

Appendix A

Summary of responses given to Key Decisions Consultation

Question 1: Do you agree that we should sustain the plan-for figure of 200 homes per year?

Of the 131 respondents who ticked either Yes or No:

41.2% ticked 'Yes'

58.8% ticked 'No'

Reasons in support	Reasons against	Neutral
Lack of houses drives prices up at a time when more affordable homes needed	Figure should be lower to factor-in windfall expectations	Housing figures should be based on local need, not national requirements
Would lead to benefits such as increased council tax receipts, developer contributions and labour resource	National figures are unsuitable for rural area like Ryedale	Adjustments should be made if there is over-delivery
Increased housing numbers will help to sustain local services	There is no clear rationale to go beyond the 186 required by national targets	Development should be in the correct locations with relevant infrastructure and employment opportunities
The figures are consistent with the Strategic Housing Management Assessment 2022	Existing services and infrastructure, including highways, cannot cope with this level of additional development	Smaller-scale development, including in 'Other Villages', should be supported
This would deliver a mix of housing including affordable units	This level of additional development would negatively impact the attractive rural character as well as valued landscapes and ecology	More homes are needed for local people
	This level of additional development would lead to significant impacts on the environment, including air quality	Development should only happen on brownfield sites
	Requirements have already been exceeded in current plan period	Flood risk should be considered
	The numbers would not be stuck to	Every settlement should be subject to a percentage of possible growth
	It shouldn't be necessary to set housing targets when the government is relaxing its own approach	Second homes and holiday homes should be brought back into the housing stock
	The value of existing properties would be impacted	Development should be dispersed and not concentrated in a few places
	The Council should plan for more than 200 houses pa	

Question 2: Do you agree with the principle of Option 2 (a more dispersed, less concentrated approach to spatial distribution)?

Of the 131 respondents who ticked either Yes or No:

38.2% ticked 'Yes'

61.8% ticked 'No'

Reasons in support	Reasons against	Neutral
A dispersed model allows for growth without putting too much concentrated pressure on existing infrastructure	Development should be in market towns because that's where there are the most services, facilities, employment opportunities and public transport	Development in villages should be in keeping with local character
The approach provides greater flexibility	The designation of a service village is not appropriate for Welburn or Terrington	Development in either market towns or villages should have commensurate infrastructure
The approach would allow existing communities and villages the opportunity to be sustained by retaining younger people and families	There are insufficient services in existing service villages and public transport is insufficient/unreliable; would result in more private cars on the road	Every settlement should be subject to a percentage of possible growth
Malton and Norton requires significant infrastructure improvement	Existing services and infrastructure, including highways, would not cope with the level of additional development that would come with service village designation	Small infill development could enhance a community
Malton should not be over-developed	The level of additional development that would come with a service village designation would negatively impact the attractive rural character as well as valued landscapes and ecology	The current distribution policy has failed
Option 2 would provide more opportunities for smaller local builders and operators	The level of additional development that would come with a service village designation would lead to significant impacts on the environment, including air quality	More options should be explored, including a new village
Existing service villages are presently subject to masterplans that are deliverable and developable	Further growth in Malton is required, demonstrated by lack of footfall in town centre	Infrastructure should be delivered before housing and a comprehensive infrastructure plan should be formed
Many service villages and possible service villages are capable of delivering growth	No evidence that Malton is at or close to capacity	Pickering should continue to accommodate the same levels of growth
Malton and Norton are too congested	Villages have fewer brownfield sites, which should be prioritised for development	Malton has the potential to attract high-end retailers but is scruffy and run-down in places
	The policy provides too much support to land-owning estates	We should be guarded against second homes
	There is insufficient evidence to suggest that more people are working from home	
	There has been insufficient consultation with local communities	

Question 3: Do you agree with the approach (to broaden the service village designation, thereby including more service villages)?

Of the 129 respondents who ticked either Yes or No:

20.2% ticked 'Yes'

79.8% ticked 'No'

Reasons in support	Reasons against	Neutral
General support for the criteria	There are insufficient services in existing service villages and public transport is insufficient/unreliable; would result in more private cars on the road	Good broadband and mobile signal are the most important services
Recommend that the hierarchy is transferred into emerging North Yorkshire Local Plan	The designation of a service village is not appropriate for Welburn or Terrington; the latter particularly because it doesn't have a regular bus service	Villages should be grouped around services, particularly schools, to encourage development of other services – e.g. pubs
Many service villages and possible service villages are capable of delivering growth	Existing services and infrastructure, including highways, would not cope with the level of additional development that would come with service village designation	New properties may become second homes/holiday lets
Provides greater flexibility	The level of additional development that would come with a service village designation would negatively impact the attractive rural character as well as valued landscapes and ecology	Major infrastructure would be required to facilitate development in villages
	The level of additional development that would come with a service village designation would lead to significant impacts on the environment, including air quality	Housing should be located where there is more employment opportunities
	Residents will choose not to use village shops or public transport	Matters such as school capacity and bus frequency should be considered
	Online shopping does not provide a sufficient alternative to a local shop	A service village doesn't necessarily require a school providing there is one in a neighbouring village
	There has been insufficient consultation with local communities	
	The policy provides too much support to land-owning estates	
	The criteria is too limited	
	The Council is out of touch with how communities actually operate	
	Significant opposition specifically from residents in Terrington	

Question 4: Do you agree with the approach to cease the Local Needs Occupancy Condition (LNOC)?

Of the 129 respondents who ticked either Yes or No:

47.2% ticked 'Yes'

52.8% ticked 'No'

Reasons in support	Reasons against	Neutral
LNOC inhibits small-scale / ad-hoc / infill development by making it uneconomic	There should be more controls to limit development in villages	Ryedale requires external investment
LNOC restricts housing delivery, including affordable housing, on suitable sites	Removing LNOC will lead to windfall sites becoming occupied by those from outside the area, rather than meeting local need	There is a vital need for affordable housing in areas of high property values
Removing LNOC will provide more certainty, boost supply, give greater flexibility and allow small-scale development based on the merits of each application	It is wrong to allow builders' wishes to take precedence over those of local communities	The eventual approach should encourage villages and towns to embrace their heritage and history
There are better ways to prevent local residents from becoming priced out of the market	Removing the condition incentivises developers to build large, unaffordable homes for wealthy incomers	The policy makes more sense in an area such as the National Park
People are reluctant to purchase properties subject of LNOC because it has a negative effect on values and they become difficult to sell	LNOC is valued by local communities	LNOC should only be removed if it can be guaranteed that windfall properties would be available at reasonable prices to local people
LNOC does not conform to national policy	Removal of LNOC could see more second homes and holiday homes	General support for providing affordable homes for local people
LNOC impacts the sustainability of villages and their services – such as pubs and shops – because they become preserved 'in aspic'	Local people should be given first opportunity of any properties on the market in their locality	
LNOC has left Malton and Norton with far too many houses with minimal infrastructure improvements	Some houses, subject of LNOC, are built and occupied by local people that would otherwise be sold at a higher price and occupied by someone without a local connection	
Other policies can be applied to protect against inappropriate development	It prevents inappropriate and unjustified developments in villages	
It is an outdated practice		

Question 5: Do you agree with the approach to not apply a Primary Residence Condition (PRC)?

Of the 121 respondents who ticked either Yes or No:

34.7% ticked 'Yes'

65.3% ticked 'No'

Reasons in support	Reasons against	Neutral
Could inhibit development and specifically the delivery of affordable housing	Parts of Ryedale are vulnerable to becoming captured by the second home/holiday home market	Disagree with people owning two homes
Second homes collect community investment and boost tax revenues without putting pressure on local services or roads outside of peak times	A PRC should be applied properties in villages where over 10% of houses are already second homes	Should be reviewed in the future
Second homes encourage growth of tourism-related businesses	Deletion of LNOC could cause a free-for-all for second homes/holiday homes	Second homes can negatively impact local communities
Would result in similar issues caused by the LNOC	Just because there is not an issue currently doesn't mean there wouldn't be one in the future	Number of existing second homes should be reduced
Restricting the use of a dwelling could impact the local economy	A PRC would increase availability of housing for local people	There is an existing precedent for the condition in other parts of the country
Would make properties difficult to sell	The proposal aligns more so with the wishes of developers than local communities	Owners of second homes should make additional financial contributions
Would be difficult to monitor/enforce	Second home ownership should be deterred because it negatively impacts local communities	Houses should be permanently occupied
It is not possible or fair to understand or inspect the circumstances of individuals	Villages will become ghost towns with poor social cohesion	It is not appropriate to use Neighbourhood Plans to apply the condition
Such a condition would impact the sustainability and vibrancy of settlements	There are already lots of second homes and they are becoming an increasing problem	Green spaces should be protected
PRC would not solve the problem of enabling delivery of affordable housing	Local services rely on the goodwill and use of local residents; too many second homes could cause closure	

Question 6: Do you agree with principle of the proposed criteria-based policy for small-scale housing developments outside development limits?

Of the 115 who ticked either Yes or No

49.5% ticked 'Yes'

50.4% ticked 'No'

Reasons in support	Reasons against	Neutral
The criteria-based policy will offer greater flexibility for the district to determine an application based upon the merits of each proposal.	Development limits should be maintained.	A criteria-based policy would have to be strictly limited to small scale e.g. no more than 10% increase in the village housing stock.
The policy is working well in Hambleton District	Building outside of existing towns and villages will potentially lose our countryside, dark skies and risk wildlife.	The policy is likely to generate quite substantial amounts of new build growth in villages. Therefore a 'windfall assumption' of 50 houses a year (25% of the 200-dwelling target) should be accounted for.
The approach would be in accordance with national policy which supports development in sustainable locations, and will enable windfall sites to come forward in these locations.	Not needed in Ryedale.	Some preference for the removal of development limits altogether and allow sites to be decided on their individual merits.
In many areas there will be sites that are capable of being developed which will not be of interest to volume builders. It makes sense to have a policy that will support smaller sites particularly if net zero gains can be made in reducing the carbon footprint in construction and life cycle costs (by virtue of less heating required in a more efficient building).	The policy would create development creep, where boundaries of new small-scale development would become new development limits, and would extend by small increments the development limits themselves.	A review of development limits would be preferred.
It seems sensible to consult on the criteria to be used. Support for self-build ideas in principle and ideas that use new technologies for low carbon housing.	Small Scale development would gradually increase over the years until villages become swamped. Worry that developers will salami slice larger sites in order to phase developments across larger sites that would not ordinarily gain permission.	The criteria should also be applied to in-fill development in service villages, within development limits.
Smaller scale development can add value to settlements in providing a wider range of housing mix.	The approach undermines the level of control of development around settlements, supported by communities. Pro developer rather than supporting communities.	The number of points included within the proposed criteria are not necessary, and that the detail is not appropriate as areas such as density, housing mix, heritage protection etc. are covered in other policies.
	Focus should be on bringing empty properties within the settlement limits up to a habitable standard, developing brown field sites within the settlement limits and restricting the number of second / investment properties being developed across Ryedale.	

Question 7: Are there additional criteria that should be considered in the formation of a small-scale housing developments policy?

Of the 106 respondents who ticked either Yes or No:

57.5% ticked 'Yes'

42.5% ticked 'No'

Suggestions for further criteria considerations	
Local concerns and needs should be considered and priorities. Development should be permitted only as long as there are no determinantal impacts on the existing community.	Housing development to meet needs and jobs, not to meet government targets.
Accessibility.	Removal of the section of the criteria which puts requirement that schemes must demonstrate a sequential approach to development with deliverable and developable brownfield sites developed first
Stronger emphasis on sustainability and biodiversity net gain. A clear non-negotiable criteria that all development should be carbon neutral, meaningfully enhance BNG, sustainable et.	The criteria should allow a fuller assessment of the site's relevance to the overall development of the settlement, past, present and future.
The provision of waste disposal.	Criteria should be set that is relevant to the sites that are available at the various settlements and their positioning in respect to the existing boundaries to permit balanced development.
The criteria need to be explored further, and is something that will be decided across North Yorkshire after re-organisation.	Public open space sustaining and enhancing
Assessing against available infrastructure of settlement: Adequate sewage disposal and drainage should be considered and Traffic increases.	Not enough detail on the criteria described in the consultation document to formulate an accurate response.
Bullet point 6 in the list could be strengthened to include a requirement for the design of new build properties to also be in keeping with existing adjacent or surrounding properties to maintain the character of the village/community. This is a general point, but particularly important within the AONBs (current and proposed).	If the village is in an area of outstanding natural beauty or part of a National Park, then housing development should be limited to infill and not extended outside the village boundaries.
AONB and Conservation areas must be respected to preserve heritage and preserving important wildlife. The relationship to form and character of the village should be a priority.	Consideration should be given to the quality of land and its current uses.
Should be sympathetic to the nature of the existing settlements character.	

Question 8: Do you agree with the proposal that bungalows delivered through SP4 should be built to M4(3) wheelchair-user accessible standards?

Of the 118 respondents who ticked either Yes or No:

79.7% ticked 'Yes'

20.3% ticked 'No'

Reasons in support	Reasons against	Neutral
It doesn't harm people who are able bodied but encourages long term occupancy of the building.	Bungalows should be built when needed not to a formula, with wheelchair accesses as required.	Although possible outside the scope of this document it would be sensible to discourage in the planning process the widespread conversion/extension of existing bungalows to form two-storey accommodation.
There is an acknowledged shortage of bungalows.	Market demand should determine what is delivered.	Do not accept affordability as an excuse to not delivery accessible and efficient homes.
This should be a minimum provision bearing in mind an ageing population.	People without disabilities often like to live in a bungalow so why should every bungalow need to be built to M4(3) wheelchair user accessibility standards	
By making these tough choices now we equip more houses for people to live in longer with reduced mobility and it should need to less retrofitting in the future.	Bungalows take up land and are often unsightly in villages and should be in towns where facilities are.	
There is a lack of accessible homes in Ryedale.	Too few bungalows are built it should be 10%	
5% seems reasonable.	I do not see that council should have a policy on the proportion of bungalows in the new housing. It seems overly restrictive.	
	All new build housing should be lifetime homes.	
	Modern technologies nowadays allow for lifts to be installed and accommodated in homes. These lifts can accommodate wheelchairs. Bungalows no longer need to be the only option and the requirements should also apply to other types of housing.	
	there needs to be appropriate evidence and suitable flexibility in the policy to address site specific considerations, including topography and flood risk/drainage. Such site-specific factors is in accordance with national policy and guidance.	

Question 9: Do you agree with the approach to not change Part 1 of Policy SP18?

Of the 110 respondents who ticked either Yes or No:

76.4% ticked 'Yes'

23.6% ticked 'No'

Reasons in support	Reasons against	Neutral
The issues are covered by other legislation and do not need to form part of the plan; no need to duplicate through planning	The energy crisis has given a new impetus and we need as much renewable energy as possible	We should use cars less and recycle wherever possible
Understanding about the challenges of inputting technologies at this time	The Council should go much further than minimum government standards	We need to move towards being carbon neutral and reduce greenhouse gases
General support/broad agreement with the proposal	All new housing should be built with both air/ground source heat pumps, solar panels and insulation to a very high standard	Roofs of properties should be south-north facing to maximise any solar power generation
Acknowledge difficulty in finding suitable sites for on-shore renewable technology schemes	The approach lacks ambition	Fracking should not be allowed to take place
	Review of this part is required to push forward the climate change agenda	Solar panels should not be on greenfield sites
	Prioritisation is being given to the finances of developers over the need to provide sustainable development for the benefit of all	Would like to see more definition of low carbon energy
	The Council should be challenging developers	The situation should be kept under review and the Council should respond proactively to changing circumstances
	The requirement for optional water efficiency standard is not justified nor consistent with national policy in relation to need or viability.	Wind turbines are noisy and impact the environment in other ways
	Would advise moving away from BREEAM as it is outdated	Houses should be designed to be energy efficient
	Planning policies should not overlap with Building Regulations	

Question 10: Do you agree with the proposed changes to Part 2 of SP18?

Of the 110 respondents who ticked either Yes or No:

64.5% ticked 'Yes'

35.5% ticked 'No'

Reasons in support	Reasons against	Neutral
This will help to build sustainably and future-proof buildings	There should be more stringent energy efficient targets and renewable energy standards for builders	Localised energy group generation could be encouraged
Broad agreement with the proposals	It is unrealistic to expect windfall sites to have the ability to accommodate decentralised energy generation, making them unviable	Ryedale should be leading in areas to improve the environment
Support for lower energy needs on new developments	Prioritisation is being given to the finances of developers over the need to provide sustainable development for the benefit of all	The climate emergency should be at the forefront of all development decisions
	The approach lack ambition – other Councils have integrated higher expectations into their Local Plans	Yorkshire Water should repair their infrastructure
	All new housing should be built with both air/ground source heat pumps, solar panels and insulation to a very high standard	Agricultural buildings represent an opportunity for renewable technologies, including rainwater harvesting
	The Council should have more policies geared towards sustainability and developers should be investing more in renewable technologies	The situation should be kept under review and the Council should respond proactively to changing circumstances
	There should be an electricity standard as well as a water standard	
	There should be targets for CO2 emissions	
	This aspect should form part of North Yorkshire Council's Local Plan and not be rushed through without significant consideration	
	The proposals would be harmful to the environment, causing more pollution, congestion and noise, setting unhealthy precedents for future development	
	Insufficient evidence has been provided	
	The additional criteria are overly onerous, particularly with regard to decentralised renewable/low energy generation on allocated sites	
	The Deregulation Act 2015 states that LPAs should not set targets which repeat Building Regulations: applicants should not have to explain, in a planning application, why they are meeting Building Regulations	
	Overly bureaucratic/disproportionate	

Question 11: Section 4 of the consultation document refers to potential and proposed changes to other policies in the Ryedale Plan – Local Plan Strategy (from page 26 in the consultation document)

Do you have any specific views on those proposed changes?

Of the 115 respondents who ticked either Yes or No:

32.2% ticked 'Yes'

67.8% ticked 'No'

Reasons in support	Reasons against	Neutral
Arguments are laid out well in the consultation document and I have nothing to add to it.	Infrastructure improvements have not been effectively enforced in respect of development that has already taken place.	Development in AONB's should be on a very small scale, with particular consideration of the landscape and environment.
Agree with the proposed strengthening of SP11 (community services and Facilities) criteria.	The lack of reliable broadband in rural areas will become an even bigger issue as there is little or no mobile signal in some of these areas.	Should be greater protection for landscapes; possible designation of Yorkshire Wolds as an AONB would be a positive step
The changes to the rules regarding Development Limits for smaller sites will be really significant if the Council goes far enough. By judging sites on their merits there is lots of chance particularly in Service villages and smaller villages of having unobtrusive developments which fit in with the local surroundings and don't burden the local services.	Some comment on the changes being proposed when Ryedale will not have responsibility or accountability for delivering them.	While we need some housing it should be limited in villages - use brownfield sites in larger towns and cities which has the infrastructure to cope.
Support for SP6 and SP11	There appears to be a move to dilute the current plans to become more developer biased, rather than protecting and enhancing the existing communities.	Empty office buildings could have change of use.
		All developments should be subject to Strict Criteria enforcing legislation upon developers to provide Affordable and energy efficient properties.
		Queries as to why proposals are being made now when RDC will cease to exist in April 2023
		VIUAs should be reviewed in context of considering site allocations
		SP14 (biodiversity) should be more robust
		No major changes to small settlements
		Flood Risk and Climate Change impact should be carefully analysed
		LPAs should appropriately forecast and allocate sufficient employment land
		Consideration should be given to Gypsy and Travellers and the locations where they live (eg verges)
		Consideration of long-term impacts of Covid-19