

RYEDALE  
DISTRICT  
COUNCIL



# **The Ryedale Plan**

  

## **Local Plan Sites Document and Policies Map**

### **Consultation Statement**

(Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England)  
Regulations 2012)

**Publication November 2017**

# Contents

Section	Page
1	Introduction
2	Background
3	Consultation Events and Process
	<b>Accommodating Growth and Managing Change in Ryedale Consultation Document (July 2007)</b>
	Availability of the Consultation Document
	Who was Contacted and How
	Results of Consultation
	Key Issues from the 2007 Consultation
	<b>Initial Regulation 25 Consultation (November 2008)</b>
	Who was Contacted, How and the Consultation Time Frame
	Results of the Consultation
	Key Issues from the Regulation 25 Consultation
	<b>Ongoing consultation - Stakeholder Workshops</b>
	<b>Summer Consultation (June 2009)</b>
	Consultation Document
	Who was Contacted, the Availability of Documents and the Consultation Time Frame
	Exhibitions
	Results of the Consultation
	Key Issues Raised at the 2009 Consultation
	<b>The Ryedale Plan - Draft Core Strategy (Summer 2010)</b>
	Who was Contacted, the Availability of Documents and the Consultation Time Frame
	Results of the Consultation
	Key Issues Raised at the 2010 Consultation
	<b>On-Going Consultation on the Sites and Further Site Submissions</b>
	<b>Consultation with Key Partners</b>

### **The Sites Consultation (Autumn 2015)**

Who was contacted, availability and scope of documents and the Consultation Time Frame

Results of the Consultation

Key issues raised in the 2015 Sites Consultation

### **Identification and Review of VIUAs consultation (Autumn 2016)**

Who was contacted, availability and scope of documents and the Consultation Time Frame

Results of the Consultation

Key issues raised

## 4 Technical Evidence and Wider Plans and Strategies Consultations

### **Malton Town Centre Strategy Consultation 2008**

### **Strategic Housing Land Availability Consultation 2009**

### **Special Qualities Study Consultation 2010-11**

### **Malton and Norton Neighbourhood Plan Consultation 2011**

## 5 Site Selection Methodology

### **Site Selection Criteria Consultation 2009**

### **Draft Core Strategy Consultation on Policy SP19 Housing Site Selection Criteria 2010**

### **Site Selection Methodology Consultation 2011**

## 6 Next Steps

This document is also available in other languages, large print and audio format upon request.

本文件也可應要求，製作成其它語文或特大字體版本，也可製作成錄音帶。 (Simplified Chinese)

Dokument ten jest na życzenie udostępniany także w innych wersjach językowych, w dużym druku lub w formie audio. (Polish)

Este documento encontra-se também disponível noutros idiomas, em tipo de imprensa grande e em formato áudio, a pedido. (Portuguese)

本文件也可應要求，製作成其他語文或特大字體版本，也可製作成錄音帶。 (Traditional Chinese)

# 1 Introduction

1.1 The purpose of this document is to set out how Ryedale District Council has complied with requirements to involve the community and consult with interested parties in the preparation of The Ryedale Plan- Local Plan Sites Document and the Policies Map. The requirements to undertake such consultation in accordance with Regulation 18 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The Ryedale Plan- Local Plan Strategy (adopted 2013) and the Helmsley Plan (adopted 2015) are subject to their own Statement of Consultation. This Statement of Consultation only refers to the consultations where site specific matters and policies were considered.

1.2 In accordance with Regulation 18 of the above regulations, this statement sets out:

- The bodies and persons that the Local Planning Authority has invited to make representations under Regulation 18 as part of on-going consultation to inform the preparation and content of the document;
- How those bodies and persons were invited to make representations;
- A summary of the main issues raised as part of this process;
- How they have been addressed in the DPD

The Consultation Statement is accompanied by supporting material and responses regarding the sites, and site issues are provided in an appendix which accompanies this document.

1.3 The Localism Act of 2011 placed a legal duty on those involved directly with Local Plan production. It concerns cross-boundary/matters, which may or may not be strategic. It is important to remember that the duty to cooperate is not a duty to agree. But it is a clear requirement that local planning authorities should make every effort to secure the necessary cooperation on strategic cross boundary matters before they submit their Local Plans for examination. For Ryedale LPA, Officers have undertaken discussions and meetings with adjacent authorities, and the prescribed bodies where meetings would be helpful. Some bodies have provided limited responses. The level of contact has, however, been proportional to the implications for these respective bodies. It is important to note that as the Local Plan Sites Document and Policies Map are site-specific Development Plan Documents, the strategic considerations are limited, but the Local Planning Authority wanted to ensure that all those involved in Plan production had the ability to shape the plan in a manner proportional to their 'sphere of influence' within Ryedale.

1.4 The document is set out in three principal sections, with the various elements of consultation undertaken chronologically displayed:

- Site-Specific Consultation Events and Process
- Technical Evidence and Wider Plans and Strategies
- Site Selection Methodology

This represents both the more generalised consultation events undertaken, some of which have related to both the strategic elements of the Ryedale Plan, and the more site- specific issues. It is important to note this at the outset of this document: There has been overlapping consultation work which has informed the strategic approach of the Plan, whilst giving local context, and providing evidence about the ability of the Local Plan Strategy to deliver its

Objectives. In particular, it is through simultaneous consultation on both strategic and site-specific elements and the findings of that consultation, that the Local Plan Strategy did not take forward Strategic Sites within this Plan Period.

- 1.5 The Local Plan Sites Document is subject to Sustainability Appraisal which incorporates Strategic Environmental Assessment, which is consulted upon at the same time as the planning policy document. The Plan is also subject to Habitats Regulations, which is split into the two stages of Screening and Appropriate Assessment. These have their own consultation process, which includes formal consultation with the national bodies: Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency. Consultation was also undertaken with other interested organisations of a local nature.

## 2 Background

- 2.1 The Ryedale Plan - Local Plan Sites Document has had a long period in the early production stages. This was because the production of the strategic planning approach for the District, known as the Local Plan Strategy document (formerly Core Strategy), had a long and complicated period of production, which formally began in 2004. At this time the Council, given the limited life-span of the existing 2002 Ryedale Local Plan, and the production of new planning policy, publicised for sites to be submitted for consideration, and this 'call for sites' has been undertaken with all stages of consultation, in particular since 2009 when publicity of the sites attracted a third more sites than had been previously submitted. At no point in the any of the 'calls for sites' have the Local Planning Authority declined any site, so as to ensure that the best range of sites are available for consideration. Indeed a site was submitted in September 2017, but this site although recorded as site 667, is not appraised.
- 2.2 Prior to 2007, the Local Development Scheme referred to the production of a series of land use-specific Development Plan Documents (DPDs). After a Core Strategy was found unsound in 2007, the Local Development Framework for Ryedale was refined to three key policy documents: Core Strategy (now known as the Local Plan Strategy) Facilitating Development DPD and the Helmsley DPD. In 2011 as a result of the Localism Act, the Facilitating Development DPD was renamed as the Local Plan Sites document and the Helmsley DPD became the Helmsley Plan, to reflect new government terminology on planning policy documents. The purpose of the Local Plan Sites Document is to provide allocations for residential development, business/industrial development, which are accompanied by policies which are concerned with development principles and site-specific policies such as those around the Town Centre Commercial Limits, and the designation of particular areas so identified for their open an undeveloped qualities which contribute to settlement form and character.
- 2.3 In summary, the stages undertaken to date for the Local Plan Sites Document include:

<b>Facilitating Development DPD</b>	
From 2004 onwards	Initial Call for sites and on-going discussions with Statutory Consultees, and Developers
July 2007 (July – August)	Accommodating Growth and Managing Change in Ryedale (Appendix 1 and 2)

November 2008 (November – January 2009)	Initial Regulation 25 Consultation on the Core Strategy (Local Plan Strategy)
November 2008 – August 2009	Stakeholder workshops
Summer 2009 (June-July)	Strategic Issues and Sites Consultation Regulation 25 Consultation on the Facilitating Development and Helmsley DPDs Further 'call for sites'
Summer 2010 - September 2013	Draft Core Strategy (Summer 2010) Publication Local Plan Strategy (January 2012) Consultation on the NPPF and LPS implications (February 2012) Submission of Local Plan Strategy (May 2012) Examination of Local Plan Strategy (September, October 2012 and May 2013) Adoption of the Local Plan Strategy (September 2013)
<b>Local Plan Sites Document</b>	
2010-2011	Consultation on Special Qualities Study
September –October 2011	Consultation on the Site Selection Methodology
Parish and Town Council briefings 2014	Informal member briefings to show the site assessment process to date
Member Briefings Spring 2015	Informal member briefings to show the site assessment process to date
Sites Consultation November December 2015	Member Approval to consult sought and obtained in Spring 2015: Consultation on the Discounted Sites Consultation on the sites taken through the Site Selection Methodology resulting in: Preferred sites (Service Villages)
VIUA Consultation October November 2016	Member Approval to consult sought and obtained in September 2016. Consulted on review of existing VIUAs Identification of new VIUAs and expanded existing VIUAs
	On-going sites consultation

2.4 A separate Appendix is available to accompany this Consultation Statement. It sets out information which at the date of publication is not available by hyperlink on the Council's website, and provides a summary of the comments raised through the various consultations undertaken as part of the preparation of the District's Plan.

### 3 Site-Specific Consultation Events and Process

#### Accommodating Growth and Managing Change in Ryedale Consultation Document (July 2007)

##### Availability of the Consultation Document

- 3.1 Consultation on the Accommodating Growth and Managing Change in Ryedale document was undertaken from 11 July to 22 August 2007.

[http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/167/HD6\\_July\\_2007\\_Accommodating\\_Growth\\_and\\_Managing\\_Change\\_in\\_Ryedale.pdf](http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/167/HD6_July_2007_Accommodating_Growth_and_Managing_Change_in_Ryedale.pdf)

This document was compiled to primarily address the key concerns raised by the Inspector at the initial Core Strategy Examination, notably the lack of detail over the distribution of new housing development.

- 3.2 The consultation document was available to view electronically on the Council's website, as well as being available in paper format at Ryedale House, Malton, the libraries in Ryedale including the mobile libraries, the Pickering Customer Contact Centre and the Kirkbymoorside and Helmsley Area Offices.

##### Who was Contacted and How

- 3.3 The consultation undertaken consisted of contacting all those involved in and informed of the initial Core Strategy as follows:

- Letter and a paper copy of the consultation document to the statutory consultees.
- Letter informing all other consultees of the availability of the consultation document - including an electronic link to the Council's website
- Press release - Ryedale News September 2007

##### Results of Consultation

- 3.4 The consultation generated a good response, with 68 people/organisations submitting comments (Appendix 4 – List of Respondents and Appendix 5 – Summary of Comments Received). The comments were reported to Members at the Policy and Resources Committee on 6 December 2007. It can be viewed at:

[http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/Data/Policy%20and%20Resources%20Committee/20071206/Agenda/Ryedale\\_LDF\\_Core\\_Strategy\\_Consultation\\_061207.pdf](http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/Data/Policy%20and%20Resources%20Committee/20071206/Agenda/Ryedale_LDF_Core_Strategy_Consultation_061207.pdf)

Minute 343.

<http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/CeListDocuments.aspx?MID=267&RD=Minutes&DF=06%2f12%2f2007&A=0&R=0>

- 3.5 Annex 1 of the Committee report summarised all of the comments received. The comments received at this stage were purely noted by Members, because as a result of the uncertainty surrounding the way in which the Core Strategy was to progress under the emerging new procedures, it was clear that further consultation would be required. The consultation responses were used (together with the Regulation 25 Responses to



Consultation) to help frame the comprehensive consultation document in the summer of 2009.

### Key Issues from the 2007 Consultation

3.6 Further information is provided in the appendices to this document, and is available at:

[http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/167/HD7\\_July\\_2007\\_Summary\\_of\\_comments\\_received.pdf](http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/167/HD7_July_2007_Summary_of_comments_received.pdf)

In summary the following general findings were:

#### *Location and distribution of new development*

- general support for the settlement hierarchy to focus the majority of development in the Market Towns and for the position/classification of the Market Towns
- concerns over the extent to which development should take place in the villages and the way in which service villages are defined
- the majority of respondents agree that Malton and Norton should be the focus for new development, although there are differing views of the way in which this should be distributed
- the precise proportion of development should be informed infrastructure capacity and character of all settlements

#### *Potential Growth Locations/Strategic Sites*

- Support for certain areas to be developed as strategic sites by those promoting specific sites, subject to infrastructure improvements.

## Ongoing consultation - Stakeholder Workshops 2008-2010

3.7 In addition to the identified consultation stages, in line with the front-loading of public participation, there has been ongoing consultation with key stakeholders and infrastructure providers. Various workshops have been undertaken to help assist stakeholders with their understanding of the LDF process and opportunities to comment. Since 2007 the following table provides brief details of these events:

<b>Date of Workshop</b>	<b>Who involved?</b>	<b>Topics covered</b>
26 November 2008	Pickering Town Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Context and background</li> <li>• Progress</li> <li>• Identify broad options for growth</li> </ul>
1 December 2008	Malton Town Council Norton Town Council Kirkbymoorside Town Council Helmsley Town Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Context and background</li> <li>• Progress</li> <li>• Identify broad options for growth</li> </ul>
29 January 2009	Key Stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Context and background</li> <li>• Progress</li> <li>• Identify broad options for growth</li> </ul>
7 April 2009	Rural Parishes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roles of villages in the new plan</li> <li>• Ways the plan can address your needs</li> <li>• Relationship between villages and towns</li> </ul>

Date of Workshop	Who involved?	Topics covered
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Context and background</li> <li>• Progress</li> <li>• Forthcoming consultation – June/July</li> </ul>
12 August 2009	Local Estates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Location/distribution of development</li> <li>• Relationship between villages and towns</li> <li>• Rural housing/affordable housing</li> <li>• Settlement Hierarchy – one of the most topical issues for the strategy and for you as landowners.</li> <li>• Previous decisions/ potential changes</li> </ul>
24 September 2010	LSP Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Context and background</li> <li>• Progress</li> <li>• Role of LSP</li> </ul>

## Summer Consultation and Regulation 25 Consultation for the Facilitating Development and Helmsley DPDs (June 2009)

- 3.8 This consultation exercise was the largest single consultation exercise that Ryedale District Council had undertaken and was the first time that stakeholders were made fully aware of the implications of the strategic policy choices as well as the sites that had been submitted. It was considered important to help the Town and Parish Councils, and local communities gain a sense of what implications of the strategic approach might mean for their towns and villages by showing what sites had been submitted. It was also the starting point for utility providers and statutory consultees to examine the sites submitted. Consultation involved the publication of a consultation document and a series of exhibitions across Ryedale. At the exhibitions, and on the Council's web site, all the sites submitted to the Council (so far) were displayed (totalling over 400 sites). Appendix 4 contains the letter which set out the (then) Regulation 25 formal consultation stage for then known as Facilitating Development DPD and Helmsley Document.

### Consultation Document

- 3.9 In the summer of 2009, following the earlier consultations, the Regulation 25 Consultation letter (for the Core Strategy) and the various stakeholder workshops, the Council prepared a consultation document for taking the Core Strategy forward and how the Core Strategy will provide the strategic context for later work on the Sites document. In combination with a comprehensive number of exhibitions throughout the District, this consultation document sought views on many topic areas including the Spatial Strategy, Housing, Employment, Retail, Sustainable Energy, Landscape Character and Community Facilities. In many cases a number of options were proposed. The summer 2009 Consultation Document is available at:
- [http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/167/HD10\\_Consultation\\_Document\\_2009.pdf](http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/167/HD10_Consultation_Document_2009.pdf)
- 3.10 The Council also took the opportunity at this time to consult on all of the sites that had been put forward to date (454) for consideration through the LDF process. Whilst the consultation document made it clear that site-specific decisions will not be made until later on in the

process, this consultation did provide the opportunity for members of the public to 'visualise' the implications of the strategic distribution options in terms of potential development sites. The sites were displayed on maps showing all the sites submitted to each parish. Individual maps were also prepared which showed basic information about the site, and what uses the land had been submitted for. Whilst highlighting the individual site, it also showed any adjacent sites submitted. Appendices 5 and 6 show examples of the Parish and Individual Site Maps.

- 3.11 The consultation document also described the proposed approach to Development Limits. The Council's approach was to continue with Development Limits as set out in the 2002 Local Plan, within the new adopted Proposals/Policies Map which would accompany the Facilitating Development DPD/ Helmsley Document. The extent of the Development Limits would remain unchanged unless they were re-drawn to accommodate planned development.
- 3.12 The consultation document asked the community of Ryedale to highlight any areas of sensitivity and community importance. We asked:
- What buildings, spaces and views are important?
  - Are there any areas that should be included within the Conservation Areas of the towns? Should any areas be included?
  - What types of green spaces are important to you?
- 3.13 The consultation also asked about Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs). VIUAs are identified in the current Local Plan and are largely undeveloped areas in and around settlements, which contribute to the form and character of the settlement. The consultant document highlighted the need to balance the continued protection of some areas with a need to accommodate new development. As some of the sites submitted are designated as VIUAs, the consultation document listed those sites, and asked whether other areas should be included as VIUAs, or conversely whether any VIUAs should no longer identified.
- 3.14 The consultation document also included a section on how should the Council consider the sites submitted. The process was described as a 'Site Selection Criteria'. The consultation document also described the status of the sites submitted so far, and reason for applying a consistent methodology to site assessment, and talked about the relationship between the site selection criteria and the Sustainability Appraisal of the Facilitating Development DPD (as was then known). This is discussed further in section 5 of this document.

### **Who Was Contacted, the Availability of Documents and the Consultation Time Frame**

- 3.15 The consultation ran from 15 June to 7 August 2009. Over 900 individuals and organisations including the statutory consultees were contacted by letter informing them of the availability of the summer 2009 consultation document and the locations and times of the exhibitions. The Statutory Consultees were forwarded copies of the document and a CD of the document, the site plans and comment forms. All information was available to view electronically on the Council's website, as well as being available in paper format at Ryedale House, Malton, and the libraries in Ryedale including the mobile libraries, the Pickering Customer Contact Centre and the Kirkbymoorside and Helmsley Area Offices. Copies of the document both paper and electronic (saved to a CD) were available to be purchased at a reasonable copying charge from Ryedale House, Malton.

- 3.16 In addition to the copy of the consultation document and the CD of information, as listed above, leaflets and a plan of the sites submitted for each particular Parish / Town Council area (see website: <http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/local-plan-sites>) were distributed to the Parish and Town Councils for display in their Notice Boards and for circulation. In addition, Forward Planning Officers also placed on Notice Boards (where open and available) the leaflets and a plan of the sites submitted for that particular settlement. This was repeated as necessary throughout the consultation period if the information had been removed.
- 3.17 In addition, the leaflet and individual site location plans were placed on lamp posts etc. near to the sites submitted inviting residents to come to the exhibitions. This was to allow those living near to a potential development site to be informed of the potential for development and to be involved in the planning process from the start. Flyers were left for up to a week before an exhibition and were removed immediately after each exhibition.
- 3.18 In addition, there was a press release issued and an article was placed in the Ryedale News Issue 21 Summer 2009. The link to this is broken but appendix 7 shows the flyer for the exhibitions which are discussed below:

## **Exhibitions**

- 3.19 The series of exhibitions that were undertaken throughout the consultation period were primarily aimed at the general public and were designed to provide those interested in the LDF with more than one opportunity to visit an exhibition in their general location. The boards presented at each of the exhibitions had a primary focus on that particular town or village with neighbouring settlement's information also presented on the boards. However, all boards were available on the Council's website throughout the consultation period and officers present were available to provide additional / more specific information for all settlements if requested.
- 3.20 The questions displayed at the exhibitions asked those present to consider their views on:
- Important issues such as housing and employment;
  - How best to grow Ryedale's towns;
  - The type of development that is suitable for the villages and the rural area; and
  - The numerous sites that landowners and developers have asked the Council to consider for new development.
- 3.21 In an attempt to gauge the strength of support for each of the settlement hierarchy options posed, there was an interactive board where those present could place a sticky dot against the settlement hierarchy option they would support. The results of this are presented in the **appendix 8**.
- 3.22 Due to the success of the exhibitions it was decided to attend Ryedale Show and present the information displayed at the exhibitions and to be available for those at the show to answer any further queries.

## Results of the Consultation

3.23 A total of 2,500 people (equating to nearly 5% of Ryedale's total population) attended the 19 exhibitions throughout June and July 2009. Although it was initially thought that there were approximately 1000 responses received, as reported to Council, the actual number of responses is nearer to 7300, of which approximately 3600 comments related directly to one or more sites. The reason for the discrepancy is due to an unrealistic estimation of the number of responses. This unprecedented level of interest in the Development Plan was welcomed, and has ensured the Plan has been shaped by substantial, initial stakeholder involvement.

3.24 The comments received and the key issues arising were reported to the Council at the following extraordinary meeting of the Council 29 October 2009:

<http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/documents/g433/Public%20reports%20pack%2029th-Oct-2009%2018.30%20Council.pdf?T=10>

Full List of Comments Received:

<http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/documents/s971/Summer%202009%20Consultation%20Comments.pdf>

Minutes: <http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=114&MId=433&Ver=4>

3.25 The consultation comments informed the preferred options for the strategy and direction of the Plan. The various decisions on the direction for each of the various topics of the Ryedale Plan were determined at the following meetings of the Full Council:

- 15 December 2009

<http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/documents/g457/Public%20reports%20pack%2015th-Dec-2009%2018.30%20Council.pdf?T=10>

Minutes: <http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/documents/g457/Printed%20minutes%2015th-Dec-2009%2018.30%20Council.pdf?T=1>

- 9 February 2010

<http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/documents/g556/Public%20reports%20pack%2009th-Feb-2010%2018.30%20Council.pdf?T=10>

Minutes: <http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=556&T=1>

- 20 May 2010 (postponed to 1 June 2010)

<http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=3711>

<http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=3719>

Minutes: <http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=149&T=1>

<http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=684&T=1>

## Key Issues Raised at the 2009 Consultation

- 3.26 The Consultation Statement prepared for the Local Plan Strategy sets out a summary of the 'key issues' raised by the consultation in 2009, together with some of the main changes to the strategy directions that have been made in relation to representations expressing concerns in relation to a draft plan. Below, is a brief examination of key findings from the consultation concerning the site-specific issues.
- 3.27 The response to the proposed approach to Development Limits was generally supportive of their retention in principle. Some respondents were supportive of amendments, depending on their position regarding specific sites; this was both for the expansion and contraction of such limits. The Council agreed that approach to retain the existing Development Limits was appropriate, subject to being able to refine the extent in due course subject to any allocations being made in the Local Plan Sites Document.
- 3.28 The consultation document asked the community of Ryedale to highlight any areas of sensitivity and community importance regarding buildings, spaces and views. The heritage aspects were raised, in particular market places, historic street patterns, distinctive local building materials, community buildings. This is considered in greater detail regarding the Special Qualities Study which is considered in the ninth section of this document, and the consultation on VIUAs undertaken in 2016.
- 3.29 The responses to Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs) were generally supportive of their retention in principle, although there was acknowledgement that further evidence is available to assess the contribution of such sites to the character of settlements, and this should be used. Some respondents were supportive of amendments, depending on their position regarding specific sites; this was both for the inclusion and deletion of such a designation. In terms of land that was considered suitable for VIUA status, land around villages, particularly around villages close together to avoid coalescence, allotments, river corridors, recreation areas, areas around Castle Howard were explicitly referenced.
- 3.30 There were a very substantial number of responses around the acceptability and suitability (or lack thereof) for the sites submitted. The responses provide information about the site's situation, any locally-known constraints. Unsurprisingly, often the proposer of the site has made representations supporting the development of the site. A brief summary of the findings are displayed by Settlement (within the Settlement Hierarchy) with a list of those who made comments, in the appendix 11.
- 3.31 To agree the consultation document for the Core Strategy (2010) together with the Full Council Responses to the consultation of Summer 2009, the draft document and the responses were presented to the following Council Meeting. The responses to the 2009 consultation regarding the Site Selection Criteria were also presented:

- Extraordinary Meeting of Full Council 29 July 2010

<http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=618&T=10>

<http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=114&MId=618&Ver=4>

- The Responses to the 2009 consultation and the Council's Response

<http://extranet.ryedale.gov.uk/pdf/Summer%202009%20Consultation%20Comments%20and%20the%20Council's%20Response.pdf>

Minutes: <http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=618&T=1>

The Ryedale Plan- Draft Core Strategy (Summer 2010) and

The Ryedale Plan - Local Plan Strategy (Publication and Submission) 2012

Adopted 2013

- 3.32 The full details of the consultation undertaken on the Core Strategy/Local Plan Strategy is set out in the relevant Consultation Statement produced for the Submission. A list of those consulted is set out in appendix 10.

[http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/140/Consultation\\_Statement\\_Jan\\_2012\\_Report\\_and\\_appendices.pdf](http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/140/Consultation_Statement_Jan_2012_Report_and_appendices.pdf)

[http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/152/SD6a\\_Local\\_plan\\_strategy\\_addendum\\_to\\_Statement\\_of\\_Consultation\\_May\\_2012.pdf](http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/152/SD6a_Local_plan_strategy_addendum_to_Statement_of_Consultation_May_2012.pdf)

Key elements which were established in the Local Plan Strategy which are of particular relevance to the site assessment process, and the resulting Local Plan Sites Document are:

- The spatial approach, and the explicit position on only allocating sites within the Market Towns and Service Villages;
- The identification of Quantums of Development for the tiers in the hierarchy, with recognition of factoring in permissions granted within the Plan period;
- The absence of Strategic Sites within the Plan;
- The retention of, and principles of policy approach to, Visually Important Undeveloped Areas, but to review them as part of the production of the Local Plan Sites Document;
- The decision to not include a site assessment policy in the Local Plan Strategy;
- Development Limits would be retained as drawn in 2002, unless there were any factual inaccuracies. Where allocations are to be made, there would be, by default, an extension of the Limits.

As such in the 2015 Sites Consultation, these matters were set out to ensure that those making representations were clear that these matters were not being treated as being capable of being reconsidered. Representations were still received which objected to this approach.

## On-Going Consultation on the Sites and Further Site Submissions

3.33 Since the 2009 consultation, the Council has kept on the website, and updated accordingly, all the sites submitted. The website invites views on these sites. By 2009 there were over 400 sites; by February 2013 over 630 sites have been submitted, and by Publication 666 sites have been submitted (with a further, very late submission). From the outset of the Plan process, the Council has made it clear that it will not need all of the sites that have been put forward by landowners. Only a small proportion of these will actually be needed, but it enables the Council to make informed, selective choices about where development needed as part of the Plan-making process, ensuring the 'best sites' come forward. The sites are displayed by settlement and then number, and can also be viewed on Parish plans to see where the sites have come forward on a Parish-wide scale. The link is below:

<http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/local-plan-sites>

3.34 The Council invited further comments to be made at any time; this was done because sites could still be submitted at any time up until the end of February 2013 and they would be considered through the Council's strategic modelling work. However, after this time, whilst the Local Planning Authority has not declined to accept site submissions, it has accepted them on the basis that the site submitter will need to provide significant levels of information to present to the LPA the case for their site. Post -Publication this will be then considered through the Examination of the Plan. The Council also sent out notifications to Parish and Town Councils of any new sites that had been submitted within their respective parishes.

3.35 A range of delivery partners have been involved in the plan process in an on-going way from the outset of the Plan process. Increased and more detailed involvement has taken place since 2013, particularly with site submitters, reflecting the evolution of the scope and content of Plans over time with increased emphasis on infrastructure requirements and delivery mechanisms, to ensure that the Local Planning Authority is reassured that the sites are deliverable as well as developable. Consultation and engagement with a range of delivery partners has helped to shape the Plan and inform a number of policy choices. This has taken place through direct meetings and/ or as written consultation responses.

### **North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC)**

3.36 North Yorkshire County Council is a key service provider and partner in the plan process. The County-wide Community Strategy provides a context for the vision and objectives of the Plan. The organisation has been consulted on strategic issues from the outset of the Plan process and regular meetings and detailed discussion have taken place with specific services at the County. The plan is also informed by technical evidence which has been provided by NYCC or which has been prepared in conjunction with the organisation (for example, the Strategic Transport Assessment for Malton and Norton). They have also supported the delivery of evidence documents, such as the Special Qualities Study which are concerned around landscape character and sensitivity.



3.37 Corporately, with the production of the Local Plan Strategy, NYCC have supported the strategic approach and direction of the Plan and have confirmed that this is consistent with local priorities and objectives including those of NYCC. Specific service areas have helped to identify the infrastructure requirements needed to support planned levels of growth and to confirm CIL will need to be secured for this purpose.

#### Highways

3.38 NYCC Highways have been very closely involved in elements of the Plan which have implications for transport and movement. Strategically, the service area has helped to identify the infrastructure requirements needed to support the planned growth of settlements and is linked to Local Transport Priorities (LTP3) and cross boundary work (notably the on-going work to identify potential improvements to the A64). Over 2013-2014 and intermittently thereafter site assessment for access, safety, parking and general movements of traffic. Some sites have produced a Transport Assessment, particularly where they are larger sites, but it is a challenge for site submitters when they are not aware of the impact of other sites which are then identified as development sites. The Local Planning Authority employed the consultants Jacobs to undertake a modelling exercise to test different development scenarios in Malton and Norton and Pickering using both committed development (i.e. with permission) and site option choices. This work was not to establish the individual contribution of each site to the road network, but was to test combinations of sites to establish pressure on the network where it has not existed before. County Highways have been integrally involved in the transport modelling work undertaken to inform decisions on the level and distribution of development for Malton and Norton, and Pickering and to identify the junction improvements necessary to support growth and address air quality issues.

#### Education

3.39 The distribution of housing has clear implications for this service. Over time, County Education has confirmed that the distribution strategy in the Ryedale Plan is consistent with their service delivery and the Schools Organisation Plan. The implications of planned levels of growth at the various settlements have been discussed and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan reflects the requirements which arise. Discussions continue with respect to the impact of new housing delivery and contributions required as a result of this. Officers have borne in mind the need for sites to provide land for the delivery of new schools, and has sought confirmation from County Education as to the most suitable strategy ensuring that new development is supported by school places (secondary) and land for Schools (primary). The County Council in a meeting of 26 July 2017 advised that much will depend on the location of the largest sites at Malton/Norton and these will influence where the primary school provision will need to be met. For Pickering, the position has changed since earlier discussions; the need for a new primary school with the planning growth of the town is no longer identified. Three site submissions, each at Malton, Norton and Pickering all identify land for a primary school.

#### Adult and Community Services

3.40 On-going consultation with this service area has helped to shape detailed policy standards/ requirements in the plan which are aimed at supporting the reconfiguration of this service area in the longer term. The Plan also makes policy provision to help secure the extra care bed spaces that NYCC require on the basis of their needs assessment. Since the adoption of the

Local Plan Strategy, Extra Care provision is being delivered in Norton, with Helmsley and Pickering in Planning. Whilst the Local Plan Strategy does not outline the provision, NYCC are happy that there is a sufficient policy framework to consider such sites in the future.

#### Heritage Services

- 3.41 Between May and September 2014 site specific heritage advice was provided by the NYCC Heritage Unit. A GIS layer of all the sites was provided to the team, who then researched the Heritage Environment Record for information which may identify particular archaeological sensitivities on sites, and give an indication as to the likelihood for significant archaeology. They also provided information as to whether geophysical surveying or trial trenching will be required as part of the site's consideration for allocation, or be required as part of the planning approval. On specific sites, archaeological evaluation was undertaken, in particular site 430, to ascertain the implications for a Scheduled Barrow Site which was in proximity to ascertain whether the linear features were a part of the Barrow Site, and the findings were analysed by the heritage unit. Further analysis was undertaken for site 387/205 in Pickering.

#### Environment Agency

- 3.42 The Environment Agency has been consulted and involved in the plan process at a series of stages within the Plan-making process. The organisation has helped to influence strategic choices through its involvement in the Sustainability Appraisal process and as part of its contribution to technical evidence, such as the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Following its response to the 2010 consultation document, the points of detail raised by the Agency led to more specific references to the approach to flooding and to the inclusion of a detailed Managing Resources Policy, in particular around air, soil and water pollution. A GIS layer of all the sites was provided to the team, who then assessed those sites against their constraints. In their continued support on the formation of the Local Plan Sites Document they have provided specific advice at meetings on 22 September 2014, 30 March 2016 and 23 September 2016 in respect of:

- Flood risk and the operation of the sequential test on sites in Kirkbymoorside, Pickering and Norton; and
- The assessment of sites with Ground Source Protection Zones and whether development would be acceptable in principle, and when a Hydrogeological Risk Assessment HRA would need to be submitted (which has been identified as being the planning application stage for the proposed sites).

The Environment Agency responded in detail to the Sites Consultation and was on the whole satisfied with the proposed sites, and any the identification of sensitivities: key matters were:

- That the site 622 in Kirkbymoorside be discounted due to the high flood risk of the site, and the ability to sequentially consider other land; this was taken on board in the Publication of the Local Plan Sites Document;

- The clarification in the Site Selection Methodology of the assessment framework for considering sites in Ground Source Protection Zone; to make the impact more clear, this was undertaken by Officers
- The identification of two option sites (sites 116 and 347 in Pickering) which would have hydrogeological sensitivities which would require the production of Hydrogeological Risk Assessments for the consideration of any planning application. The site were proposed for residential development, which in the view of the Environment Agency, did not raise an outright objection in principle, and so could be considered post allocation, were the sites to be allocated.
- That site 200, in Pickering would need to exclude that area of the site within Flood Zone 2/3, and that revisions to the extent of site 649(88) would also need to exclude any area of Flood Zone 3, except for the road, but that in doing so drainage would be required to ensure no increased risk of flooding elsewhere.

### **Highways England (formerly Highways Agency)**

- 3.43 The Council has consulted and liaised with Highways England (HE) over the course of producing the Ryedale Plan, as a whole, as the A64 is a national trunk road linking West Yorkshire and the A1 to the Coast at Scarborough via York, Malton and Norton. This has included both formal consultation and individual meetings. HE made a number of comments to the Summer 2010 consultation, in addition to a number of general comments, the key comments related to the operation of the Brambling Fields junction following the proposed upgrade and whether this could accommodate the proposed future traffic; whether infrastructure improvements had been factored in due to the location of development at service villages; clarification on how developer contributions will be handled for strategic highway improvements; and travel planning measures have been taken into account. The HE were also supportive of the Plan approach and evidence base which underpinned it at the Publication of the Local Plan Strategy, and attended the Examination in Public of the Local Plan Strategy. As such, in the production of the Local Plan Sites Document is informed by the settlement hierarchy, the quantum of development attributed to each settlement.
- 3.44 An informal meeting was held on 29 July 2014, in which Highways England were able to discuss the implications of the Service Village sites as they were progressing through the site assessment. Sites which had issues were identified, and Highways England had no concerns in principle with the indicated preferred sites, as they were all of a modest size, and served by a signalised junction onto the A64. Of the sites which were still potentially for consideration, where sites were not served by such a junction safety assessments may be required, and no new access points were supported onto the A64. Existing ones could be improved.
- 3.45 The Sites Consultation response from Highways England, is focussed around the safe and efficient operation of the A64:
- Concerning Malton and Norton the Local Plan modelling work was not completed, and so they were unable to provide detailed comments on the sites within Malton and Norton upon the SRN. Their initial review of sites indicates that Sites 218 and 249 are likely to impact on the existing Musley Bank junction on the A64. No improvements are

proposed at this junction which is currently only a partial movement junction with access to and from the south, but no northbound access.

- They supported the safety concerns identified in relation to site 248 (Malton) given its proximity to the A64 at Musley Bank. Highways England advised that in relation to the potential improvement at Musley Bank, although there is an aspiration locally to upgrade the junction, there is currently no scheme identified or proposal at this location.
- They concluded that further technical work is required to establish the predicted traffic impact of the preferred development sites on the A64 junctions at Malton and Norton, and they would appreciate discussions on this.
- We consider that the sites identified in the Service Villages are unlikely to have a significant impact on the SRN due to their size and location. They do not raise any access or safety issues for us at this stage. However, as with all sites that would have an impact on the SRN, when these sites are brought forward for development appropriate transport assessments and travel plans would be required.

3.46 A further informal meeting was held with Highways England on 4 July 2017. At this meeting the proposed sites were considered. Regarding the sites outside of Malton and Norton Highways England advised that due to the dispersed nature the resulting increase in journeys on the SRN would be attributable to background traffic. For small sites in the Service Villages, providing that the access width can be suitably increased, small sites would not raise concerns, providing they do not lead a concentration of new access points, with a significant cumulative increase in traffic. In respect of Malton and Norton they acknowledged that the increased use of Brambling Fields was to be expected, and was a key piece of infrastructure delivered to ensure that planned growth at Malton and Norton could be supported. They acknowledged the benefits of sites which would utilise the junction because this would ensure that capacity within the internal (non SRN) junctions is not compromised further and would help with air quality implications. They confirmed that in respect of the potential broad location at Eden Camp, Highways England would not object to the identification of a broad location, on the basis of the following matters:

- The setting back of the roundabout which serves the agribusiness park from the interchange, which will assist visibility.
- The Old Malton Interchange is fully grade separated, and avoids the need to travel through the Town Centre giving access both east-bound and west-bound
- A Transport Assessment and safety audit would be required to establish the scale and nature of impact on the SRN, and what, if any, mitigation measures are required on the Old Malton interchange to ensure safety. Such measures would be expected to be met by the Developer. This is a matter which can be only be established, once detailed information about the uses and extent of the site is identified.

### **Historic England (formerly English Heritage)**

3.46 Historic England have provided detailed advice over the course of the development of the Ryedale Plan. They have produced technical studies which inform landscape appraisal, such

as the Statement of Significance of the Vale of Pickering, and they have assisted in providing information about the relative significance of heritage assets within Ryedale, and the methodology of in-house studies. In the 2009 consultation when the sites and broad locations for development were consulted upon, English Heritage provided individual responses on the broad locations in terms of their potential impact on the significance of heritage assets and the capacity and sensitivity of the settlements to accommodate development. They were supportive in principle of the Local Plan Strategy's approach to the management of the historic environment. As part of the Sites Consultation, Historic England responded to all the sites which received either a group 3 or 4 status, and of the Site Selection Process to date:

- Whilst being broadly supportive of the approach, they sought clarification on a small number of sites in respect of how the loss of the undeveloped site would impact on the setting and significance of particular heritage assets. In response the Council has focused on the sites which it has identified that should be taken forward, and assessed the setting and significance of heritage assets, and identified key mitigation.
- They sought further confirmation on the treatment of archaeological heritage assets, such as those in the Vale of Pickering.
- They sought clarification as to how sites with identified Strip Field Systems has been identified as potential development sites, and what the rationale/ decision making process has been in deriving which sites. At meeting on 21 January 2016, Officers discussed the rationale, and explained that the Local Plan Sites Document would in due course:
  - Identify significant areas of Strip Field Systems as a VIUA;
  - Where development is necessary to occur on an identified strip field system it is on the basis that: it is necessary to be there in considering the suitability of the site for development and wider development considerations; and that the Strip Field System is one which has, in the passage of time, become degraded and is not visually prominent and therefore contributes to settlement setting and character.
  - Officers were working on the Background Papers which accompany each settlement, and which set out in a settlement-specific manner the site and settlement-wide considerations which have been taken on board to ensure that the most suitable sites come forward for development to meet identified requirements in the Local Plan Strategy

### **Developers, Landowners and their Agents**

- 3.47 The development industry with an interest in Ryedale has been both generally consulted as part of the formal and non-formal consultations at set out above, and consulted on the scope and methodology of specific technical documents; including the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, Strategic Housing Market Assessment, development viability assessments and the Employment Land Review. Developers and their Agents were asked to comment on Sites Selection Methodology, and their comments informed the development of the Methodology.
- 3.48 In 2004, 2008, 2009 and 2010 specific 'Call for Sites' were made either individually, or as part of other, wider consultations. By 2004 there were over 400 submissions, and as a result of the

2009 consultation nearly 150 further sites were submitted, and since 2015 a small number of sites have been submitted, or reconfigured. As the sites go through the site selection process, the Council have liaised with landowners/agents/developers to ensure that deliverability and developability is fully covered, and the ability of sites to meet the wider objectives of the Plan is fully explored in terms of feasibility and viability. It was stressed to those with interests in developing sites that evidence is necessary to demonstrate the potential opportunities, strengths, and sensitivities and concerns of a site, and how they may be addressed.

3.49 In the call for sites, we asked for a site map which clearly outlined the extent of the site, and ideally any access point. We then asked for a covering letter which identified the ownership situation of the site, any legal or practical considerations, and indication of the proposed use, and any levels of development.

- Generic letters were sent to site submitters (who may be landowners or developers or their agents) in March and April of 2014 to ask for further information
- Specific letters sent to Preferred and Option sites 1 November 2015
- Further specific letters were sent regarding the consideration of sites in March 2016

These letters were principally concerned with identifying whether the sites were deliverable, and the landowner/developer were aware of the financial implications of Plan-compliance and CIL liability. They did also identify, or make the site submitter aware of sensitivities, or concerns which the Local Planning Authority had sought clarification on.

## The Sites Consultation (November- December 2015)

3.50 Site Assessment commenced in earnest in the summer of 2013 and focused initially on the Service Villages, once the Examination in Public progress of the Local Plan Strategy was concluded. This involved site visits, and the consultation with key delivery partners, technical assessments and the application of the Council's 'Site Selection Methodology' using information provided by local, regional and national datasets, and information from the site submitters about their deliverability considerations around policy compliance and the forthcoming (as was) CIL charge. This is discussed in greater detail in the section on Site Selection Methodology. Informal briefings were undertaken with Members of the District, Town and Parish Councils to explain the assessment process to date:

Hovingham	16 July 2013
Slingsby	21 July 2013
Thornton le Dale	11 August 2013
Sheriff Hutton	12 September 2013
Amotherby Swinton	06 October 2013
Nawton Beadlam	20 October 2013
Staxton/Willerby	21 October 2013
Sherburn	17 November 2013
Rillington	Made invitation but no meeting
Ampleforth	Made invitation but no meeting

Malton and Norton	7 December 2014
Pickering	19 January 2015
Kirkbymoorside	26 January 2015

3.51 By Spring 2015 Officers sought, and obtained approval from Members to consult on the site assessment work to date. The report link is below:

<http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/documents/g1439/Public%20reports%20pack%2031st-Mar-2015%2018.00%20Planning%20Committee.pdf?T=10>

The minutes:

<http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/documents/g1439/Public%20reports%20pack%2031st-Mar-2015%2018.00%20Planning%20Committee.pdf?T=10>

As an interim consultation, it sought to provide a point-in-time assessment of the work to date on the sites, also outlining other more strategic considerations, such as:

- The Spatial Strategy of the Ryedale Plan-Local Plan Strategy
- The quantum of development in the Ryedale Plan-Local Plan Strategy
- The presence of planning permissions within the Plan Period (From March 2012); and
- how these matters would affect the consideration of sites

The following documents were also publicised:

- Site Selection Methodology tables for each settlement in the Settlement Hierarchy to which allocations could, in principle, be made.
- Interim Sustainability Appraisal
- Habitats Regulations Assessment (Screening)
- The Consultation Document was also summarised into settlements and contained:
  - Discounted sites on the basis of non-compliance with the Settlement Hierarchy;
  - Sites which had been assessed through the SSM, and their performance through that process, and within that then identifying:
  - Sites which were capable of being identified as preferred sites; and
  - Sites which were capable of being identified as option choices- so indicating the range of sites which the Local Planning Authority would be identifying the preferred sites to meet the residual requirement.

A link to the resulting consultation event and document are below:

<http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/local-plan-sites/sites-consultation-2015>

[http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/362/Sites\\_Consultation\\_Document\\_October\\_2015.pdf](http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/362/Sites_Consultation_Document_October_2015.pdf)

## **Who Was Contacted, the Availability of Documents and the Consultation Time Frame**

3.52 The consultation period ran from 2 November until 14 December 2015. Notification of the Consultation was sent by letter (posted or emailed) to all those who has asked that their details be added to our Consultation Database, and since the 2009 consultation the Consultation Database contains over 1600 respondents. These include statutory Consultees, and the prescribed bodies of the Duty to Cooperate. The letter is attached as appendix 12. The Council also wrote to the Parish Councils earlier and asked them to put up a poster alerting their community to the impending consultation this is attached as appendix 13. The documents were available on line, and on deposit in the District Council Offices in Malton, and at the Libraries of Malton, Norton, Pickering, Kirkbymoorside and Helmsley. The Council no longer has satellite offices, and in future consultations will not use the Libraries to place on deposit information. They will continue to have select information and forms. Officers of the Council met with Officers from the adjacent Local Authorities, and subsequent meetings were also held with the Environment Agency, Yorkshire Water, and Historic England. Specific, individual, letters were written to site submitters of the Preferred Sites and the Option Sites to both inform them of the assessment process to date, but also to obtain further information about how deliverable sites are, and in the consideration of potential sensitivities how could they be addressed. These are provided in appendices 14 and 15.

### **Results of the Consultation:**

3.53 153 representations were submitted by a range of individuals and organisations. Those ranged from concerns around development at non-service villages, to a lack of development at those 'Other Villages'. There was general support for the assessment approach, by the statutory consultees, with some site-specific comments and considerations. The responses have been publicised on the Council's website, in two general categories:

- Site Representations (which are responses to the Consultation):

<http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/local-plan-sites/sites-consultation-2015/371-responses-received>

- Site Submission Information (which whilst often being a response to the findings of the Consultation, but also includes information about the delivery of the site which is the subject of the representation):

<http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/local-plan-sites/sites-consultation-2015/372-submission-material>



## Responses received in respect of the Duty to Cooperate

Date consulted	Date of meeting	Duty to Cooperate Body	Matters Discussed
2.11.15	30.11.15	North York Moors National Park LPA	<p>NYMNP are looking at producing a new LP with allocations for housing. Looking at producing a SHMA. Retain the Helmsley Plan. Consider that Ampleforth and Thornton le Dale should be considered holistically (not in terms of joint plans). Identify that a number of sites have performed poorly through the site assessment process and concur with those findings. Acknowledge that no sites are being proposed at these settlements due to recent permissions/completions.</p> <p>Note site 650 (eastern limb) and have concerns about the site's proximity to the Boundary with the park, as an isolated limb, strip field. Discordant form of development. Agree with Officer's assessment.</p>
2.11.15	10.12.15	York City LPA	<p>Discussed implications of sub-regional planning, role and approach of sustainability appraisal work, Green Belt boundary for 20 years. Looking to use Technical Officers Group to ensure that DtC matters and endorsed policy and then taken up through to the Spatial Planning Board. Discussed investigation of joint working on Gypsies and Travellers accommodation needs. York looking to have a SPD on Wind Energy. Note that aiming to produce a publication version of the plan by June 2016.</p>
2.11.15	03.12.15	Scarborough Borough LPA	<p>No sites presented concerns in terms of delivery of their Local Plan. Sites work is an extension of the Local Plan Strategy, and not affecting Scarborough's planned approach. Mutually meeting own respectively identified OAN. No concerns regarding the A64 and respective Plan approaches. Consistent and shared approach to landscapes, particularly Vale of Pickering- recognition of the archaeological sensitivity.</p>
2.11.15	02.12.15	Hambleton LPA	<p>Limited cross boundary issues. Due to lack of connectivity in terms of roads and rail and no major settlements even proximal to the boundary. Acknowledge aspirations at Sheriff Hutton, nearest settlement with a policy expectation of modest residential development, reflecting the Service Village Status, and that the level of development will not affect Hambleton in any manner. Current position of restraint to north and south.</p>

			Hambleton are initiating a new Local Plan- and reviewing their Spatial Strategy, going out to Issues and Options consultation in January. Awaiting findings of the SHMA. Landscape matters, no conflicts of approach. Also looking at identifying areas of less sensitivity with regards to Wind Energy.
2.11.15	26.11.15	East Riding of Yorkshire LPA	Two main areas: Treatment of Stamford Bridge and the Wolds LCA. Majority of settlement within ERYC area, site in Gate Helmsley (Ryedale District). Discussed individual merits of the site. Look in further detail at impact on River Derwent SAC. EYRC consider meeting the needs of EYRC and the settlement appropriately and within their planning area. Two planning applications, totalling 295 units have now consent. Are being treated as commitments within the LP at EiP. Agree that site 92 does not need to be bought forward. Agree that a there is a comparable approach to development in respect of the Wolds, both from development levels, and recognition of landscape sensitivity.
2.11.15		North Yorkshire County Council (including County Highways) Minerals and Waste Education	Letter provided- see representations table and para
2.11.15		The Environment Agency	Letter provided- see representations table
2.11.15		Historic England	Letter provided- see representations table
2.11.15		Natural England	Letter provided- see representations table
2.11.15		Homes and Communities Agency	No response made
2.11.15		Vale of York CCG	No response made
2.11.15	14.12.15	Scarborough and Ryedale CCG	No response made to the consultation
2.11.15		National Health Service Commissioning Board	No response made
2.11.15		Office of Rail and Road	Response 09.11.15 - No comment to make on this particular document. ORR only requires to be consulted where there is impacts on main line railway, tramway or London Underground.

2.11.15		Highways England	Letter provided- see representations table
2.11.15		Marine Management Organisation	No response made
2.11.15		Civil Aviation Authority	No response made

### Key Issues Raised at the Sites Consultation

- Some disappointment at no sites in the Other Villages
- General support for sites from statutory consultees with:
  - some qualification concerning heritage matters and archaeology, flood risk considerations, Brownfield/Greenfield land
  - general support for the site selection methodology
  - sustainability appraisal and Habitat Regulations Assessment are considered to be acceptable, with some wider in-combination effects of other plans and projects to be considered
- The findings of the strategic transport modelling and Air Quality Impacts were necessary before decision on sites, particularly in Malton and Norton could be made
- concerns with some site submissions which had performed well in the SSM were then being discounted in settlements where development had already happened within the Plan Period (although the LPA viewed that this could lead to oversupply and the need to as equitably as possible distribute the housing requirement across the Service Village Tier)
- Concerns about the scale of some of the larger sites, and the ability of those sites to meet the commensurate impact on infrastructure.
- general support for sites from parish and town councils, except for in Amotherby Parish who strongly object to Site 8, and question the SSM (they have applied a numerical assessment which is not the way the assessment is to operate)
- Staxton and Willerby Parish are supportive of site 480 which has severe highway and archaeological constraints.
- Malton and Norton Town Councils were unable to identify their preferred option site(s) due to the absence of the transport modelling work, and the air quality assessment
- Site submissions sometimes critique other sites, in particular in Kirkbymoorside, with the identification of the Sylatech site as a redevelopment option, and concerns raised around uncertainty over delivery.
- Concerns were raised over the absence of a site identified for the Gypsy and Travelling Show People communities. (The Local Plan Strategy provides the framework for site assessment, and a GTA confirmed (December 2016) that sufficient pitches were available without the need for a new site.

3.54 Members of Planning Committee (24.10.2017) agreed the responses to the 2015 Sites Consultation. The responses are at appendix 16

The Covering Report

<https://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/documents/s35202/1%20-%20Report.pdf>

The Responses

<https://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/documents/s35203/2%20-%20appendix%20%20Representations%20sites%20consultation%202015.pdf>

## **Identification and Review of VIUAs Consultation (Autumn 2016)**

- 3.54 Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs) are areas of land which are identified for their contribution to settlement form and character. This is through their ability to influence a settlement, and the buildings within that settlement, through the open, and undeveloped qualities of the land. They were first identified in the 2002 Ryedale Local Plan, and their retention in principle was taken forward into the Ryedale Plan- Local Plan Sites Document, Policy SP16. As part of the production of the Local Plan Sites Document there was a need to review the existing designations, reflect any factual changes, and identify any new VIUAs as a result of new evidence and consultation.
- 3.55 The 2009 Consultation, referred to in paragraphs 3.28 and 3.29 of this document, has asked whether there were areas of open space which were considered to be important to retain. The findings of this concerning site-specifics were responded to in the VIUA Consultation Document produced in October 2016. The consultation also looked at evidence in the form of Conservation Area Appraisals (undertaken in Ampleforth and Slingsby), The Special Qualities Study, and as a result of the work conducting site visits around the settlements.
- 3.56 The content of the Identification and Review of VIUAs Consultation Document considered through the following:
- The document sets out the policy approach to the development of VIUAs, and why they are different to 'Local Green Space'.
  - The removal of a select number of VIUAs due to development, and one due to no longer having relevance due to the site's condition;
  - Providing a light-touch assessment of all current VIUAs;
  - The re-evaluation of a small number of VIUAs in terms of their extent- primarily looking at the site's extents and applying on-ground boundaries (this was also to deal with the some inset map edge clarifications), and some mapping anomalies;
  - The identification of new VIUAs in Pickering, Norton, Slingsby, Ampleforth, Hovingham;
  - The reasons why some areas of land identified as being suitable in the 2009 consultation were not considered appropriate for the designation.
- 3.57 Members approval of the document for consultation was given on the 27 September 2016 at a meeting of Planning Committee, and the consultation commenced for a period of 6 weeks in 5 October 2016- 9 November 2016.

<https://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/documents/g1681/Public%20reports%20pack%2027th-Sep-2016%2018.00%20Planning%20Committee.pdf?T=10>

Minutes: <https://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/documents/g1681/Printed%20minutes%2027th-Sep-2016%2018.00%20Planning%20Committee.pdf?T=1>

### **Who was contacted, availability and scope of documents and the Consultation Time Frame**

3.58 Letters and emails were sent to the entirety of the Consultation Database. A copy of the letter is attached as appendix 17. The Consultation Document was placed on deposit at Ryedale House, the District Council Offices, and on the website. The website for the VIUA Consultation:

<http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/local-plan-sites/viua-consultation-2016>

### **Results of the Consultation**

3.59 129 responses were received to the consultation, including support from Historic England and Natural England.

### **Key issues raised**

3.60 The response to the document was broadly positive, save for those specifically objecting to the inclusion of land as VIUAs due to their development interest of the site.

- There were no objections to proposed removal of the identified VIUAs;
- No objections to potential de-designation of part of a VIUA (in Kirkbymoorside) if the sites were to be allocated;
- Broad support for the retention of existing VIUAs except where the land owner had submitted the site for development;
- No objections to the revisions to existing VIUAs for clarification
- Support for the following areas of land for VIUA status, with the exception of \* all or parts of these areas of land have been identified as potential allocations:
  - Land to the North and South of Castle Howard Road, Malton
  - Land at Folliot Ward Close, Malton\*
  - Land at to the north of Peasey Hills, Malton
  - Land to the south of Norton (particularly south and west)
  - Land to the north of Middleton Road, Pickering
- Objections to the following areas of land for VIUA designation, and the policy approach to designation:
  - Land between Langton and Welham Roads, Norton- particularly in relation to the proposed identification of VIUA on a site which currently has planning permission (granted on appeal)
  - Land to the north of the Worsley Arms, Hovingham

- A objection to the potential inclusion of land at Castle Howard Road as a VIUA

## **Response**

- No whole changes proposed: the changes to existing VIUAs have been taken forward;
- The identification of the land at Langton Road with permission as a VIUA has not been take forward due to the likelihood of the scheme's commencement;
- Land at Peasey Hills and Folliot Ward Close have been identified as proposed VIUAs; and
- The other areas of land suggested as VIUAs have not been taken forward because the land does not directly influence the form and character of the settlement, and to designate areas of land would resulting a general devaluation of the designation.

3.61 Members of Planning Committee 24.10.2017 agreed the responses to the VIUA consultation. They are contained within Appendix 18.

Covering report:

<https://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/documents/s35202/1%20-%20Report.pdf>

Comment and Responses

<https://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/documents/s35204/3%20-%20appendix%203%20Ident.%20and%20Review%20of%20VIUAs%20-%20consultation%20statement%20and%20resp%20v3.pdf>

## 4 Technical Evidence and Wider Plans and Strategies

### Malton Town Centre Strategy (Summer 2008)

#### The Document

- 4.1 One of the Council's goals is to improve the shopping offer in Malton to support a town centre bustling with life and interest. The Council and Yorkshire Forward commissioned consultants WSP in March 2007 to undertake the Malton Town Centre Strategy. This is a study which looks at:
- Potential uses of 10 key town centre sites based on public consultation
  - How these important sites will work together
  - The design of the town centre
  - Financial appraisal of options identified for the sites
  - Traffic management
- 4.2 A draft of the Document was prepared and considered by Policy and Resources Committee on the 5 March 2008. As a result they resolved for further consultation. The minutes of the meeting are available to view here:

<http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/CeListDocuments.aspx?MID=271&RD=Minutes&DF=05%2f03%2f2008&A=0&R=0>

The committee report is available here:

<http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/CeListDocuments.aspx?MID=271&RD=Agenda&DF=05%2f03%2f2008&A=1&R=0>

#### Who was contacted, availability and scope of documents and the Consultation Time Frame

- 4.3 In 2007 the Council undertook a consultation event that was attended by over 250 people in the main market place of Malton. A consultation event was held at the Milton Rooms called "Have Your Say" held on the 29 and 30 August 2008, to supplement the earlier consultation in 2007. The key objectives of the strategy and various options for the 10 sites in the town displayed on boards. A short documentary was made and viewable on a continuous loop. The event coincided with the farmers' and regular markets and a continental market, to capitalise on the greater number of people circulating in the town on these days.
- 4.4 Specific consultations were also carried out with local retailers, the farming community, Town and Parish Councils, Malton School and the readers of Ryedale News. Council Officers had also undertaken a consultation event with year 9 pupils from Malton School to find out how they would like to use Malton Town Centre. The event was a debate and role play regarding the future of 'Maltown' Livestock Market.

## Key Issues from the 2008 Malton Town Centre Consultation

- 4.5 The 2008 consultation event in the Milton Rooms was attended by over 1500 people: the most successful individual consultation event that the District Council has ever held. This provided over 500 detailed questionnaire responses from individuals, couples and families. 509 questionnaire responses received at and since the Milton Rooms event. For each of the eleven questions asked on the questionnaire the analysis sets out the number of people (and percentage splits) who supported, rejected or were unsure about the proposals put forward by WSP for each of the sites / buildings in the Town Centre Strategy. It had encouraged many local people to attend and to provide their views on how to improve Malton Town Centre. This had shown certain issues where there was a relatively clear public view and other issues that were much more finely balanced.
- 4.6 Ryedale News Readers were invited in August 2008 to respond to questionnaire, as part of the 'Have Your Say' consultation. 206 responses were received.

## Resulting Actions

- 4.7 The consultant response to the consultation was considered by the Policy and Resources Committee of the 2 October 2008.

<http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/CeListDocuments.aspx?MID=275&RD=Minutes&DF=02%2f10%2f2008&A=0&R=0>

The Committee Report is available below:

[http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/ceListDocuments.aspx?Committeeld=119&MeetingId=275&F=Agenda\\$SubIndex\\$embed\\$.htm](http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/ceListDocuments.aspx?Committeeld=119&MeetingId=275&F=Agenda$SubIndex$embed$.htm)

- 4.8 The concluding report of the Malton Town Centre Strategy was presented and agreed by Council Thursday, 21st May, 2009 as an evidence-based document for consideration of options through the Local Development Framework. It was not to be, or replace, policies to be developed through the Local Development Framework. The resulting main report is accompanied by 10 development briefs. All documents are available to view on the website below:

<http://extranet.ryedale.gov.uk/default.aspx?page=7147>

The Council Minutes of the meeting which approved the report are available here:

<http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/CeListDocuments.aspx?MID=212&RD=Minutes&DF=21%2f05%2f2009&A=0&R=0>

- 4.9 The main report and development briefs were considered and approved by Members in Policy and Resources Committee 2 April 2009 to then be finally approved by Council on the 21 May 2009. They were approved to be used as part of the evidence base for the Local Development Framework in the following ways:



(i) Endorse the recommendations in the WSP report and take these forward for consideration and consultation through the LDF process.

(ii) Include Wentworth Street Car Park in the June consultation for redevelopment for food retail and parking through the LDF process.

(iii) Approve that the study and supporting technical work be a material consideration in the decision making process in advance of the LDF.

(iv) Fully investigate through the LDF process, the potential for a comprehensive approach to the redevelopment of Malton town centre.

The agenda is below:

<http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/CeListDocuments.aspx?MID=280&RD=Agenda&DF=02%2f04%2f2009&A=1&R=0>

The minutes are:

<http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/CeListDocuments.aspx?MID=280&RD=Minutes&DF=02%2f04%2f2009&A=0&R=0>

The agenda for full council is below:

<http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/CeListDocuments.aspx?MID=212&RD=Agenda&DF=21%2f05%2f2009&A=1&R=0>

The minutes for Council are:

<http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/CeListDocuments.aspx?MID=212&RD=Minutes&DF=21%2f05%2f2009&A=0&R=0>

## Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (2009 and Updates)

- 4.10 The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) is a technical evidence document which considers the potential supply of housing across the part of the District outside of the National Park over a 20-year period from a base date of April 2008. The SHLAA forms part of the Ryedale Local Plan evidence base, along with a range of other technical studies. It is not a policy document, therefore nor does it prejudice decisions taken by the District Council in relation to preferred directions of growth, site identification in the Development Plan or the determination of planning applications.
- 4.11 Work on the SHLAA began in 2008, and the Council commissioned consultants Roger Tym and Partners to undertake the study. The document was finalised in October 2009, and given the nature of such studies was updated, annually from 2011 onwards in house. The document is in two parts. The first sets out the framework of considering the deliverability and developability of sites which are either subject to planning permission, a decision in principle

or are identified as an allocation, and provides the ability to establish what the five year land supply position is, through establishing the rate at which sites will be built out. The second part of the SHLAA is the listing of the sites and their relative deliverability and developability as part of the housing land supply within Ryedale. It provides basic information about the sites, and their likelihood, on a scale of 1-3 of their deliverability/developability/availability. The sites are identified from a range of sources: call for sites, earlier studies known as 'urban capacity studies', and land known to the Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority will be updating the Part II of the SHLAA in 2018.

The 2009 SHLAA is available here:

[http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/132/SHLAA\\_Main\\_Report\\_Oct09%20.pdf](http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/132/SHLAA_Main_Report_Oct09%20.pdf)

Appendices:

[http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/132/SHLAA\\_Appendices\\_Oct09.pdf](http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/132/SHLAA_Appendices_Oct09.pdf)

Schedule of responses:

[http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/132/SHLAA\\_Schedule\\_of\\_Responses.pdf](http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/132/SHLAA_Schedule_of_Responses.pdf)

4.12 In 2012 the first part of the SHLAA was updated, and has been updated on an annual basis:

<http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/other-documents/evidence-base/132-strategic-housing-land-availability-assessment>

### **Who Was Contacted, the Availability of Documents and the Consultation Time Frame**

4.13 Reflecting advice in the Guidance that stakeholders should be engaged in the SHLAA process from the outset, the Council undertook a range of consultation exercises to inform the study. We also considered the sites that were submitted through the various call for sites exercises which the District Council conducted over the last couple of years prior to the production of the document, and continued up until February 2013.

The various consultation exercises that informed the study are described below:

#### **Stakeholder Seminar**

A stakeholder seminar was held on Monday 20 April 2009 at the District Council's offices in Malton, attended by Council officers and a range of external stakeholders including developers, housebuilders, planning consultants and agents. At the event, the stakeholders were:

- Briefed stakeholders on the study objectives and described/discussed our approach to the study and technical inputs/assumptions, in order to ensure that the study procedure/outputs are consistent with other SHLAA studies that are being undertaken elsewhere in the sub-region; and

- We shared and pooled information and intelligence on housing delivery and achievability issues.

The drafting of report we took on board the various useful comments and suggestions that were made at the seminar.

#### Public Sector Bodies:

Early in the study we consulted with a range of strategic public sector bodies such as Natural England, the Environment Agency and the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) in order to identify any particular constraints that may have a bearing on the delivery of housing in Ryedale.

#### Utilities:

We also consulted utilities providers such as Yorkshire Water, National Grid and United Utilities, to establish whether there are any significant utilities capacity issues in the District that we should be aware of.

#### Consultation with Local Estate Agents:

We consulted with a range of local estate agents early in the study with a view to identifying any particular, locally specific housing-related issues in any parts of the study area. We then used the intelligence gained from these consultations when we assessed the ‘achievability’ of sites. It is important to emphasise at the outset that our achievability assessments, and the study generally, have been undertaken as if we are operating in normal market conditions.

### Key Issues Raised

- 4.14 From the consultations undertaken with the statutory public sector bodies, most of the responses that we received were general in nature. For instance, the comments from the HCA included the recommendation to consult with a wide range of stakeholders. Similarly, the response from Natural England did not raise any site-specific or settlement-related issues.
- 4.15 United Utilities did not have any specific comments to make. In relation to electricity and gas, National Grid advised that ‘...development in Ryedale will not have a significant effect upon National Grid’s infrastructure, both gas and electricity transmission. It is unlikely that any extra growth will create capacity issues for National Grid given the scale of [our] gas and electricity transmission networks. The existing network should be able to cope with additional demands.’ Yorkshire Water provided more detailed initial comments regarding water supply and the capacity of the local sewerage infrastructure and wastewater treatment works. Whilst no insurmountable constraints were brought to our attention, the following issues were identified by Yorkshire Water:
- Water supply – the main ‘trunk’ infrastructure is thought to be sufficient to cover the needs of all brownfield development in Ryedale, albeit some local reinforcement might be required, which would be assessed on a site-by-site basis. Extension of the trunk infrastructure may be required to support any extensions of the existing urban area. Again, the extent of the work would depend on the needs of the site as and when development

was proposed; generally, the further a new site is from an existing urban centre the more extensive the infrastructure needed to support it.

- Sewage treatment works capacity – Yorkshire Water does not have any short term concerns in relation to sewage treatment works capacity. However, specific information was provided in terms of the relative capacity for foul flows in the sewerage infrastructure in and around the District's four main settlements, and outlined where their would need to be investment in expansion of such utilities.
- Yorkshire Water also identified various specific sites in Malton/Norton, Pickering and Kirkbymoorside, and raised concerns about their suitability for housing on the basis that they are quite close to existing sewage works. On that basis the particular sites have either been discounted, or the areas of site have been reduced to comply with industry standards.

### **SHLAA Part 1 updates**

- 4.16 On an annual basis, the Council monitors the level of completions, and the amount of dwellings granted permission, which is then assessed to establish when those units are to be rolled out, and to identify whether the Council has a 5 year land supply- which is an important element in the decision-making process when dealing with speculative residential development. As a technical document, it is not subject to Member approval, and is not subjected to a policy decision or formulation of policy so the document is publicised on the website, and links are provided from the main homepage.

## **Special Qualities Study (July 2010 and selectively updated in 2016)**

### **The Document**

- 4.17 The Special Qualities Study is an internally prepared technical document which sought to identify, describe and begin to assess the significance of the cultural, historic and environmental attributes of the Market Towns within Ryedale and the land which surrounds them. It collated together a number of established sources of data in geographical information system (GIS) form, with photographic records and visual descriptions of the land around the settlements.

The web link to the study report and the accompanying GIS material is below:

<http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/other-documents/evidence-base/130-special-qualities-study-2010-of-ryedales-market-town>

The direct link to the study report is:

[http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/130/Special\\_Qualities\\_Survey\\_updated\\_20.09.2016.pdf](http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/130/Special_Qualities_Survey_updated_20.09.2016.pdf)

## **Who Was Contacted, the Availability of Documents and the Consultation Time Frame, and Key Findings**

- 4.18 The preparation of this document was from summer 2009 until summer 2010, and was finalised before the summer consultation on the draft Core Strategy. In the preparation of this document the Council liaised with the North York Moors National Park. This was considered vital given the Study covered Helmsley, a town which has dual planning jurisdiction. The National Park Authority Planning Policy Team was involved in the scoping of the document, and were given drafts to make comments upon.
- 4.19 The North Yorkshire County Council were also involved in the document's preparation. Firstly, because the County Council were preparing a County-wide Landscape Character Assessment of North Yorkshire, and it was considered that their input into the overall objectives and approach of the study were important to ensure consistency. The County Council also had technical data, in the form of Historic Landscape Characterisation and Public Rights of Way which was used in this study.
- 4.20 The 2009 summer consultation asked stakeholders to highlight any areas of sensitivity and community importance regarding buildings, spaces and views. The heritage aspects were raised, in particular market places, historic street patterns, distinctive local building materials, community buildings. The Special Qualities Study referred to the findings of the consultation by considering particular issues that would need further consideration before sites were developed, firstly issues which would require consideration in all the towns, then specifically for each of the towns in terms of impacts on setting, character and environmental constraints. We also asked: What were important forms of Green Infrastructure? Using the findings of the 2009 consultation we have the opportunity to consider what forms of Green Infrastructure the people of Ryedale value, and where they feel improvements could be made. The special qualities study makes reference to these aspects, and will inform the Site Selection Methodology.
- 4.21 Involvement from Natural England and English Heritage was also from the outset. They endorsed the concept of the Special Qualities Study, its methodology, and made comment upon drafts of the document. They considered that it was an important element of the evidence base for the further consideration of development capacity of the settlements, and to inform the site selection process in due course. This was because the study considered the character and qualities of places in a more holistic manner.
- 4.22 Once the document was finalised, the main report, interactive maps and map with hyperlinks to photographs were available for distribution on DVD (due to the interactive nature of the supporting documentation) and available on the Forward Planning website within the Evidence Base section. As a technical document, it is not subject to Member approval, and is not subjected to a policy decision or formulation of policy.
- 4.23 A selective update was undertaken in 2016, to expand consideration of wider areas.

## Transport Modelling

- 4.24 Two Local Plan modelling projects were commissioned by the Council, and undertaken by Jacobs Consultants. The Strategic Transport Modelling (completed in June 2010 with an addendum in October 2010) was undertaken to inform the level of development to be attributed to Malton and Norton, both in terms of junctions, and impacts on the A64. The Highways Agency (now Highways England) and North Yorkshire County Council, as Highway Authority, were involved through the production of the document. The document is available to view on the website in the evidence base section.

[http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/121/Malton\\_and\\_Norton\\_STA\\_June2010.pdf](http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/121/Malton_and_Norton_STA_June2010.pdf)

- 4.25 A second study, Local Plan Modelling, tested various development scenarios at Malton and Norton and Pickering. As a very technical piece of work, consultation was undertaken with the County Council, as Highway Authority at the conception, and over the course of the modelling work. The document is also available to view on the website. As a technical document, it is not subject to wider public consultation although it has been made available to view as part of the technical evidence base.

[http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/374/Highway\\_Modelling\\_Malton\\_Norton\\_Pickering\\_August\\_2016.pdf](http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/374/Highway_Modelling_Malton_Norton_Pickering_August_2016.pdf)

## Air Quality

- 4.26 Malton and Norton experiences adverse air quality conditions in no small part to the combination of stationary traffic as a result of a railway crossing, and the topography and built form creating a canyoning effect. The Council commissioned Systra to undertake an assessment of the air quality implications of the two of the development scenarios identified through the Transport Modelling work as being schemes which would be the most likely development scenarios. North Yorkshire County Council as Highway Authority were consulted/involved in agreeing the methodology for the study. Once the modelling work was undertaken, the findings of the study were provided to the County Council as it was important for them to consider the implications of the findings in their proposals for providing changes to traffic management to reduce emissions from MGVs/HGVs. As a technical document, it is not subject to wider public consultation although the study has been made available for information. The document is available to view on the website in the evidence base section.

[http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/378/Systra\\_Ryedale\\_AQA\\_Report\\_Final.pdf](http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/378/Systra_Ryedale_AQA_Report_Final.pdf)

## Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment

- 4.27 In response to the Sites Consultation of 2015 it was identified that a new assessment was required to identify any changes in the requirements for the Gypsy and Travelling community, as representations had been received which were critical of the lack of sites proposed for the delivery of sites to meet identified needs. Whilst the Local Plan Strategy identified the policy framework, no sites were proposed in the forthcoming sites document. The National Planning Policy framework and guidance had been changed in respect of the definitions to be used when establishing need. The Council responded, and undertook a new survey. The primary fieldwork for this study comprised survey work with Gypsies and Travellers.
- 4.28 There is one Gypsy and Traveller site in the District – Tara Park – which is a Local Authority (Council) site with 20 pitches. There are no private authorised or unauthorised sites and no Travelling Showperson yards located in the District. In late September 2016, all residents living on Tara Park were moved off following threats made to occupants. However, telephone interviews have been achieved with the majority of residents. Additionally, Horton Housing runs an advice workshop and through this 13 Gypsies and Travellers living in bricks and mortar housing and on the roadside were identified.
- 4.29 The household survey was undertaken by arc<sup>4</sup>. It comprised telephone interviews with members of the Gypsy and Traveller community currently living within Ryedale District. The overarching aim of the fieldwork was to maximise the number of interviews secured from households living on sites and in bricks and mortar within the District. Consulting with stakeholders ensured that the fieldwork team had a good understanding of the local issues facing Gypsies and Travellers and helped to maximise the community's participation in the study.
- 4.30 Interviews with remaining residents began on the 19<sup>th</sup> October and by the end of the fieldwork period (which ran until the 25<sup>th</sup> November) a total of 8 interviews were achieved. There have been 2 refusals, 2 households with incorrect contact details who cannot be contacted and 2 households who the fieldwork team were not able to contact despite up to 6 attempts.
- 4.31 A list of 13 households who attend the 'drop in' centre run by Horton Housing was obtained on the 14<sup>th</sup> November 2016 and interviews were carried out by telephone between the 15<sup>th</sup> November and 25<sup>th</sup> November 2016. A total of 5 interviews were achieved and of these 4 lived in bricks and mortar accommodation and one was living on the roadside in Ryedale. Of the remaining 8 households 5 did not respond to calls and messages could not be left, 2 had incorrect telephone numbers and 1 refused to participate.
- 4.32 Of the 8 households interviewed who ordinarily live on a pitch, only 3 meet the new PPTS definition of being a Gypsy/Traveller household. Of the 4 households interviewed who live in bricks and mortar accommodation, 3 meet the new definition and the roadside household also meet the definition.
- 4.33 As a technical document, it is not subject to Member approval, and is not subjected to a policy decision or formulation of policy. The document is available to view on the website.

[http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/117/Ryedale\\_GTAA\\_Final\\_Report\\_2016.pdf](http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/117/Ryedale_GTAA_Final_Report_2016.pdf)

## Malton and Norton Neighbourhood Plan (in production) 2011- Onwards

- 4.34 The towns of Malton and Norton are working together to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan for the towns. It has been in production since 2011. The Local Planning Authority has provided limited direction, but has sought to provide guidance. The earliest form of the neighbourhood plan is discussed in the Statement of Consultation produced for the Local Plan Strategy. Officers from the Place Team (within a Development Plan production capacity) have attended meetings of the focus groups, to both understand the issues and areas of focus, and to provide the guidance from the Local Plan Perspective. The Local Planning Authority's input has also been sought and provided in respect of technical material produced to inform the neighbourhood plan.
- 4.35 The Plan still remains in an early stage of production, to date the extent of Neighbourhood Plan boundary as not been formalised. A draft policies intentions document is being prepared for consultation. It is the current intention of both Parish Council's that the Neighbourhood Plan will not contain site specific land allocations.

## Strategic Housing Market Assessments

- 4.36 Over the course of the production of the plan the Council has produced a series of Housing Market Assessments. Their primary purpose is to identify the need within the District (or in some cases sub-area) for new dwellings, and what that need is for affordable dwellings. In time, they have become known as Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMAs) and they form a key element of the Plan's evidence base for deriving what the Plan's housing requirement should be. The Adopted Local Plan Strategy was informed by a series of SHMAs, and as part of the monitoring of the Plan, the Local Planning Authority committed to reviewing the SHMA within 5 years of the commencement of the Plan Period. However, to align with other SHMAs in production by several neighbouring authorities, the council took the decision to undertake a SHMA in spring 2016, a year earlier. This was to ensure that in terms of the Duty to Co-operate the evidence base underpinning Plans was being consistently produced in terms of the methodological approach, recognising the important cross-boundary considerations around the identification of housing markets. This confirmed that the Plan requirement of 200 homes per year, remained acceptable, with the operation of the local buffer, which allows a 25% uplift of the Plan requirement, without a corresponding reduction in following years land supply calculation. Consultation on the draft findings of the SHMA was undertaken. A joint stakeholder and duty to co-operate engagement event and a further stakeholder event were held to discuss the findings of the SHMA. No objections to the work were raised at the duty to co-operate engagement event. In addition, given the SHMA finding's relevance and importance to Plan production, and monitoring, Members of the District Council were invited to attend a meeting around the SHMA's production and findings, and how the OAN is derived on the 23 March 2016.

<http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/112/Ryedale%20SHMA%20Final.pdf>





## 5 The Site Selection Methodology

5.1 The Ryedale Site Selection Methodology is a key element of the framework for site assessment. It is in effect the site-specific component of the Sustainability Appraisal. It has been subject to three consultations prior to its application through the production of the Local Plan Sites Document:

- In 2009 the Council consulted on a 'Site Selection Criteria' as part of the 2009 Summer Consultation. Appendix 9.
- In 2010 the draft Core Strategy contained a policy on Housing Site Selection Criteria.
- In 2011 a stand-alone consultation was undertaken on the 'Site Selection Methodology'.

### Summer 2009 Consultation (Site Selection Criteria)

5.2 Within the consultation document the Council proposed a two-stage assessment process. This was through a series of questions, which would be aligned to the Objectives of the Sustainability Appraisal. In the first stage proposed two criteria used:

1. Relationship with the Settlement Hierarchy; and
2. Flood Risk and presence of 'functional floodplain' Flood Zone 3b.

The second stage proposed the consideration of social and economic issues, accessibility and transport issues, environmental issues, landscape issues and resources issues.

5.3 The consultation document explained that the purpose of the assessment under Stage 2 is to understand how a site performs against these considerations. This is so an informed decision can then be made by balancing all the issues relevant to the site. From this, comparisons can be made with other sites to ensure the best site is chosen on an objective basis. This will then form the basis for determining the various options for the development of sites in that settlement.

5.4 The consultation document also refers to the relative significance that can be attributed to some issues/constraints. The Council asked consultees about whether the factors are suitable, whether any further factors should be considered, and what weight should be attached to the above-mentioned factors.

5.5 The key issues raised around the site selection criteria were as follows:

- Substantial agreement for the Stage 1 'sieve' of sites and broad support for the factors set in Stage 2.
- Some concern that Malton and Norton we're being treated differently in the 2009 consultation as all sites - not just those adjacent to the development limits - would be considered.
- Also confusion over the phrasing of sites that partially lay in Flood Zone 3b.
- Concern that consultation on this subject was too specific for the Core Strategy.

- Concern that no detail is given on how the consideration of sites in Stage 2 would be undertaken – for example a scoring approach or matrix.
- Suggestion that weighting needs to be taken into account in Stage 2 as some factors are more important than others, and decisions need to be made on a transparent basis. In particular transport and accessibility issues were considered more important as was developing ‘brownfield’ sites first and avoiding unnecessary encroachment into the open countryside. Another respondent also thought that community impact, impact of population increase and historic and cultural factors should be considered to carry more weight in Stage 2.
- Suggestion, particularly from proposers of development sites, that the deliverability and developability of the site should be recognised.
- Suggestion that sites which affect Special Protection Areas (SPAs), Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) should be included in Stage 1.
- Suggestion that both cultural and heritage assets as well as a full list of environmental designations should be listed in Stage 2.
- Concern that no detail around how the approach to flood risk in Stage 2 would be tackled in terms of the sequential test as set out in Planning Policy Statement 25: Flood Risk

## The Ryedale Plan- Draft Core Strategy Policy SP19 (Summer 2010)

- 5.6 The Draft Core Strategy included a Policy SP19 called ‘Housing Site Selection Criteria’, which was developed from the Site Selection Criteria of the 2009 consultation. The consultation process for this policy is set out in paragraph 3.32 and is therefore not repeated here.

### **Key Issues Raised at the Draft Core Strategy 2010 Consultation**

- 5.7 The key findings of the consultation, in specific reference to Policy SP19, which was the Site Selection Criteria, were as follows:

There was general support for the use of a consistently applied standard methodology assessing sites:

- There was concerns raised that the Site Selection criteria were considered too detailed for the strategic nature of the Core Strategy.
- The principle of using the Settlement Hierarchy (although the Settlement Hierarchy was not always supported in its present form) was supported as an initial sieve.
- The discounting sites or the part of a site which was in flood zone 3b (functional floodplain) were supported, although some respondents wished to see more clarity regarding this particular issue around flood risk so that sites with only partial areas of flood zone 3b were not totally discounted.
- That there are factors which should have more weight than others in the consideration of sites, in particular access and traffic impact.

A summary of the responses made is below:

<http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/mqConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=8274>

Responses from the 2010 consultation:

<http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/documents/s5981/Policy%20CS19%20Summaries%20-%20Annex%202.pdf>

The Council's response to the comments made is below:

<http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=8329>

## Consultation on Site Selection Methodology (September 2011)

- 5.8 In response to issues raised in the 2009 and 2010 consultations, the Council decided to treat the Site Selection Methodology to be a stand-alone document which is applied as part of the preparation of the Local Plan Sites Document. This and other issues were also raised and considered at Council 10 March 2011 for the consultation on the Site Selection Methodology later in the year:

Report:

<http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/documents/s5979/Council%20-%20HOP%20-%20Site%20Selection%20Methodology%20-%20Sites%20Development%20Plan%20Document%20-%20Report%20-%2010%20March%2011%20.pdf>

Draft Site Selection Methodology for consultation:

<http://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/documents/s5980/Site%20Selection%20Methodology%20-%20Annex%201.pdf>

## The Document

- 5.9 The findings of the 2009 and 2010 consultations informed the preparation of the draft Site Selection Methodology. The approach was modified from a two stage process to three stages:
- Stage 1 - is an initial sift of sites which do not fit with the approach of the Core Strategy or have significant constraints (such as falling within the 'functional floodplain' of Flood zone 3b) which effectively prevent the site coming forward for development. This is similar to the approach taken into the consultation but also now includes impact on nature conversation sites and heritage assets as suggested by consultation.
  - Stage 2 – is made up of three assessment levels to allow comparisons between the various factors and to take into account the weighting of those factors. These are:
    - Assessment 1 - considers key strategic considerations – accessibility, highways and flood risk - that should be given due weight through this methodology and which were supported at consultation as having more significant weight.
    - Assessment 2 - considers groups of detailed thematic considerations which influence and inform relative merits of each site.

- Assessment 3 - considers the deliverability of the site in terms of physical, commercial, legal and other factors. It also assesses the likely contributions that can be secured from the development of the site to necessary infrastructure to deliver the objectives of the plan. This will be an ongoing discussion and negotiation with the development industry.
- Stage 3 – represents the conclusion of Stages 1 and 2 to enable Officers to make informed choices based on the results of the detailed assessment.

### **Who Was Contacted, the Availability of Documents and the Consultation Time Frame**

5.10 The Council specifically consulted a range of Developers and Landowners who have interests within the District, the Parish and Town Councils, and Statutory Consultees. A letter was sent on the 14 September 2011 giving six weeks to make comment with a deadline of the 28 October 2011. The Document was available to be posted, on request, but was available on the Council's Local Development Framework web site.

### **Key Issues Raised at the Site Selection Methodology 2011 Consultation**

5.11 The summaries of Site Selection Methodology comments are as follows:

#### *Principle*

- Importance of having a consistent approach, with the ability to consider sites in the round;
- Full consideration of significant environmental issues;

#### *Links to Ryedale and National Park Authority Sustainability Appraisal*

General support for the SSM and its linkages to both the Ryedale and National Park Authority Sustainability Appraisal, concerns about:

- Doesn't fully accord with aims and objectives of NPPF;
- Scoring could be prejudicial;
- Premature to ask about economic viability;
- Too complex, unworkable and requires too much information upfront at such an early stage in site consideration.

#### *Stage One Sift*

General support for stage one 'sift', but there are some reservations:

- Reference to sites in towns should be broadened- as sites will need to be found outside the existing town extents or development limits;
- Concerns about the Settlement Hierarchy definitions and the nature of the Settlement Hierarchy;
- Define significant harm of heritage assets;
- Object to exclusion of part of a site which is flood zone 3b, this land may be used for appropriate uses (such as open space) ensuring a more efficient use of the site as a whole.

- Stage 1 should also exclude sites in HES zones.

### *0.3 site size threshold*

- General support for this threshold.
- No quantification of its use.
- Smaller sites should be evaluated for their contribution.

### *Prioritisation of accessibility, highways and flood risk as having additional weight in the choice of sites*

- General support, with some caveats:
  - subject to consultation responses from statutory consultees, being passed to the site promoter for comment and response before being sieved
  - Some could be mitigatable

### *Stage 2 – Do you agree with the range of factors chosen to gauge the performance of a site?*

Generally supportive of the range of factors, some clarifications regarding how they are applied to gauge performance of the site regarding:

- Mitigation and enhancement of biodiversity;
- Uncertainty regarding renewable/low carbon energy and the changes to building regulations and inappropriate that meeting a mandatory level is awarded a negative score;
- No presumption on brownfield land;
- Most greenfield sites will fall into BMVAL classification;
- Amenity factors, such as smell can be mitigated and considered at planning application stage;
- Premature to consider affordable housing, drainage issues, community facilities;
- The scale of the site will affect impact, but also provide benefits;
- On/off site delivery is unable to be quantified.
- Larger sites may have a larger impact, but also provide benefits.
- Sites are penalised for being outside the settlement's existing limits.
- Flooding- can be mitigated, and if part of a site is subject to flooding this should not sterilise the rest of the site.
- Unlikely that sites will maintain or enhance the equality of the landscape- should focus on minimising impacts.
- One respondent felt the criteria were too detailed, and scoring could lead to unfair assessment.
- Common concerns were that this required too much information from developers at any early stage, significant expense without clear prospect of permission – in particular being detrimental to smaller developers, and landowners. Should be streamlined.
- SSM process can provide a useful starting point for the provision of GI.
- Regarding use of SuDs: If a site is suitable for SuDs, then they should be used, those sites where SuDs are not appropriate should not necessarily receive a negative score, they may be good sites just not conducive for SuDs. May be best to have three scores: Proven and deliverable; no evidence as to whether they are possible; investigated and not possible.

- Highlight importance of the Highways Assessment in Stage 2 of the methodology.

*Are there any other factors do you think that should feature here?*

- Meeting the needs of the elderly.
- Define what feature of a scheme will contribute to attracting a balanced living and working community.
- Include geodiversity interests of designated sites.
- Considering wider benefits.
- Greater weight should be given to schemes which provide local needs housing or support the continued viability of community facilities and services.
- Consider impacts on landscape character through criteria based policies for landscape character areas.

*Stage 2 – Assessment level 3 – Do you agree with the deliverability and developability factors? Are there any others you think we should consider?*

Broadly supported, to ensure realistic likelihood of delivery, some concerns:

- Developer contributions should not form part of the assessment;
- Too much reliance on SHLAA;
- Takes insufficient account of specific constraints and the effect on viability;
- Should include geodiversity compensation measures;

*Do you agree with the proposed ‘categorisation’ and ‘rating’ approach to the consideration of sites through the various stages as opposed to a numeric scoring system?*

Broadly supported, some concerns:

- Absence of a numeric system for clarity. Doesn’t go into sufficient detail and needs to have flexibility.
- The initial sieve is crude
- Find the SSM over complicated and confusing. Majority of the questions in Level 2 are better considered at the pre-application/application stage.
- Categorisation and weighting is unclear. Currently it is not sufficiently transparent.
- Suggest a meeting is arranged to discuss what weighting should be used in respect of flood risk.

#### **How these were responded to:**

The following key principles were taken forward as a result:

- No numeric scoring, but the use of a traffic light system would indicate sensitivities;
- The operation of stage 1 was to act as a ‘sift’ but the matter had to be fundamental to not progress to stage 2. It was considered necessary to define some key parameters to ensure that where sites have key issues, these are discounted at an early stage in the assessment process.
- The level of information sought would need to be proportional to the size of the site, the matter in question, and whether it represented an otherwise insurmountable concern.

- Discussions on the evaluation of Flood Risk were considered as the site selection process commenced. Would be in accordance with the sequential test in accordance with both the NPPF, and the Local Plan Strategy.
- Viability would be an important consideration concerning developability.
- Identify priority stage two assessment considerations: flood risk, accessibility, and whether there were any highways implications and the issues would then be considered as to whether the matters are capable of resolution or not.
- The role of the assessment was to consider both opportunities and constraints
- The use of Brownfield land was to be identified as a clear positive, but that the use of Greenfield sites would not be identified as a negative, given the other considerations regarding other aspects of the site assessment process, it would however be identified as a concern if the site was over 5ha in size, but that in itself would not result in the site being discounted.
- The stage 2 process needed to be sufficiently detailed to ensure that the Local Planning Authority could robustly demonstrate that the most suitable sites were being taken forward, and this is in respect of assessing the sites against the sustainability criteria.
- Some matters, such as energy efficiency compliance, or residential amenity in terms of privacy and overbearing effects, would not actively count against a site if such information is not available.
- It was considered important to ensure that, as far as possible, sites were also assessed in respect of viability considerations, as it is important for sites to be deliverable in the Plan Period, and come forward in a manner which ensures a supply of sites which ensures a rolling five -year land supply.
- The settlement hierarchy has now been identified with the adoption of the Local Plan Strategy- and so this identifies which settlements, and therefore which sites, are automatically discounted from the site selection process.
- The site assessment process looks at accessibility, and the proximity to Development Limits is a factor, but being outside Development Limits would not stymie a site's consideration.
- The SSM includes assessment of how sites have the potential to meet the needs of Ryedale's elderly community.
- There are two size thresholds: 0.3ha for Market Towns and 0.15ha for the Service Villages.

The Site Selection Methodology has remained on the Local Plan Sites Page since Members Approved the Revisions:

<http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/local-plan-sites>

[http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/category/13/Site\\_Selection\\_Methodology\\_v3.pdf](http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/category/13/Site_Selection_Methodology_v3.pdf)

5.12 The SSM forms part of the Sustainability Appraisal framework that has been prepared to appraise policy/site choices. The Sustainability Appraisal framework has itself been prepared following consultation on a scoping report. Similarly, a Habitat Regulation Assessment and Appropriate Assessment has also informed the sites document and these have also been subject to consultation with specific bodies. These documents have been published as supporting documents to the Sites Document and Policies Map and the consultation undertaken is included in each of them.



## 6. Next Steps

- 6.1 This document is produced to set out the consultation undertaken to satisfy Regulation 18 which precedes Publication Stage of the Ryedale Plan- Local Plan Sites Document. The next stage will be for the Publication (Regulation 19) of the Local Plan Sites Document to take place.
- 6.2 After Publication, the Local Planning Authority will take the steps to prepare the Plan for Submission to the Secretary of State for Examination in Public. This Consultation Statement, and all the representations made at Publication stage, will be submitted, and will be considered by the Inspector appointed to undertake the Examination in Public.