of the public | Yes |
| Member of the public | No. This is several questions rolled into one that demands more than one answer. |
| Member of the public | No. This should and can be accommodated within the Government requirements. |
| NYCC Adult and Social Care | Yes, affordable housing across Ryedale district is lacking. Collaboration with County Council is required for specialist housing requirements for older people and/or disabled people and people with behaviour that challenges. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|------------------------|--|
| Pickering Town Council | <p>There should be some elasticity in the yearly delivery target, and there would be benefits in delivering more than the Government standard model if this allowed for the delivery of all types of additional affordable and social housing, which is needed in Ryedale. It is recognised that there is also a need for significant investment in infrastructure and job creation and if there is to be more development than the Government standard model then there should be investment in infrastructure, and this should be delivered alongside the development of new housing. It should also be acknowledged that it is difficult for towns like Pickering to assimilate new population growth, particularly with the high targets set, without losing a sense of place and a sense of identity.</p> |

Questions 14 and 14a: Should we continue to use the Local Needs Occupancy condition? If yes, should we continue to use it in its current form or with changes to the way in which we operate the condition?

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Steve Murray Associates Ltd | <p>Yes. For key workers. Don't see any reason to change it, other than perhaps for key workers.</p> |
| Rural Solutions obo Castle Howard | <p>No.</p> <p>Castle Howard considers that the Local Needs Occupancy condition should not be maintained.</p> <p>Firstly, it is important to note that Castle Howard is clearly embedded in the local area, including local villages. It understands the reasons why the condition was introduced in the existing Local Plan. Many of its staff live in villages and the importance of local people being able to continue to live in the communities (and schools to have a healthy percentage of children attending from the local area).</p> <p>However, Castle Howard considers that the restrictive nature of the condition stymie housing delivery.</p> <p>There are two clear reasons why the occupancy restriction stymies delivery:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduction in values – the effect of value reduction is understood to be well in excess of 35% of property value. Whilst for single dwellings in high value areas, where the builder or occupier has access to capital, this may make for a viable development. However, on a multiple house site, such as those promoted by Castle Howard, where there are infrastructure costs, rising material costs, service provision requirements and affordable housing to deliver, this would render development unviable, and certainly at the highest quality of design and sustainability which Castle Howard aspires to; and, 2. In addition to viability in costs and value terms, the majority of lenders are unwilling to provide developer finance or mortgage finance on restricted property. For those seeking a mortgage, such as young families and those without large assets, this means that houses would be inaccessible. <p>The demographic information in section four of this report clearly shows that the adopted local plan strategy, which includes the local occupancy restriction has not been successful in maintaining vibrant communities in villages in the Castle Howard area. On that basis, a 'step change' is required in terms of how the Local Plan Review addresses rural planning issues and it is considered that this must involve the removal of the restrictive condition.</p> <p>It must be noted that even with the occupancy condition removed a proportion of housing on larger sites will effectively have a 'local occupancy' type restriction as occupants of new affordable housing will have to demonstrate a local connection.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|--|
| Persimmon Homes | Yes. No change. |
| Carter Jonas obo Nawton, Nunnington, Place Newton, Thorpe Bassett and Westow Estates | <p>No. Carter Jonas does not consider it necessary or appropriate to continue to use the Local Needs Occupancy condition as it is too restrictive and can result in empty and abandoned homes, ultimately restricting housing supply.</p> <p>The continued use of this condition contradicts the aims of seeking to promote sustainable development in rural areas and enhance the vitality of communities.</p> |
| ArkleBoyce obo Andrew Pern | <p>We consider the Local Needs Occupancy to be overly restrictive, inflexible and would fully support its abolition. Its use does not align with national planning policy and there are far more effective policies in place that can help restrict development where it is not appropriate and encourage housing for local people. The implications of imposing the condition has, in many circumstances, caused perfectly acceptable developments to be unviable through the blanket restriction which is not imposed in the majority of rural areas across the country.</p> |
| Edwardson Associates obo Lutton landowners | <p>No. This condition is unnecessary and has prevented otherwise good quality development coming forward. It is unknown how mortgages for example, would be arranged against such properties and this is perhaps why very few have come forward for development. If a development is an appropriate scale and quality it shouldn't be restricted to occupancy.</p> |
| Savills obo the Church Commissioner for England | <p>No. Small scale development in villages can be provided through modest extensions to the existing settlement, infill development and via conversion schemes. However, such development should not be restricted to occupancy conditions or affordable housing.</p> <p>The application of a local needs occupancy condition is not explicitly identified in national planning policy. It is an approach that is very commonly used within the National Parks, where housing delivery is strictly controlled. Whilst Ryedale is located partly within the National Park, the Ryedale District Local Plan does not cover the area located within the National Park and therefore it is considered to be an onerous condition for the District to apply to development on land located outside the North York Moors.</p> <p>Its restrictive tests would also not be an in alignment with an approach which seeks to deliver more housing to a greater range of villages, to support village-based services and facilities in which our client supports. We therefore do not consider it necessary to continue to use the Local Needs Occupancy Condition.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Savills obo the Settrington Estate | <p>No. Small scale development in villages can be provided through modest extensions to the existing settlement, infill development and via conversion schemes. However, such development should not be restricted to occupancy conditions or affordable housing.</p> <p>The application of a local needs occupancy condition is not explicitly identified in national planning policy. It is an approach that is very commonly used within the National Parks, where housing delivery is strictly controlled. Whilst Ryedale is located partly within the National Park, the Ryedale District Local Plan does not cover the area located within the National Park and therefore it is considered to be an onerous condition for the District to apply to development on land located outside the North York Moors.</p> <p>Its restrictive tests would also not be an in alignment with an approach which seeks to deliver more housing to a greater range of villages, to support village-based services and facilities in which our client supports. We therefore do not consider it necessary to continue to use the Local Needs Occupancy Condition.</p> |
| Savills obo Birdsall Estate | <p>No.</p> <p>Whilst we understand the intention was to ensure housing was delivered to meet a local need, we do not support the retention of the LNOC going forward, particularly in the context of the representations made above.</p> <p>The retention of the LNOC will clearly restrict development from coming forward in Villages and would therefore contradict the more broadly distribution of development which we strongly support. The retention of the LNOC would result in less sustainable and less vibrant rural settlements. This is evident in the lower growth in these locations over the 2012-21 period, where housing completions in other villages and the open countryside represented only 12% of total completions.</p> <p>In addition, the application of an LNOC can have negative implications on a property's value, cause delays in re-sales and very often are avoided by competitive mortgage providers. This adds an additional layer of complexity and cost which fundamentally restricts the market for a dwelling with such a condition. First time buyers are particularly severely impacted by this restriction and retention of younger people in rural villages is a key objective for Ryedale and village viability.</p> <p>In the context of the Enabling Development Program at the Birdsall Estate, where the key objective is to generate income to be used in the preservation of the key heritage assets on the estate, the implementation of any condition which restricts the market value of a dwelling, or its attractiveness to the market, will have significant implications on the net receipt which can be re-invested into the Estates upkeep.</p> <p>We strongly suggest that Ryedale remove the LNOC from Policies SP2 and SP21 through the course of this Local Plan review. This is not a National Policy requirement, has a number of negative implications on the value and re-sale of properties and does not align with the broader distribution of growth strategy.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Spawforths obo Keyland Developments | No. Keyland does not consider that Local Needs Occupancy Conditions reflects the Framework to boost significantly the supply of housing. The Framework states in relation to rural housing planning policies and decisions should be responsive to local circumstances, but that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Therefore, local plans should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive. |
| KVA Planning obo CPRE | Yes. This is essential to ensure those residents who want or need to stay local can do so in order to support existing communities/local workforce. This is an effective condition but equally good at supporting housing development in small settlements. Affordable housing should be delivered under a separate policy across smaller sites (under 1ha) to ensure a wider delivery. |
| Home Builders Federation | No. The HBF does not consider that it is appropriate to continue to use the Local Needs Occupancy condition. The HBF does not consider that this is in line with current policy and consider that it does not support the objective to boost supply or promote sustainable development in rural areas where it can enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. |
| Wintringham Parish Council | Yes. Definitely. This is important for local people. |
| Malton Town Council | Yes. Stop second homes. |
| Chair Wintringham Parish Council | Yes. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--------------------------|---|
| Amotherby Parish Council | Yes. Good idea but needs extending to allow people moving to the area for work from other parts of the country. |
| Member of the public | Yes. It needs to be a little more flexible. It needs to be a little more flexible. By all means use it where sites are really in short supply but for larger developmental opportunities then allow non-qualifying development to take place but only if local interests are satisfied first. |
| Member of the public | No. There needs to be flexibility from case to case. |
| Member of the public | No. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Where applicable. This seems appropriate. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| Member of the public | Yes. To give priority to existing residents. |
| Member of the public | No. Conditions should be removed after application. Particularly the case for dwellings formed through the conversion of buildings, national policy having long supported the reuse of buildings into dwellings without occupancy constraint. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Once the condition is placed it should remain even if that house is later resold. |
| Member of the public | No. It limits opportunities to first time buyers. |
| Member of the public | No. In its present form it simply isn't working to promote the development of affordable housing for Ryedale people. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| Member of the public | Yes. |
| Member of the public | Yes. |
| Member of the public | No. I think this is too restrictive in some cases and could stop development - perhaps a proportion of houses assigned to local needs and then released if not taken within a time period. |
| Member of the public | No. The Local Needs Occupancy condition is an impediment to development providing an unnecessary almost discriminatory rule on who should live where. The whole fabric of life is the juxtaposition of people from different backgrounds mixing and integrating together. It should be abolished immediately. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Yes, it helps local people find housing in their locality and stops prices been driven up by people moving in from outside the area where property may have higher value. It gives local people first choice and may help houses becoming second homes. What are the alternatives? |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| Member of the public | No. This is a distortion of the housing market and will tend to render building in villages less attractive, a factor that I think militates against local builders. |
| Member of the public | Yes. It's currently in place why change? Is it not working? |
| Member of the public | Yes. You need to have some way of ensuring local people can acquire property at a price reflecting salaries in the district. My own view is that every second home/Holiday let should need specific change of use permission and a criteria be set that no more than 5% say of any village/town can be used for this purpose. That alone may solve some of the affordability and community issues in Ryedale. Yes it should be continued in its current form, no changes. |
| Member of the public | Please see my extensive writing on the subject on ryedale.net |
| Member of the public | Yes - this ensures that any development in villages does not simply feed demand from those who wish to re-locate to the district – leading to yet more unsustainable development. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--|--|
| <p>NYCC Children and Young People's Services</p> | <p>Similarly to the comment in response to question 11 if the Local Needs Occupation Condition is likely to provide an increased number of pupils to small rural schools with existing surpluses then this may be beneficial for keeping pupil numbers viable.</p> |
| <p>NYCC Adult and Social Care</p> | <p>Using Section 106s for local connections is helpful if they are broad enough to allow people to move around the North Yorkshire County (i.e. someone may want to move from Whitby to Malton to be nearer friends or have better access to places such as York). A tight Section 106 which limited access to existing residents of Ryedale would be overly restrictive, would limit people's choice and place artificial limits on our capacity.</p> |
| <p>Pickering Town Council</p> | <p>Yes. Villages should shoulder some of the burden of housing allocation if appropriate infrastructure is in place and if development can take place without overwhelming these villages. The Local Needs Occupancy Condition can prevent appropriate development taking place in villages where there are suitable sites and the way that the condition is used and operated should be reviewed.</p> |
| <p>Weaverthorpe Parish Council</p> | <p>With regard to the above consultation, Weaverthorpe Parish Council would like to contribute their views on the Local Needs Occupancy condition of the Ryedale Local Plan. We do not agree with the condition and would ask that it be removed. Our reasons for this are:</p> <p>We understand the reason is to stop villages becoming full of second homes for city dwellers but this is not the case in Weaverthorpe. We have only one second home owned by someone who lives in Sheffield.</p> <p>If homes are only for sale to those who have a link to the village it will not lead to a mix of residents in the village, which has happened over the last couple of decades because people have moved from elsewhere which helps to create a diverse and supporting community, which the local needs occupancy condition will cease to achieve.</p> <p>The local needs occupancy condition includes selling to people who have employment in the village. There is no evidence that our local businesses only employ local people.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--------------|--|
| | <p data-bbox="392 140 2132 240">When properties are for sale, a mix of age groups need to be attracted to the village. The local needs occupancy condition will eventually stagnate our school if non local people are not allowed to purchase properties, as younger people need to see Weaverthorpe as an attractive place to live. This does not always mean young people who have existing links to the village.</p> <p data-bbox="392 284 2132 384">We feel that a more important issue for the District Council is to encourage builders who are developing property to create affordable housing. The increasing use of the local needs occupancy condition which makes marketing the property more difficult will increase the number of empty properties in the village, which increases the risk of vandalism and illegal occupation of the properties.</p> <p data-bbox="392 392 1944 419">There are already plenty of beds for tourism in the village which makes the prospect of the purchase of a holiday home less viable.</p> <p data-bbox="392 427 2107 454">One property that was developed by an existing resident has the LNO conditions, this will make it difficult to sell once their family has grown up.</p> <p data-bbox="392 462 1444 489">The LNO has not been consistently applied to all properties that it could have applied to.</p> <p data-bbox="392 497 2018 525">RDC did remove the LNO on one property which the developer was having difficulties selling, so why continue the practice in the future?</p> <p data-bbox="392 533 2024 560">Weaverthorpe Parish Council have already raised the subject of the local needs occupancy rule with RDC on a several previous occasions.</p> |

Question 15: Do you have any views on the use of a primary residency occupancy condition for new dwellings in your community?

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|--|
| Carter Jonas obo Nawton, Nunnington, Place Newton, Thorpe Bassett and Westow Estates | Carter Jonas has concerns surrounding the implications of a primary residency occupancy condition. Carter Jonas also has concerns on the impact these restrictions could have on the second-hand house market which may experience increased price rises as a result of the condition being applied. |
| Persimmon Homes | No. |
| Rural Solutions obo Castle Howard | <p>No.</p> <p>For the reasons outlined above, and particularly that reason around the difficulty of gaining finance, Castle Howard would also not support a primary residency restriction.</p> <p>These are used only in rare cases across the country e.g. in small coastal communities where there are very clear pressures on the housing stock. In such communities single dwelling developments, often by those with existing capital may predominate. We are not aware of any circumstances where primary residency restrictions have been used on multiple units housing developments, including affordable housing and service provision.</p> <p>It is not considered that there is a similar pressure across Ryedale on the housing stock, as that experienced in some coastal communities where land availability is constrained, which would justify the imposition of such a restrictive occupancy condition. Any type of restriction could stymie the delivery of new development and it is considered that the inherent risk associated with a restrictive occupancy condition does not justify its inclusion. As noted in relation to question 14 a degree of all new development (the affordable housing proportion) on all unrestricted sites will have an occupancy condition that restricts it to the local area.</p> |
| ArkleBoyce obo Andrew Pern | We would object to the use of a primary residency occupancy condition. As with any restrictive condition, it would likely affect the viability of development from coming forward in villages and would therefore contradict the more broadly distribution of development which we strongly support. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|---|
| Edwardson Associates obo Lutton landowners | This is preferable to the local needs occupancy condition. |
| Savills obo the Church Commissioner for England | Our client has concerns in relation to these restrictions and the potential implications they could have on the delivery of homes, including the potential to deliver infrastructure and other policy requirements set out in the plan and the impacts on future financing and rights of occupants. |
| Savills obo the Settrington Estate | Our client has concerns in relation to these restrictions and the potential implications they could have on the delivery of homes, including the potential to deliver infrastructure and other policy requirements set out in the plan and the impacts on future financing and rights of occupants. |
| Savills obo Birdsall Estate | <p>We also object to the use of a primary residency occupancy condition, which is likely to have the same negative implications on the value and marketability of houses to which the condition applies. As with the LNOC, a primary residency occupancy condition is not a requirement of National Policy and is not considered necessary in Ryedale. Again, first time buyers will be most impacted with a reduction in the number of mortgage products available to them and the competitiveness of those products.</p> <p>Should the Council progress the Primary residence condition within the Local Plan review, we kindly ask that exceptions are built into any associated policy to allow maximum land receipts when an application is brought forward as part of an application for Enabling Development.</p> |
| Savills obo Hovingham Estate | <p>We strongly object to the use of a primary residency occupancy condition. The <i>Distribution of Development</i> consultation paper outlines the key issues encountered through the application of restrictive conditions, such as the existing Local Occupancy Condition. Whilst the Local Occupancy Condition is not applied in Service Villages such as Hovingham, we would envisage that any primary residency occupancy condition would have similar negative implications on the delivery and re-sale of homes.</p> <p>Whilst we understand the intention of the proposed primary residency occupancy condition would be to ensure that housing delivered in the district can meet local needs, we do not support the proposed condition, particularly in the context of the representations made above.</p> <p>The proposed condition could affect the viability of development from coming forward in villages and would therefore contradict the more broadly distribution of development which we strongly support.</p> <p>If applied, the condition could also result in less sustainable and less vibrant rural settlements through inevitable impacts to values, meaning the delivery of less affordable housing and other infrastructure contributions. The application of restrictive policies such as this is evident in the lower</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| | <p>growth in these locations over the 2012-21 period, due to the application of the Local Occupancy Condition. In the locations in which the LNOC was applied, housing completions represented only 12% of total completions.</p> <p>In addition, the application of the LNOC has had demonstrable negative implications on the value of a property, caused delays in re-sales and very often can be avoided by competitive mortgage providers. This adds an additional layer of complexity and cost which fundamentally restricts the market for a dwelling with such a condition. The same is likely to occur when properties are subject to a primary residency occupancy condition. In general, the application of any occupancy condition can reduce the value of a property by around 30%.</p> <p>In the context of enabling style development at the Hovingham Estate, where the key objective is to generate income to contribute to the sustainable footing of the Estate for the long term, the implementation of any condition which restricts the value of a dwelling, or its attractiveness to the market, will have significant implications on the much needed funds that can be re-invested into the Estates upkeep.</p> <p>As such, we would not support the proposed principal residency occupancy condition.</p> |
| Spawforths obo Keyland Developments | Keyland is concerned how the use of such conditions could have an associated impact on the housing market. Any such policy would need to be fully explored and robustly justified and that any action is proportionate to the scale of the issue. The approach of national policy is to boost the supply of housing and the effective sustainable delivery of new homes. The consequential impact on the wider housing market in the area needs to be considered, as this would not be covered by such a new policy. |
| KVA Planning obo CPRE | CPRE would support the use of this condition to ensure that local people are not pushed out of the housing market by second homes. |
| Home Builders Federation | The HBF seeks assurances from the Council that this requirement will not be an impediment to the effective delivery of homes. The HBF has concerns in relation to these restrictions and the potential implications they could have on the delivery of homes, including the potential to deliver infrastructure and other policy requirements set out in the plan and the impacts on future financing and rights of occupants. The HBF also has concerns on the impact these restrictions could then have on the second-hand home market which may see significant prices rises, as these homes are not subject to restrictions seen in the new build sector. |
| Wintringham Parish Council | Second homes are very bad news for Ryedale. We should take every step possible to reduce the number of them. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Chair Wintringham Parish Council | Second homes are causing many problems to our rural communities and should be strongly discouraged. |
| Amotherby Parish Council | New houses should be for people to live in full-time, not to be holiday cottages. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Development opportunities are scarce and to allow dwellings to be used as second homes or holiday homes or houses standing is not only immoral it will water down and ruin village life. |
| Member of the public | No. |
| Member of the public | No. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|--|
| Member of the public | Not applicable for reasons given on opposition to further development in the village. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Driving up price of housing so local families cannot afford and as these houses are empty much of the year it doesn't help keep village communities thriving. |
| Member of the public | Holiday lets bring an important source of income to the area. |
| Member of the public | No – you are just trying to manipulate a system that would be better if you get the planning policy right. |
| Member of the public | No. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| Member of the public | Yes. To avoid too many holiday home which destroys a village community. An example is what is happening at Coneysthorpe. |
| Member of the public | Such a condition should be included. |
| Member of the public | No. |
| Member of the public | Yes. I think we should learn the lessons of Cornwall where the high proportion of second home owners is problematic for residents' communities. |
| Member of the public | The primary residence condition is fine. Nobody wants to live in an area with a lot of empty second homes only occupied at certain times of the year. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| Member of the public | Yes. Second homes are an issue in Ryedale and puts up the price of houses, many of which are smaller homes which would be suitable for younger, local residents. |
| Member of the public | I am against any such restriction. It is heavy handed and the position in Ryedale is nothing like the problem it has become in Cornwall. I think there are other ways to ensure second home owners pay more to the local exchequer. |
| Member of the public | They aren't used for second homes or rental properties. |
| Member of the public | No |
| Member of the public | Please see my writing on the subject on ryedale.net The condition should be applied to ALL new housing in Ryedale without exception. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|------------------------|---|
| Member of the public | They should be introduced in any community where the percentage of 2 nd home properties exceeds 10% of the housing stock. |
| Pickering Town Council | It is acknowledged that empty properties do not contribute to the economy and there are a high number of second homes in Ryedale. These second homes are also often the type of smaller and more affordable homes that younger, local people might be able to buy. The Local Plan cannot address the use of homes in future years, but the problems caused by second homes can be addressed for new developments and should be addressed in the Local Plan. |

Question 16a: Do we make specific allocations which will be only for Self-build properties?

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|--|
| Carter Jonas obo Nawton, Nunnington, Place Newton, Thorpe Bassett and Westow Estates | No. We have no comments at this time. |
| Evolution Town Planning | Yes. This would help to deliver a type of housing that is required by government policy. |
| Persimmon Homes | No. |
| Rural Solutions obo Castle Howard | No. Castle Howard wishes to deliver legacy development of the very highest quality on its land. Whilst it does not have any objection to the principle of self-build it would not actively support allocations on its land. Whilst it is possible in some cases for self-build housing to be governed by a very strict design code, there can be challenges in ensuring that development is of the highest quality and contributes to a village in a way that is highly sensitive to the local vernacular. On that basis, Castle Howard's position is that it does not actively support the provision of specific allocations for only self build properties (on its land). |
| ArkleBoyce obo Andrew Pern | Yes. We would fully support allocations for self-build properties, such as Site 218 that has been submitted as part of the Call for Sites. Our client is committed to ensuring the life of the village is sustained and in allowing his own property to be converted to support the expansion of a valued business in district, it is important replacement is allowed without restrictive condition. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--|---|
| Edwardson Associates obo Lutton landowners | No. Sites should be allowed to accommodate a mix of house types. |
| Spawforths obo Keyland Developments | <p data-bbox="394 363 2107 501">Yes. Keyland supports the delivery of Custom and Self Build housing within a balanced market. Keyland’s Six Capitals Approach delivers a mix of house types and tenures on a site, which can be seen in the Vision Report for their site at Whitby Road, Pickering, which shows a mix of development approaches including traditional housebuilder alongside Custom and Self Build housing.</p> <p data-bbox="394 544 2069 644">An integral part of the scheme is the ability to deliver choice in housing. The proposed scheme will invest in the local community and seek to make a significant contribution to Pickering through not only growing the local population, but supporting an increase in local skills and employability, developing local design and construction knowledge and maximising the opportunities for healthier living.</p> <p data-bbox="394 687 2085 825">The provision of Self Build and Custom Build housing is a key component to this approach. These alternative forms of housing design and delivery create the opportunity for both new and existing residents to design and build their own homes (or have them built to order), whilst also encouraging the use of a local supply chain to provide labour and materials. In this way, many of the proposed new homes can be built in Pickering by the people and businesses of Pickering.</p> |
| KVA Planning obo CPRE | Yes. The Government require Councils to ensure that self build plots are available. Specific allocations would enable the Council to set a specific criteria to control development but also include sites in the housing land supply. |
| Home Builders Federation | Yes. The HBF considers that it would be appropriate to make specific allocations for Self-Build properties. The HBF considers it may also be appropriate to include a set of criteria to assess self-build homes by, although it is likely these requirements may be similar to other residential development requirements. The Council will need to consider the evidence they have in relation to the need for self-build and custom-build homes, in relation to the numbers required, the location, the deliverability and the viability. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Chair Wintringham Parish Council | Yes. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Any self builds should fit in with all of the pertaining restrictions. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Adds variety in property market. |
| Member of the public | No. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Needs to be stringent planning control and application of building regulations. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| Member of the public | No. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Self-build would provide a greater range of housing choice for residents. Not all housing should be delivered by the large home builders. There is a demand for high quality properties with larger gardens. |
| Member of the public | Yes. If allocated as self-builds, will hopefully keep properties away from flood plains. |
| Member of the public | Yes. This could help locals build for themselves and small scale development. |
| Member of the public | No. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| Member of the public | No. |
| Member of the public | No. |
| Member of the public | Yes. I think areas could be set out for Self Build properties, these will be naturally be quite different designs but add to the character of an area, with residents who have a desire on spending a longer term at the location as it will be in their bespoke house. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Encourage variety. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Yes but you need to back this with the ability for the individual to obtain a mortgage |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|------------------------|--|
| Member of the public | <p>Self-build properties are essentially no different to one-off houses built by a local builder or developer. The only difference being that the self-builder buys the land and builds the house (as main contractor) and not the small local builder.</p> <p>Getting rid of the LNOC will bring plenty of small sites to the market in Ryedales other villages to satisfy both adventurous self builders and Ryedales small local builders and developers.</p> <p>The self build question is an unnecessary diversion at the present time.</p> |
| Member of the public | <p>No – I cannot see the need for this. Self builders can always take advantage of the local occupancy condition option – this would demonstrate their long term commitment to the area as opposed to using this as a means to eventually realise a profit from development that would otherwise not be allowed.</p> |
| Pickering Town Council | <p>If a resident wishes to build a Self-Build property they submit a planning application which complies with planning conditions, then they should be allowed to do this. Rather than there being specific allocations in the Plan it might be more appropriate to consider each application on its own merit.</p> |

Question 16b: Do we employ a set of criteria to assess Self-build homes by? What should these criteria be? What is the most important?

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|--|
| Carter Jonas obo Nawton, Nunnington, Place Newton, Thorpe Bassett and Westow Estates | No. We have no comments at this time. |
| Persimmon Homes | Yes. |
| Spawforths obo Keyland Developments | <p>Yes. Keyland supports the delivery of Custom and Self Build housing within a balanced market. Keyland’s Six Capitals Approach delivers a mix of house types and tenures on a site, which can be seen in the Vision Report for their site at Whitby Road, Pickering, which shows a mix of development approaches including traditional housebuilder alongside Custom and Self Build housing.</p> <p>An integral part of the scheme is the ability to deliver choice in housing. The proposed scheme will invest in the local community and seek to make a significant contribution to Pickering through not only growing the local population, but supporting an increase in local skills and employability, developing local design and construction knowledge and maximising the opportunities for healthier living.</p> <p>The provision of Self Build and Custom Build housing is a key component to this approach. These alternative forms of housing design and delivery create the opportunity for both new and existing residents to design and build their own homes (or have them built to order), whilst also encouraging the use of a local supply chain to provide labour and materials. In this way, many of the proposed new homes can be built in Pickering by the people and businesses of Pickering.</p> |
| KVA Planning obo CPRE | Yes. Energy efficient and adaptable homes, sustainable and high quality design. Access and green space provision. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--------------------------|--|
| Home Builders Federation | Yes. The HBF considers that it would be appropriate to make specific allocations for Self-Build properties. The HBF considers it may also be appropriate to include a set of criteria to assess self-build homes by, although it is likely these requirements may be similar to other residential development requirements. The Council will need to consider the evidence they have in relation to the need for self-build and custom-build homes, in relation to the numbers required, the location, the deliverability and the viability. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Houses should be in sympathy with the surroundings in which they are built and should not stand out in a conspicuous manner. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Quality assurance. |
| Member of the public | Yes. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Needs to be clear and enforceable guidelines. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Member of the public | No. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Eco friendly. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Otherwise system will be abused. |
| Member of the public | Yes. |
| Member of the public | No. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| Member of the public | No. |
| Member of the public | Yes. That the project(s) benefit those who would otherwise be unable to live in the Ryedale villages. |
| Member of the public | No. |
| Member of the public | Yes. To ensure it's a level playing field. |
| Member of the public | No |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|------------------------|---|
| Member of the public | <p data-bbox="394 204 450 228">Yes.</p> <p data-bbox="394 272 1240 296">The self build question is an unnecessary diversion at the present time.</p> <p data-bbox="394 347 1167 371">See above re removing LNOG before adding more complications.</p> |
| Pickering Town Council | <p data-bbox="394 504 2007 568">The criteria to be considered might be energy efficiency, length of time before resale is permitted, the need for self-occupancy, and the requirement for the property not to be sub-let.</p> |

Question 17a: When development is identified or 'allocated' to meet future development needs, the Development Limits are reconsidered as part of this process and expanded to accommodate the site/allocation. Do you agree with this approach?

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|--|
| ID Planning obo The Vistry Group | Yes, the Development Limits of a settlement should be extended to include sites which are allocated for development as the new sites form an extension to the settlement and the boundary should reflect this. |
| Evolution Town Planning | Yes. This is a logical approach. |
| Freeths LLP obo Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation | Yes. If the respective amendment to the settlement boundary was not made in respect of allocated sites it would unnecessarily constrain development that has been concluded to be acceptable through the Local Plan process by triggering policies applicable to open countryside locations etc which would be contrary to the objective of such land allocations. |
| Persimmon Homes | Yes. |
| Rural Solutions obo Castle Howard | <p>Yes.</p> <p>Castle Howard considers that a criteria based policy approach which would allow small-scale development on the edge of villages in prescribed scenarios is preferable to a development limits approach. Castle Howard owns some smaller parcels of land on the edge of villages, which may not be suitable for allocation but could deliver small-scale development that provides benefits to the local area.</p> <p>A development limits approach could stymie the delivery of such small-scale development sites.</p> |
| KVA Planning | Yes |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--|---|
| Steve Murray Associates Ltd | Yes. Allows expansion of existing settlements. |
| Barton Willmore obo Barratt and David Wilson Homes | No. The retention of development limits seeks to constrain development and growth and so they should not be retained in the emerging Local Plan. The removal of development limits would allow for incremental growth adjoining sustainable settlements. |
| Barton Willmore obo Tim Parkinson | No. The retention of development limits seeks to artificially constrain development and growth and our client does not agree with the approach of retaining development limits around any settlements within the emerging Local Plan. The NPPF does not refer to restricting development within defined development limits and tightly drawn boundaries would be contrary to the aims and objectives of promoting sustainable development and significantly boosting the supply of homes. As such, the use of development limits is contrary to the objectives of the NPPF and therefore, should no longer be used as a tool to steer development. |
| ELG Planning obo Fitzwilliam Malton Estate | No. County Durham have recently adopted the County Durham Plan (October 2020) which does not contain development limits. In addition to housing allocations, they also have a policy (Policy 6) which allows for development on sites outside of, but well related to the built-up area, subject to amenity, design, landscape impact considerations. This policy recognises that in addition to the development of specifically allocated sites, there will be situations where future opportunities arise for additional new development over and above that identified in the development plan for the area and allows settlements to grow organically, as well as meaning that the local plan is entirely flexible to changing circumstances. |
| Carter Jonas obo Nawton, Nunnington, Place Newton, Thorpe Bassett and Westow Estates | Yes. CJ considers that it is appropriate to amend development limits where sites are allocated or to allow for a development opportunity (for example infill development) which responds to housing needs in the area. |
| ArkleBoyce | Yes. We would urge the Council to undertake a full review of development limits through the Local Plan Review, taking a long-term view to ensure that the development limits are not acting to unnecessarily stifle new development, which would otherwise be appropriate and sustainable. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|--|
| Pegasus Planning Group | Yes. We believe there is scope to reconsider the development limits, particularly in Sherburn. The current development limits are drawn too tightly & don't offer any opportunities for expansion; the development of new housing, maintenance or enhancement of services & facilities. Expansion has the potential to vastly increase Sherburn's sustainability. |
| Edwardson Associates obo Lutton landowners | Yes. The development limits should be redrawn to include allocations. However, some Authorities are opting for no development limits and judging sites on their accessibility and sustainability. Simply being on the wrong side of the line does not make a development unacceptable or unsustainable. |
| Savills obo the Church Commissioner for England | Yes. It is considered appropriate to amend the development limits where sites are allocated for development or to allow for increased opportunities for infill or windfall development as part of the strategy of the Plan going forward. However, retaining tight development limits on the villages across the District will continue to restrict housing completions in such areas limiting the market and by default exasperating the affordability of homes in Ryedale due to the supply and demand implications associated with limited new growth. |
| Savills obo the Settrington Estate | Yes. It is considered appropriate to amend the development limits where sites are allocated for development or to allow for increased opportunities for infill or windfall development as part of the strategy of the plan going forward. |
| Johnson Mowat obo KCS Development | <p>Yes. The consultation paper proposes that when land is identified or 'allocated' to meet future development needs, the Development Limits are reconsidered as part of this process and expanded to accommodate the site/allocation. This is considered to be appropriate.</p> <p>An alternative approach to defining development limits in Ryedale could be appropriate and it is recommended that consideration is given to the removal of development limits and the alternative approach of defining criteria to establish the 'built form' of individual settlements. Such an approach is proposed in the emerging Hambleton Local Plan, which is a comparable rural district. This alternative approach allows for more flexibility and the potential for appropriate windfall development to come forward within the built form as well as adjacent to the built form subject to appropriate criteria and recognised association of land with the built form rather than the countryside.</p> |
| Johnson Mowat obo Yorkshire Land Ltd | An alternative approach to defining development limits in Ryedale could be appropriate and it is recommended that consideration is given to the removal of development limits and the alternative approach of defining criteria to establish the 'built form' of individual settlements. Such an approach is proposed in the emerging Hambleton Local Plan, which is a comparable rural district. This alternative approach allows for more flexibility and the potential for appropriate |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| | <p>windfall development to come forward within the built form as well as adjacent to the built form subject to appropriate criteria and recognised association of land with the built form rather than the countryside.</p> |
| Savills obo Birdsall Estate | <p>Yes. We would urge the Council to undertake a full review of Development Limits through the Local Plan Review, to ensure that the development limits are not acting to unnecessarily stifle new development, which would otherwise be sustainable.</p> <p>The NPPF reaffirms the Governments objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes but ensuring sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed. Arguably, the current development limits identified on each settlements policies map, are too tightly drawn, and do not allow for housing to be delivered in areas where the market for such is strongest. This contradicts Policy 82d which requires planning policies to be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan.</p> <p>In village locations, it is particularly important that opportunities remain for windfall or smaller developments which may not meet the criteria for allocation and instead can be market driven. Paragraph 69c of the NPPF requires local authorities to support the development of windfall sites through their policies and decisions. The broadening of development limits in villages would be a positive approach to meeting this requirement.</p> <p>We would support the broadening of development limits, to ensure that sites can come forward for development in a way that is organic and market driven. This approach will also present opportunities for edge of settlement development and self-build homes.</p> |
| Savills obo Hovingham Estate | <p>Yes. We would urge the Council to undertake a full review of development limits through the Local Plan Review, taking a long-term view to ensure that the development limits are not acting to unnecessarily stifle new development, which would otherwise be appropriate and sustainable.</p> <p>The NPPF reaffirms the Governments objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes but ensuring sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed. Arguably, the current development limits identified on each settlements policies map, are too tightly drawn, and do not allow for housing to be delivered in areas where the market for such is strongest. This contradicts Paragraph 82d of the NPPF which requires planning policies to be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan. We would support the broadening of development limits, to ensure that sites can come forward for development in a way that is organic and market driven. This approach will also present opportunities for edge of settlement development and self-build homes.</p> |
| Savills obo Louise Kirk (Ampleforth) | |
| Spawforths obo Keyland Developments | <p>Keyland considers that in accordance with best practice throughout the country where land is allocated in a local plan, the development limits of that settlement are adjusted to accommodate the site.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Home Builders Federation | The HBF considers that it is appropriate to amend the development limits where sites are allocated for development or to allow for increased opportunities for infill or windfall development as part of the strategy of the Plan going forward. |
| Heslerton Parish Council | Yes. It always pays to keep matters under review. |
| Wintringham Parish Council | No. There needs to be a very good reason to change development limits. |
| Malton Town Council | No. Expansion could have no limits. |
| Chair Wintringham Parish Council | No. What is the point in continually extending development limits? It undermines their purpose. |
| Amotherby Parish Council | No. Encourages the owners of next door fields to "jump on the bandwagon" by submitting their fields as potential development sites. This will lead to villages constantly expanding and possibly coalescing if allowed. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|--|
| Member of the public | No. Care must be given to the location of any land identified for development. By all means possible expansion for the future but ensure that all development is controlled in line with predetermined factors and be sympathetic to local situations. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Development limits are bound to evolve as settlements grow. There is a balance which should not artificially attempt to restrict growth. |
| Member of the public | No. My village is a conservation area. Any expansion to the development limits would set a precedent, which could be limitless. |
| Member of the public | Yes. This is particularly important for “green sites” and land adjoining water courses. Flood mitigation and habitat loss will become increasingly important considerations. |
| Member of the public | No. To maintain the space between villages which gives Ryedale its essential character. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| Member of the public | Yes. To allow land to become available to keep the price of housing affordable in the villages. |
| Member of the public | Yes. However development limits need to change as settlements grow to prevent inappropriate development. Space within the development limits will become congested or not available at all. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Without such an approach developmental items would have to be discussed on a case-to-case basis which is impractical. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Makes sense. |
| Member of the public | Yes. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|--|
| Member of the public | No. |
| Member of the public | No. Existing development limits should be kept. |
| Member of the public | Yes. |
| Member of the public | Yes. But the limit should always be under review, it should be something that is appealable against outside of a plan. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Seems sensible. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-------------------------|--|
| Member of the public | Yes. There are always unknowns further down the track that can't be seen from the start. |
| Member of the public | Yes. |
| Member of the public | <p>Yes.</p> <p>According to the RDC Head of Planning, service village development limits are simply expanded to include new developments.</p> <p>The same principle should apply to all the villages in Ryedale. The development limits are all out of date and should be revised.</p> |
| Member of the public | Yes – it seems an appropriate way of controlling where development occurs so it is deployed in the most sustainable way. |
| Northminster Properties | Yes, If the development limits are not expanded you wouldn't be able to have development in these locations. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|------------------------|---|
| Pickering Town Council | It is acknowledged that Development Limits have a degree of flexibility, with planning consent more likely to be given to those applications that are within those Development Limits, which seems to be a reasonable approach. However, the setting of Development Limits should be strategic and set out in the Plan and should not be led by developers or landowners. |

Question 17b. Do we make small scale adjustments to take account of appropriate Self-build proposals that have been submitted through the 'call for sites' event?

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--|---|
| Evolution Town Planning | Yes. This is a logical approach. |
| Persimmon Homes | Yes. |
| KVA Planning | Yes. It is important to factor small scale adjustments to existing settlement limits in the review in order to allocate appropriate sites. Sometimes, this will require appropriate realignment |
| Carter Jonas obo Nawton, Nunnington, Place Newton, Thorpe Bassett and Westow Estates | No. We have no comments at this time. |
| ArkleBoyce | Yes. We would fully support allocations for self-build properties, such as Site 218 that has been submitted as part of the Call for Sites. Our client is committed to ensuring the life of the village is sustained and in allowing his own property to be converted to support the expansion of a valued business in district, it is important replacement is allowed without restrictive condition. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Savills obo Birdsall Estate | We support the broadening of development limits to ensure that sites can come forward in a way that is organic and market driven. This approach will also present opportunities for edge of settlement development and self-build homes. |
| Savills obo Hovingham Estate | We support the broadening of development limits to ensure that sites can come forward in a way that is organic and market driven. This approach will also present opportunities for edge of settlement development and self-build homes. |
| Heslerton Parish Council | Yes. It always pays to keep matters under review. |
| Wintringham Parish Council | No. |
| Chair Wintringham Parish Council | No. Small scale adjustments over time can lead to significant over development in small communities. |
| Amotherby Parish Council | Yes. But only if they are truly appropriate to the settlement. |
| Member of the public | No. To avoid the possibility of creep, a firm approach is needed. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| Member of the public | Yes. |
| Member of the public | No. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Important to include Environmental Impact Assessments and proposed mitigations particularly if close to SSSIs and important wildlife habitats. |
| Member of the public | No. Sounds like an excuse just to ignore the current development limits. |
| Member of the public | No. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|--|
| Member of the public | Yes. Development limits should be regularly reviewed to ensure they remain relevant and adapted to account for anticipated demand such as self build or bungalows. Development limits in Ryedale appearing unchanged since the last century. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Some degree of flexibility will no doubt be required for a limited number of "self-builds". |
| Member of the public | Yes. Makes sense. |
| Member of the public | No. |
| Member of the public | No. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| Member of the public | No. |
| Member of the public | Yes. |
| Member of the public | Yes. |
| Member of the public | No. I don't think Self Build locations need any preferential treatment from any other forms of development. Any building should be based on sound planning criteria. I have no issue with sites solely set up for self building though. |
| Member of the public | Yes. I support Self-Build, partly because I suspect the quality of houses so built are of better quality than the quality of the more mass produced ones of the national housebuilders. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|------------------------|---|
| Member of the public | Yes. To ensure everything is fair for all parties. |
| Member of the public | Yes. |
| Member of the public | No. As I have explained above, there is no difference between self-builder and a local builder building a house. Please treat all small sites and all small builders the same. |
| Member of the public | No |
| Pickering Town Council | There should be some flexibility, but this must be small scale adjustments, not adjustments led by the availability of suitable sites. |

Question 18: How important do you think it is to maximise the following aspects of new development (1 being 'very important', 2 being 'important', 3 being 'somewhat important', 4 being 'less important', 5 being 'least important')?

| Organisation | Energy efficiency | Carbon neutrality | Water conservation | Active travel | Green and blue infrastructure | Biodiversity protection / enhancement / resilience |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Evolution Town Planning | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Freeths LLP obo Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Persimmon Homes | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Rural Solutions obo Castle Howard | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| KVA Planning | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Edwardson Associates | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| North Yorkshire Local Access Forum | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

| Organisation | Energy efficiency | Carbon neutrality | Water conservation | Active travel | Green and blue infrastructure | Biodiversity protection / enhancement / resilience |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Heslerton Parish Council | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| Wintringham Parish Council | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Malton Town Council | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Chair Wintringham Parish Council | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Amotherby Parish Council | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |

| Organisation | Energy efficiency | Carbon neutrality | Water conservation | Active travel | Green and blue infrastructure | Biodiversity protection / enhancement / resilience |
|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Member of the public | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Member of the public | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Member of the public | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| Member of the public | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 |

| Organisation | Energy efficiency | Carbon neutrality | Water conservation | Active travel | Green and blue infrastructure | Biodiversity protection / enhancement / resilience |
|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Member of the public | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Member of the public | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Member of the public | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Member of the public | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

| Organisation | Energy efficiency | Carbon neutrality | Water conservation | Active travel | Green and blue infrastructure | Biodiversity protection / enhancement / resilience |
|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Member of the public | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Member of the public | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Member of the public | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| Member of the public | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

| Organisation | Energy efficiency | Carbon neutrality | Water conservation | Active travel | Green and blue infrastructure | Biodiversity protection / enhancement / resilience |
|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Member of the public | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Member of the public | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Member of the public | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Member of the public | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 |

| Organisation | Energy efficiency | Carbon neutrality | Water conservation | Active travel | Green and blue infrastructure | Biodiversity protection / enhancement / resilience |
|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Member of the public | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| Member of the public | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | | 2 |
| Member of the public | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Member of the public | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 |

| Organisation | Energy efficiency | Carbon neutrality | Water conservation | Active travel | Green and blue infrastructure | Biodiversity protection / enhancement / resilience |
|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Member of the public | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Pickering Town Council | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

Question 19: Are there any other areas of the Ryedale Plan we should be looking to review at this time and why?

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|--|
| Evolution Town Planning | No. |
| Freeths LLP obo Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation | No. |
| Persimmon Homes | No. |
| Rural Solutions obo Castle Howard | <p>Yes.</p> <p>Castle Howard Estate considers that in addition to housing related issues and allocations, the Ryedale Plan should also review the approach to supporting new employment development (within rural areas).</p> <p>Following discussion with Officers, two sites for proposed allocation for new employment development are put forward.</p> <p>Castle Howard bespoke policy:</p> <p>Over the plan period, development at Castle Howard will be supported where it consists of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Residential and commercial development on sites allocated for development at - (List of allocated sites to be included by Ryedale District Council) 2. Smaller scale residential and commercial development on unallocated windfall sites. 3. Tourism development including visitor facilities, infrastructure and accommodation. 4. New infrastructure to promote and improve enhanced cycling and walking opportunities. 5. Other development and infrastructure necessary to support the efficient running of the Estate including its visitor offer and agricultural and forestry operations. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| | <p>All new development at Castle Howard must:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Demonstrate that there will be no unacceptable on the significance of the Castle Howard landscape. 2. Demonstrate that high quality and sustainable design has been a consideration throughout the design process. 3. Incorporate where possible and at a proportionate level to the scale of new development, opportunities to encourage cycling, walking and the use of public transport, and to facilitate the charging of electric vehicles. 4. Incorporate opportunities for biodiversity net gain. 5. Where a development is within, or affects the setting of, the Howardian Hills AONB, it should be demonstrated that this designation has been considered. 6. Where a development has a direct impact on a heritage asset or its setting, it should be demonstrated how this has been considered throughout the design process, with opportunities. |
| KVA Planning | <p>Yes.</p> <p>Policy SP13 should be reviewed to ensure it is up to date - following the Glover Report the Council should ensure that the AONB is given the strongest protection in the plan and also the Yorkshire Wolds potential AONB should be considered.</p> |
| ArkleBoyce | <p>No.</p> |
| Johnson Mowat obo KCS Development | <p>KCS reserve the right to make comments in relation to other policies when they are known at the next consultation stage. It is assumed that the Council will not deviate from relevant Government policy particularly in relation to biodiversity net gain, design, minimum space standards and renewable and low carbon energy requirements</p> |
| Johnson Mowat obo Yorkshire Land Ltd | <p>Yorkshire Land Ltd reserve the right to make comments in relation to other policies when they are known at the next consultation stage. It is assumed that the Council will not deviate from relevant Government policy particularly in relation to biodiversity net gain, design, minimum space standards and renewable and low carbon energy requirements</p> |
| Savills obo Louise Kirk (Ampleforth) | <p>It is important that the Local Plan considers the market requirements in a post-covid world. The pandemic has resulted in a shift in working practices, with more people working from home and a reduction in commuting or travelling for work.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Spawforths obo Keyland Developments | <p data-bbox="396 177 591 204"><u>Space standards</u></p> <ul data-bbox="443 248 2107 389" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="443 248 2107 316">• Keyland would like to highlight that any policy seeking to implement national space standards for new homes needs to be accompanied by appropriate justification and evidence. <li data-bbox="443 320 2107 389">• If the Council wishes to adopt the higher optional standards for accessible and adaptable homes, the Council should only do so by applying the criteria set out in the PPG. <p data-bbox="396 432 898 459"><u>Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (SP18)</u></p> <ul data-bbox="443 504 2107 571" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="443 504 2107 571">• Keyland is generally supportive of ensuring developments are sustainable and respond to the climate change agenda; however, and such policy approach should be fully cognisant of new and future Building Regulation updates. |
| Home Builders Federation | <ul data-bbox="443 652 2107 863" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="443 652 2107 679">• The HBF considers that the Council should not deviate from the Government’s proposals on biodiversity net gain. <li data-bbox="443 687 2107 715">• A policy requirement for NDSS (nationally described space standards) should be justified and credible and robust evidence. <li data-bbox="443 722 2107 790">• If the council wishes to adopt the higher optional standards for accessible, adaptable and wheelchair homes the Council should only do so whether this would address an identified need for such properties. <li data-bbox="443 798 2107 863">• The HBF recommends that the Council looks to work with nationally defined standards regarding Building Regs, EV Charging and Future Homes Standards when amending any existing policies. |
| British Horse Society | <p data-bbox="396 948 943 975">Would request consideration of the following:</p> <ul data-bbox="443 983 1509 1238" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="443 983 1151 1010">• Emphasis within the plan on connecting off-road routes <li data-bbox="443 1018 1151 1045">• For equestrians to be considered vulnerable road users <li data-bbox="443 1053 1218 1080">• Horse-riding to be considered within the plan as active travel <li data-bbox="443 1088 1330 1115">• Horse-riding to be included as a design consideration for shared routes <li data-bbox="443 1123 1218 1150">• Equestrians to be consulted on major housing developments <li data-bbox="443 1158 1509 1185">• The use of CIL money to improve the off-road network for ‘higher status’ PROW users <li data-bbox="443 1193 1285 1220">• The use of CIL money for the provision of a community horse arena |
| Heslerton Parish Council | No |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Wintringham Parish Council | No |
| Malton Town Council | Yes. Removing the excessive amount of traffic out of Malton and Norton. It is ruining peoples lives and their health. |
| Chair Wintringham Parish Council | No |
| Member of the public | Yes. Demand for housing is only going to increase so one must always seek to find new sites. |
| Member of the public | No. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|---|
| Member of the public | No. |
| Member of the public | Yes. Flood risks and impact on habitats particularly taking into account future increased risks arising from predicted climatic changes. Better rural network availability. |
| Member of the public | No. |
| Member of the public | No. |
| Member of the public | No. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|--|
| Member of the public | No. |
| Member of the public | No. |
| Member of the public | No. |
| Member of the public | <p data-bbox="394 975 2134 1182">Yes. The last Ryedale Plan process seemed to lean towards the bigger developers building in and around the larger towns, one element I strongly disagreed with was the indiscriminate minimum size threshold in the site sifting process. At one stroke several decent small but unobtrusive sites were taken out. I think there was no need to do this, housing would have happened on some of these sites organically and the larger scale housing in the bigger towns would have still happened but not to the levels they have done. Notwithstanding It would have made sense for these sites to have been kept engaged (banked for the future) even if they weren't being planned to be used in the first phases. If there were any obstacles to overcome on these sites the landowners could have been working on them in the meantime.</p> <p data-bbox="394 1225 2134 1401">It also irks me that the minimum size threshold wasn't announced at the start of the process and plenty of small landowners (who were possibly applying through agents) will have lost out in both time and money. The Plan dragged on and on and never seemed to meet the planned deadlines, whether this was a tactic by some of the larger developers to filibuster the process in order to get their sites passed "Gladman style" whilst no plan was in place, I'm not sure. The council should make deadlines non-negotiable for this process in the future.</p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|--|
| | <p>I think the Ryedale Plan should have an exceptional circumstances overrule condition, sometimes there are sites which miss out on planning permission almost by default. Perhaps a totting up procedure and aggregation of the marginal gains mentality might help get some sites into better use even if they fall foul of a criteria. I think this is particularly important for smaller sites which ordinarily would not require vast infrastructure overhaul.</p> <p>Finally development Limits in Service Villages needs to be open to change, it cannot be correct that sites are allowed to be built large scale on the edge of towns (in open countryside), yet in villages if someone is trying to build one house marginally outside the limit they are knocked back.</p> |
| Member of the public | No. |
| Member of the public | Yes. The Covid 19 pandemic is changing the pattern of demand for a number of services as can be seen from the changes in houses prices across different parts the country. This implies a Review of and probably changes to the plan. |
| Member of the public | No. |
| Member of the public | No. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|----------------------|--|
| Member of the public | <p>We should be gathering accurate information re all the village service we consider important:</p> <p>i.e. village bus - What type of bus? Frequency of service? Hourly, Daily Weekly, Destinations? Duration of stay etc.</p> <p>Cycle paths and proximity of villages to national cycling routes or byway loops etc.</p> <p>Similar data required for all services listed against all villages. The inclusion of the word bus is meaningless without all the other data.</p> |
| Member of the public | <p>When plans are being reviewed, every household should be advised in writing and the extent of the review should be made clear – otherwise it is skewed towards the landowners and developers who have a strong vested interest in responding and the resources to put forward their case in the best possible light. In this case, consultations which were launched in the middle of a global pandemic appear to have been largely missed by the populations affected.</p> |
| Environment Agency | <p><u>Biodiversity (SP14)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We strongly support the update of SP14 (Biodiversity) to include new information and requirements relating to Biodiversity Net Gain • We would strongly support the district’s decision to expect greater BNG values [than mandatory 10%] • There is an opportunity to consider Nature Recovery Strategies as part of evidence base • Consider areas being set out as strategically important • We also strongly recommend that the update to SP14 explicitly stipulates what level of information is required to demonstrate sufficient net gain <p><u>Natural Resources (SP17)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This policy could be strengthened, taking account of all sources of flood risk and the emerging information from SFRAs • The Sequential Test should be applied to identify areas of lowest overall flood risk, taking account of all sources of flood risk, and risk now and in the future • Where development is identified on vacant/previously developed sites, this will take account of the existing flood risk and ensure that: consideration is given to relocating development elsewhere; flood risk is not increased as a result of development; flood risk is reduced overall • Add a policy about ‘making development safe’, for eg: sequential approach within sites at known flood risk; position on culverting; incorporate flood resilient design; cumulative impacts of development • Identify areas of functional floodplain and also areas that may be required for current future flood defence infrastructure <p><u>Specific additions/adjustments to SP17:</u></p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--------------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protecting surface and groundwater from potentially polluting development and activity. Sources of groundwater protection of potable water from groundwater within and adjacent to the District will be protected using the by reference to Source Protection Zones (SPZs) locations identified by the Environment Agency¹. Within SPZ1-the following types of development will not be permitted unless adequate safeguards against possible contamination can be agreed: • Septic tanks, waste water treatment works, effluent treatment plants, cesspools, cesspits underground storage tanks containing hydrocarbons or any chemicals; <i>make this a separate bullet point as set out in the next one</i> • Underground storage of hazardous substances (e.g. hydrocarbons) or non-hazardous pollutants; • Sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) with infiltration to ground and deep infiltration soakaways (<i>deep borehole soakaways listed separate as they are not covered by the CIRIA SUDS manual</i>) • Oil pipelines • Storm water overflows and below ground attenuation tanks • Activities which involve the disposal of liquid waste to land • Graveyards and cemeteries • Other specific types of development identified within the Environment Agency’s Groundwater Protection Policy. 14 • Within Source Protection Zones 2 and 3 a risk based approach will be applied to the consideration of development proposals with the exception of development involving deep soakaways for surface water run-off and for any form of discharge to ground of treated effluents or storm waters, sewerage, trade and storm effluent to ground which will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that these are necessary, are the only option available and where adequate safeguards against possible contamination can be agreed. • Within Source Protection Zones developers will be expected (<i>required?</i>) to provide full details of the proposed construction of new buildings and construction techniques, including foundation design as part of their proposals full details of those aspects of the development that pose a risk to both groundwater quality and resources from activities during construction and from the final development itself. Developers will be expected (<i>required?</i>) to provide a robust assessment of the risks to groundwater, together with the appropriate mitigation to protect groundwater for all phases of development. <p><u>Gypsy & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (SP5)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development uses incorporating caravans, mobile homes or park homes should be outside FZ3 • Sites used for holiday or short-let caravans and camping should be subject to a specific flood warning and evacuation plan • If identifying additional permanent or temporary sites: if development is considered ‘more vulnerable’, consider use of occupancy restrictions to restrict timings to areas of lower flood risk <p><u>Water Resources and Water Quality</u></p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--------------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local plans should consider the capacity and quality of water supply systems and any impact development may have on the environment, including the supply and demand patterns now and in the future • Water cycle studies and Infrastructure Delivery Plans can help with understanding what is needed and therefore are an important part of the evidence base. • Local Plans should consider the environmental capacity of the water environment using sources such as the RBMPs. <p>• Draft policies:</p> <p>a) 'To conserve, maintain and enhance water resources, Ryedale District Council will support proposals which: do not result in the deterioration of water bodies and which conserve and enhance in conjunction with net gain the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The natural geomorphology of water resources ii) The water quality, and iii) The ecological value of the water environment, including watercourse corridors <p>b) Implement positive progress towards achieving 'good' status or higher under the Water Framework Directive (WFD) in the borough's ground water and surface water bodies, with any development being able to demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) That there is no deterioration in the status of any surface or ground water body ii) that it does not compromise the ability of any surface or ground water body to achieve WFD status objectives iii) that any proposed development also meets wider environmental duties and iv) that where possible, indicate that the proposed development contributes to the delivery of WFD objectives set out in the Humber River Basin Management Plan (RBMP). <p>c) Manage water demand and water efficiency through appropriate water conservation techniques and good practice adaption to assist climate resilience (for example grey-water recycling and rainwater harvesting) and dispose of surface water appropriately and improve water quality through the incorporation of SuDS and</p> <p>d) Dispose of surface water appropriately and improve water</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We support the development of more water efficient housing. • Any developments, either commercial or housing, should always connect to the sewer network to treat waste water unless technically unfeasible. • New development should be in accordance with the drainage hierarchy <p><u>Watercourse buffer zones</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Watercourse buffer zones: all watercourses and their riparian corridors/floodplains should be protected and enhanced to provide multiple benefits; there should be un-development buffer zones of at least 10m along main river and ordinary watercourses <p><u>Culverts</u></p> |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|------------------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presumption against installing new culverts on watercourses • We would also suggest that where new developments are to be located over an existing culvert, the presumption should be that de-culverting and opening up the watercourse should always be the first option • Opportunities to re-naturalise watercourses should always be considered as part of developments |
| Natural England | <p><u>Recommendations and advice under the following sub-headings:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessment of potential housing sites should be informed by the landscape character approach • Avoiding harm to the international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity • Avoiding harm to priority habitats, ecological networks and priority and/or legally protected species populations • Seeking opportunities to enhance and create Green Infrastructure • Avoiding harm to nationally and locally designated sites of importance for geological conservation • Seeking opportunities to contribute to landscape restoration and enhancement • Avoiding best and most versatile agricultural land • Seeking opportunities to enhance public rights of way and accessible natural green space. <p><u>SP14</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We welcome the commitment to update Policy SP14 (Biodiversity) in relation to requiring biodiversity net gain. |
| Historic England | <p><u>Spatial Portraits</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan should include a description of the historic environment in the District and the contribution it makes to the area. • The Plan needs to describe the historical growth of the area, highlight key features of the present historic environment and explain the contribution heritage makes to all aspects of life in the District. • The Plan should describe the distinctive character and identity of different places in the District and identify those elements of the historic environment that are at risk. <p><u>Policies</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan should include strategic policies to conserve and enhance the historic environment of the area. • The strategic policies for the historic environment will derive from the overall strategy to deliver conservation and enjoyment of the area's heritage assets for generations to come. • The Plan can also include non-strategic policies setting out more detailed policies for specific areas, neighbourhoods and types of development. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|---|---|
| | <p data-bbox="394 142 562 165"><u>Site Allocations</u></p> <ul data-bbox="443 209 2136 331" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="443 209 2136 268">• Before allocating any site there needs to be some evaluation of the impact, which the development might have upon those elements that contribute to the significance of a heritage asset including their setting, through undertaking a heritage impact assessment. <li data-bbox="443 272 2136 331">• Policies for allocated sites may need to make reference to identified historic assets in order to guide how development should be delivered alongside them. |
| <p data-bbox="109 504 360 568">NYCC Minerals and Waste Management</p> | <p data-bbox="394 504 2136 568">When considering new housing developments, the capacity of the waste water and sewage infrastructure needs to be taken into consideration and whether any improvements would need to be made to accommodate the additional waste water and sewage which would be generated.</p> |
| <p data-bbox="109 788 300 815">NYCC Highways</p> | <ul data-bbox="443 708 2136 900" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="443 708 2136 767">• Update needed to strategic transport assessment (last carried out by Jacobs in 2016) regarding highways impacts of development proposals in Malton, Norton and Pickering. <li data-bbox="443 772 2136 831">• Any aspirations to grow and develop strategic villages/towns within Ryedale should provide a transport evidence base to aid development, accompanied with a robust developer contributions funding mechanism to deliver the transport infrastructure (IDP) to support the Local Plan. <li data-bbox="443 836 2136 900">• Recommend that a strategic transport review be carried out, based on proposed development locations and associated trip rates and distributions, which will be needed to identify potential mitigation and to produce outline cost estimates. |
| <p data-bbox="109 1075 309 1134">NYCC Local Lead Flood Authority</p> | <ul data-bbox="443 975 2136 1235" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="443 975 2136 1066">• Once a preferred options appraisal has been undertaken, it is recommended that RDC seek early advice from statutory consultees (Local Lead Flood Authority, Internal Drainage board, Environment Agency, etc) when determining suitability and conversely, when identifying unsuitable locations, seeking opportunities to relocate development and control new development in these locations. <li data-bbox="443 1070 2136 1129">• LPAs should ensure that developments are steered to the lowest areas of flood risk through the application of the sequential and – where relevant – exception tests. <li data-bbox="443 1134 2136 1193">• LPAs should ensure that development will be safe throughout its lifetime; in addition, it should be appropriately flood resistant and resilient without increasing flood risk elsewhere. <li data-bbox="443 1198 2136 1235">• There is an emphasis on sustainable drainage systems particularly for major developments and those within flood risk areas. |

| Organisation | Answer to Question |
|--|--|
| Pickering Town Council | The council has no suggestions for further elements of the Ryedale Plan that should be reviewed at this time. |
| Yorkshire Coast & Ryedale Disability Forum | <p>We have no comments to make on either the distribution of sites for new housing or on the suitability of any of the submitted sites. For elderly and/or disabled people. Due to the pandemic our membership in Ryedale has reduced from what was already a small number of members pre pandemic.</p> <p>Our first concern regards access into, and use of, new and refurbished buildings. You put the responsibility of ensuring access into and throughout developments on the building inspector from the North Yorkshire Building Control Partnership. Two years ago Mr Rob Harper, who is the manager of the Partnership, told us that his officers are not responsible for ensuring access and inclusivity, as it is the responsibility of the developer and his architect. His response and yours sums up the problem that results in some new developments failing miserably to be accessible. The lack of any public body inspecting new developments to check that the building complies with the intent of the Equality Act 2010 allows some developers to exploit this omission. As the Public Sector Equality Duty (section 149 of the Equality Act) puts responsibility on all council officers to reduce discrimination etc etc it is unfortunate that your proposed Local Plan does not require planning applications to demonstrate that access and inclusion inside the building has been considered. Larger developments e.g., over £1 million should ideally have input from a consultant on the National Register of Access Consultants with smaller developments being required to include a comprehensive Design & Access statement, focused inside the development, with the planning application.</p> <p>Your email mentioned that the review is partial and that the council are unlikely to consider any other aspect of your Plan unless "legislative & contextual changes" require you do so. Contacts of mine within the Access Association have confirmed to me that there are no plans to mandate a minimum standard of M4(2) housing for new developments. It has been recommended by numerous organisations including Habinteg, the EHRC and Joseph Rowntree Foundation among others, but it is a political decision to do so which may never happen. Consequently we believe that the answer to your question "are there other areas of the Local Plan you should be looking to review at this time" is the issue of including a % of new developments as both M4(2) and M4(3) housing. We understand that Ryedale DC must provide evidence of the need for such housing, to satisfy the Planning Inspectorate, but we feel that finding such evidence is a challenge that the council must take on now. Once again a failure to do so is surely a failure of the council's Public Sector Equality Duty.</p> <p>I apologise if my references to the PSED appear harsh or demanding but it cannot be acceptable that disabled people have to take legal action against a service provider within a new development to obtain reasonable adjustments to make the building accessible and inclusive for all. Likewise it is unacceptable that many disabled people are living in housing that fails to meet their needs. A requirement within your proposed Plan that all Affordable new housing is built 90% M4(2) and 10% M4(3) would start to address this issue.</p> |