

# Examination of the Ryedale Plan- Local Plan Sites Document

## Hearing Statement – Ryedale District Council

### Statement 3 – Matter 3- Housing Relevant policies: SD1-SD11

#### Existing residential commitments-Policy SD1

- 3.1 What is the rationale for including existing commitments in Policy SD1? What is the justification for including the sites in Policy SD1 as opposed to allocating them?

The LPSD post-dates the LPS by six years. A large proportion of the housing requirement of the Plan is now subject to planning permission. These form a significant component of the land supply, and given the fact that they have a permission, provide detailed figures of the yield, which allows the position to be clearer on the residual requirements.

The sites that have planning permission have been considered against the adopted LPS. Two of the identified Commitments: Kirkbymoorside (Westfields) and Norton (Langton Road), were granted on appeal. Whilst they were not approved by the Local Planning Authority, they have been considered to be in accordance with the Development Plan and the NPPF. Given the established policy/SA framework, to require these sites to be identified as allocations would not reflect the planning status of the sites. All but one (the former ATS site in Norton) was considered through the SSM/SA appraisal framework. Of those sites, only the site at Langton Road performed less well than the sites which have been proposed as allocations.

- 3.2 How did the Council decide which residential commitments to include in Policy SD1? Are the sites shown on the Policies map as existing residential commitments up-to-date?

The sites currently identified in SD1 are

- At Kirkbymoorside: Wains Field (part constructed) and the former Russell's site (part constructed); Westfields is subject to reserved matters,
- Westfield Nurseries (completed) and Cheesecake Farm (completed) both in Norton; Broughton Road and the Showfield, both at Malton and under construction; Coronation Farm and Land at Rainbow Lane in Malton not started. The former ATS site and Langton Road in Norton not started.
- At Pickering: Land at the nurseries (Whitby Road), Whitfield Avenue Former Mercedes Garage, and Mickle Hill all completed; Land at Firthland Road (under construction)
- At the Service Villages: Thornton le Dale (well advanced); Nawton Beadlam (completed); Ampleforth (completed); Hovingham (completed); Sheriff Hutton (completed); Rillington (under construction); Sherburn not started.

In general terms the proposed commitments in SD1 reflect the more substantial (Major) extant permissions granted within the plan period. A number of commitments are also sites which have now commenced and are under construction. The sites

represent sites considered to be sustainable, either by the LPA or an Inspector, and in the plan making process the Council has chosen to revisit those sites which have been granted planning permission under appeal within that context. The sites align with the LPS in principle. Although the SSM has identified that the site in Langton Road does not perform as well as other allocations and commitments in terms of accessibility and impacts on form and character.

The identification of the ATS site as a commitment has been an informed conscious decision. The Council is not clear whether the current scheme subject to planning permission is coming forward. However, pre-commencement conditions are discharged, and a lawful commencement has been made. The site was not submitted through the plan-making process, but it is a brownfield site within the Conservation Area, and is very accessible to the town centre. The site has areas of higher flood risk, and a flatted scheme which enhanced the Conservation Area would be a form of development which the Council is keen to support, and there is developer interest in providing a viable format, which includes the provision of affordable housing.

The following circumstances have changed for the proposed allocations:

- Since publication planning permission on SD9, Kirkbymoorside, has obtained permission for six dwellings. (17/00969/FUL).
- Since submission permission in principle has been granted for the site identified as SD5, Whitby Road, Pickering for 239 dwellings (17/01220/MFULE)
- Since submission a planning application has been submitted for SD11, Slingsby (18/00686/MOUT).

3.3 If a planning permission expires, is it still allocated for residential development for the remainder of the plan period?

Yes, provided that it is consistent with the site's existing/previous permission. This would not mean that the scheme was identical, consistent with a residential scheme, and the policies of the LPS.

3.4 How would the Council assess a proposal for a revised or alternative development?

Revised or alternative developments would be assessed against the Policies of the LPS and the LPSD, in conjunction with any material considerations.

3.5 Are all of the sites developable within the Plan period?

The NPPF definition of developable defines these are sites which are in years 6-10 and where possible for years 11-15. To be considered developable, sites should be in a suitable location for housing development and there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged

It is noted that some sites (The Gladman Sites of Westfields Kirkbymoorside and the site at Sherburn) have been subjected to criticism for their lack of delivery. However, whilst these sites have made disappointingly slow progress, there is no evidence to indicate that these are not developable housing sites within the NPPF's definition.

The Council are aware that ATS site is potentially deliverable in its current format. It does not currently form part of the land supply. There is developer interest in the site. There is no evidence to indicate that such a site could not come forward. The site has specific wider benefits in its delivery.

The Wainds Field site at Kirkbymoorside is part completed, and the Council have tried at length to establish whether the developer, Trilandium, will complete the site. The Council is unable to contact them. As such the site is not capable of being identified as deliverable. However, the planning permission is extant, and in past discussions with the developer, there was the intention to return and complete the site. The site is also well-related to the settlement.

The former Russell's site, which has been part built out, has been recently bought. Its development depends on whether the landowner wishes to proceed with the extant permission which exists on the site.

## Site selection process

- 3.6 Has the site selection process for housing allocations been based on a sound process of sustainability appraisal and the testing of reasonable alternatives?

The chosen Site Selection Methodology (SD03) was developed with the SA objectives developed from the Ryedale Plan SA Scoping Report (TE01), and which were then overlain by local sustainability considerations, at a settlement and site specific basis. It was developed in conjunction with technical consultees and organisations in the development industry. It has provided a comprehensive, comparative, objective and transparent approach to assessing the complex, balancing exercise of site selection.

The Council are confident that the sites chosen represent the most suitable sites for development in sustainability terms, and will best meet the objectives of the LPS. The Council has appraised a range of sites, circa 300 in number (albeit some of similar configurations), submitted by landowners where they comply with the settlement hierarchy.

- 3.7 Is the methodology appropriate? Was an appropriate selection of potential sites assessed?

The Site Selection Methodology (SD03) was subjected to extensive consultation, and developed from the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report in terms of the objectives, with locally-specific objectives identified at the settlement and site-specific level. See SD03 (SA Report, each SSM Table and the Background Papers. The same approach was applied to site selection process undertaken for the Helmsley Plan, adopted in 2015. The selection of sites assessed was framed significantly by the LPS Settlement Hierarchy. Since the call for sites was undertaken with no predetermined criteria, a wide range of site sizes were made. As such the SSM, as part of the SA, applied a site size threshold was applied of 0.15ha at the Service Villages and 0.3ha at the Market Towns. This was to ensure that sites were capable of meaningful delivery, primarily in terms of affordable housing delivery. This still allowed the consideration of relatively small sites, and this was also prior to changes in government guidance regarding small site contributions. This has resulted in some

sites being discounted on the size their size, such as the site submitted by Representor 1084.

The Council assessed over 300 sites at/around settlements where housing allocations could be made in principle, in accordance with the Settlement Hierarchy. Sites were discounted being put through the SSM only on the basis that they were at settlements which were not specifically identified in the Settlement Hierarchy of the LPS.

The LPSD has been in production for some time, it has resulted in a large range of sites being submitted, a number of sites have been submitted after the extensive consultation of 2009, and in response to the adoption of the LPS which identified the spatial approach, and influenced later submissions. As such it is considered that an appropriate selection of sites has been assessed.

3.8 Are the reasons for selecting the preferred sites and rejecting others clear and justified?

The sites assessment process has been informed iteratively through Sustainability appraisal, a series of consultation events, and technical evidence. The Sustainability Appraisal Scoping, which covers the Ryedale Plan as a whole (LPS, Helmsley Plan and LPSD) was subjected to consultation which identified a need at the site assessment level for settlement- level sustainability appraisal. This was translated, with consultation, in to the Site Selection Methodology (SD03), which informed the Sustainability Appraisal and the Background Papers (TE02) and set out the assessment considerations experienced at the settlements. The assessment of sites has also been within the context of the LPS, and events which have taken place in the determination of applications, and this is set out in the Background Papers, alongside the responses received during the consultation events.

The sites consultation in 2015 was important because it demonstrated to date how the site assessment process had been undertaken and the interim findings on the sites, showing how the sites had performed both individually, but also within a settlement-wide context. The SSM tables were continually updated as and when new information was provided to reflect that the circumstances around the sites could change.

The wider settlement context has, for some sites, resulted in them not been taken forward, despite having performed well through the appraisal process. This is due to other developments having met the LPS requirement for that settlement. Site 173/252 at Nawton is an example of this (Representor 1094).

Nine of the representations relate to sites that are at settlements not identified in the settlement hierarchy of the LPS. This is a strategic consideration around the spatial approach of the LPS. Therefore these sites have not been subjected to Sustainability Appraisal.

The Council considers it has clearly explained why other discounted sites have not been taken forward in the constituent elements of the Sustainability Appraisal of the sites and the consideration of sites in a settlement-wide context as set out in the respective background paper, principally either due to lack of need based on existing development within the Plan Period or because on balance the proposed allocation(s) performed better and met the residual requirement. The Council is

confident that it has chosen the most suitable sites to deliver the residual requirement.

The sites chosen at Pickering (SD5 and SD6) have some constraints, which are mitigatable (SD5- ground source protection zone), and provide opportunities (SD6- green infrastructure corridor enhancement). They also have both direct main road connection and do not impact on the historic strip field pattern surrounding Pickering. Other site submissions (representors 1097 and 1064) considered as option choices would have significant impacts on the strip fields and their setting.

The Malton and Norton site representations concern sites which have not been taken forward:

Representor 1075 (SD2 and SD3) seeks alternatives (although not specified) to the Norton Lodge (SD3) proposal. Concerned regarding viability- although the Council has received, and appraised externally, viability work concerning the delivery of the site.

Representor 1063 (SD2) concerned that their site (417) has been omitted- the Council have raised in the SSM concerns regarding the implications of the development of this site on the River Derwent SAC and it is not confirmed by the Highways Authority that the access proposed is suitable. A small part of the southern extent of the site is also identified as a VIUA.

Representor 1066 (SD2, SD3 and SD4) seeks to supplement the existing proposed allocations with their proposed site 121/Woolgrowers site. This site fails the sequential test due to being in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and within a Rapid Inundation Zone Area.

Representation 1090 concerns the submission of large areas of land to the east of Norton. The SSM considered the sites in constituent parts and raised a number of developability concerns. If the site was to be considered in its entirety, this would be a strategic site, and as a strategic matter is not within the scope of the LPSD.

Representor 1068 concerning the omission of site 324 – and identification as a VIUA. The Council consulted on the site as a potential site choice in 2015, based on the need to consider reasonable alternatives from which to choose the sites to be taken forward as allocation. Based on the residual requirement and performance of other sites; in conjunction with site specific sensitivities the site was not taken forward. The Council considers it has justified within the SD03 and TE02 (Malton and Norton) the reasons why this site was not required. It has also been identified as a VIUA and this is considered in Matter 8.

Representation 1079 Seeks to allocate their site of 194 over that of SD4, because of concerns over constraints around the delivery of SD3 and SD4. The Council considers that the identification of SD4 was appropriate, and the site is deliverable, without significant constraints. Also, that there are no infrastructure delivery issues with SD3, in terms of reducing the roll out, and the Developers of SD3 have sought to provide the Council with evidence of the site's deliverability. It is also noted by the Council that until Publication, there was limited information provided about the site 194's deliverability and developability.

Representation 1083 does not criticise the Council's chosen proposed allocations, but seeks to allocate further land between Langton and Welham Roads. This land

performed poorly through the SSM notably in terms of adverse impacts on form and character, setting of a listed building and impacts on local road network.

Regarding the sites submitted in Malton and Norton, the Council is confident that it has chosen the most suitable sites to deliver the residual requirement, and that no representations demonstrate that there are any better proposed sites.

SD10 Amotherby was identified as an allocation for the following reasons:

- The site has relatively limited development constraints in principle;
- Amotherby has received very little housing in the plan period;
- Amotherby is identified in the adopted Development Plan as a Service Village there was no change in circumstances, until the representation 1006 (was made), to change this designation.
- The site represents the opportunity to deliver affordable housing, a play area (where none currently exists) and land for a 'kiss and drop' facility for the school. These a wider benefits for the community.
- The site was not identified in 2015 as a preferred site due to lack of clarification on ownership- resolved in 2016.

It is noted that Amotherby Parish Council (Representor 1006 (SD2) has raised criticisms over the approach of the SSM, which the Council have explained in the Regulation 19 consultation.

No sites at Ampleforth have been identified due to the development of a scheme off Station Road (part of site 288 a completed commitment). Site 160 (representor 1062) notes that the site had performed reasonably well through the assessment process. However, due to the inability to achieve a clear access (via site 288 as the proposed access was not acceptable to the highway authority) then the deliverability of the site became questionable. Furthermore, the Council remain unconvinced that site 632 (representor 1062) represents a suitable site in which to direct future development at Ampleforth. This is primarily due to ensuring that there is sufficient separation between the village and the college. There is also the fact that the access road from the village is in a poor condition, so even a smaller scheme would raise issues.

Representor 1028 (Historic England) has confirmed that they broadly agree with the consideration of heritage matters within the Sustainability Appraisal Process and the assessment of likely significant effects. They have sought clarification around the treatment of potential archaeology, which if found, could be of national significance. They have sought the inclusion of an appendix regarding the consideration and treatment of archaeology at the following sites: SD3, SD6, SD10 and SD11 and the Broad Location for Employment Land (as the Pickering Allocation has undergone archaeological evaluation which revealed no archaeology). They have also sought explanatory text around the site choices and further development principles concerning designated heritage assets at SD6 and SD11. The Council has no objections to these changes to the Plan.

- 3.9 Is the approach of allocating housing sites within Mineral Safeguarding Areas set out in the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan (Publication Draft) justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

The Examination of the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan (JMWP) has coincided with the LPSD. Changes to the wording of the Publication JMWP have resulted in changes to the Safeguarding Policy to reflect the issues and debate around safeguarding within the context of emerging Plans. Discussions have been had with NYCC around the recognition of the safeguarding designation within the LPSD. Whilst there is no objections to the principle of the proposed allocations, the Minerals and Waste Authority would seek that the LPSD takes account of the designation, and the Council have no objections to this, through the use of supporting text and the inclusion of a further Development Principle.

- 3.10 What criteria would be used to assess an application for a proposal for housing in a proposed Mineral Safeguarding Area?

Once allocated, sites under the Safeguarding exemption criteria, become exempt. NYCC and the District Council have been working together to produce a form of words which would seek to ensure that sites which are subject to a safeguarding designation, recognise this within the development of the site. The implications for the minerals resource are considered as part of the planning application process, within the context of the feasibility and viability of the resource's utilisation. This would be in relation to sites SD3, SD6, and SD11.

- 3.11 Are all sites viable? How has viability been considered as part of the preparation of the Plan?

There are a number of sites which have obtained permission and are being built out. Most of the sites identified as allocations are Greenfield sites with limited constraints. Ryedale has a generally strong housing market and this is reflected in the completions since 2012. Viability studies have been in respect of affordable housing provision and the implementation of CIL, and have been broad brush, whilst using site typologies indicative of the type of sites brought forward in Ryedale. The Council has not undertaken site-specific viability work. The Council has been clear to developers about the implications of CIL; the need to consider any on-site infrastructure; and that there will be a policy-compliant level of affordable housing. They have confirmed that they are aware and accepting of this (elements of which is already adopted through the Charging Schedule and LPS). Headline viability work was undertaken concerning SD3.

- 3.12 How was the spatial distribution of housing allocations determined? Is the spatial distribution consistent with Policies SP1 and SP2 of the Local Plan Strategy (LPS)?

The spatial distribution of allocations is consistent with the policies SP1 and SP2 of the LPS. The SSM identifies whether site's location is adjacent to Development Limits, or distanced from the settlement. The sites are, with the exception of the brownfield site, SD7 (which now has planning permission) contiguous with current Development Limits on at least one site boundary.

Since the Publication of the LPSD, the Service Village of Amotherby/Swinton has experienced a closure of the shop. The Parish Council have sought (Representor1006 SD2/SD10) to have the site SD10 discounted on that basis. Whilst this change in circumstance has occurred since the Publication of the Plan, the Council is aware that the shop has closed, and remains its lawful use, it is close to

Malton and Norton, and Amotherby/Swinton is a settlement which has not seen any affordable housing delivery in the plan period.

### 3.13 Residential Land Allocations in Malton and Norton-Policies SD2/SD3/SD4

a. What is the background to the site allocation? How was it identified and which options were considered?

SD3: was a more recent site submission derived from another much earlier site submission received soon after work commenced on the then Ryedale Core Strategy, and was also part of a much larger area of land known as 'Norton East', which was one of two strategic sites which were consulted on in the 2009 Ryedale Plan consultation. It was promoted by Barratt and Taylor Wimpey from 2015. The site has been considered alongside large range of different sites which have also been submitted. See SD03 and TE02 Malton and Norton for the detailed site assessment consideration.

SD4: The site was submitted back in 2009, but there was a lack of information about the re-location of the Council/County Council Offices, and so whilst the site performed generally well through the SSM, the deliverability remained in question.

In 2017 a resolution was reached whereby Members agreed to release this site, with proposals for a Public Services Hub being currently worked up for an application to be submitted in November of this year.

The site has secured accelerated construction funding through the 1 Public Estate funding from Central Government to facilitate the building of homes on the site.

b. What is the scale and type/mix of uses proposed?

SD3: The site would deliver c.600 dwellings, and represents a sizable urban extension site. The site will be expected to include a range of housing. The site also includes a NEAP, a sports field, and various walking trails, land for a primary school and a distributor/link road, and SUDs scheme.

SD4: This is a medium-sized site for residential use. Proposals are seeking to maximise the amount of affordable housing on the site.

c. What is the basis for this and is it justified?

SD3:

- The SUDs scheme is necessary for water attenuation in terms of managing surface water and for the river levels in the River Derwent SAC.
- The link road is necessary to mitigate the impact of the houses on the existing junction capacity. It will also bring wider benefits, helping traffic to avoid the central road network in the town.
- NEAP and open space is a policy requirement of the LPS and to provide commensurate informal recreation to provide a meaningful alternative to recreation along the River Derwent, to reduce recreational pressure on the SAC.
- Land for the Primary School is required, as NYCC Education have confirmed that based on completions to date and meeting the residual requirement, a new primary

school is required in Norton during the Plan Period. The school is not generated by the development *per se*, therefore it will be CIL and other funding to deliver the school. This is being worked with on by RDC and NYCC as to when the school is delivered in relation to funding streams.

- Affordable Housing provision will be expected to be plan compliant, and the precise tenure split, and the breakdown of the different house sizes will be derived by the Council's Specialist People (Housing) Officers. The Council is keen to make sure that there are no deliverability issues with the affordable housing due to lack of ability to meet with Registered Providers needs concerning universal credit, making sure bedrooms can meet occupancy standards, matched with commensurate living space.

SD4: The site is well located to the town centre, and is a brownfield site. It is a site where the density of development can be maximised, by reflecting the design character of the existing buildings along Old Malton Road, which are substantial villa-style properties.

d. How were the site areas and dwelling capacities determined? Are the assumptions justified and based on available evidence having regard to any constraints and the provision of necessary infrastructure?

SD3: The proposed yield of the site is informed by the Developer's submission and the density is in the range of 35 dph, which is aligned with other developments experienced across the district.

SD4: The density has been influenced as part of the Accelerated Construction bid.

e. What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and completions/construction?

SD3: There is no planning application submitted at the current time.

SD4: There is no planning application submitted at the current time. An application is to be submitted in November for the Public Service Hub Building.

f. What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

SD3:

- The provision of a link road between Beverly Road and Scarborough Road, providing a means to improve choices in the network in Norton and Malton.
- Alternative sources of informal recreation (such as dog walking) for residents to reduce recreational pressure on the River Derwent;
- Provision of a sizable range of affordable housing at the area of greatest need;
- Support/facilitate delivery of a new primary school by providing the land and CIL receipts;

SD4: The site represents an opportunity to build at a higher density, on a site which would not increase traffic movements. It is an accessible site.

g. What are the potential adverse impacts of developing the site? How could they be mitigated?

SD3: The HRA identified specific measures to ensure than the surface run off was kept to greenfield levels and that specific measures would be used to improve the water quality going into the River Derwent.

The Council, Karro Food Group (adjacent site operative) and the developer are looking at other means for noise attenuation to protect residential amenity and ensure long-term business plans for the Karro Food Group. (Representor 1077). We are in discussion regarding a form of words which reflects the proposed allocation and the existing factory.

SD4: There are no adverse impacts identified, the site would have signage to promote recreation activities away from the River Derwent. The site is a brownfield site. The Development Principles seek to retain the trees along the frontage of the site, and the design context of the surrounding build character. The site will be subject to development management principles concerning the protection of amenity because of the presence of existing residential property nearby.

h. How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

SD3: The Sequential Test was applied to all sites submitted. SD3 is almost entirely in Flood Zone 1. A very small part of the Link Road would be in Flood Zone 3, and it cannot be diverted due to the need to connect into the existing road at Hugden way. As essential infrastructure this passes the Exception Test.

SD4: The site is in Flood Zone 1, there is some localised surface water flooding identified- a FRA would be required.

i.. What are the infrastructure requirements/costs and are there physical or other constraints to development? How would these be addressed?

SD3: Given the sale of the site, and provision of a link road, and land for a school, headline viability assessment work was provided by the Developer and externally appraised which raises no significant viability issues. Representation 1075 – SD2/SD3. The Developers concluded that they could deliver a policy compliant level of affordable housing, in conjunction with the link road, CIL contributions, with land for a school (netted off CIL at educational land value). The external viability assessment, conducted by an adjacent local authority, concluded that it would be close to being policy compliant, but that the developers may have, being nation-wide housebuilders, considerable economies of scale.

SD4: There are no significant infrastructure requirements. The Development Principles had identified specific contextual matters (design/retention of trees) to be reflected in a proposal.

j. How have the effects of the allocations been considered on the strategic and local road network?

The Quantums of development have been established through the LPS. The Local Plan Junction capacity study considered internal junctions within the settlement, and then was expanded to consider A64 Junctions, and tested alternative scenarios in terms of combinations of development and impacts on capacity of junctions and air quality. The proposed 'Norton focus' scenario had less impact on junction capacity than a Malton focus. Further modelling of the A64 junctions shows that there is significant levels of capacity

based on the LPS quantum and the proposed allocation sites in conjunction with committed sites.

SD3: Evidence on the presence of the new link road in the local network has positive effect in the distribution of traffic, and alleviating pressure along Wold Street and Mill Street. The Council discussed the implications of this site with both NYCC highways and Highways England.

SD4: This site currently has significant employee movements which are not expected to be replicated in the replacement site.

k. Is the development proposed viable and deliverable within the plan period?

SD3: The development is expected to overrun the plan period based on the residual requirement, and the developer's anticipated roll-out as indicated at Publication. It is probable that it would be developed out more quickly than a single housebuilder. Two national house-builders are working together on the site.

SD4: The site has costs associated due to the demolition, but there is no ground contamination. The Council have been advised by an independent chartered surveyor who has identified no viability issues. The site is expected to become available by 2020, based on the proposed submission of a planning application for the Public Sector Hub in November 2018.

l. Are the development principles effective, justified and consistent with national policy?

Yes. They reflect both site specific considerations, and policy amplification from the adopted LPS. Further Development Principles are likely to be added concerning amenity, archaeology and the consideration of the Safeguarded Land. The Council has no objection to their inclusion.

SD3: The Development Principles are an important policy framework for considering site specific matters which also have a strategic arm to their action:

- The link road; land for a primary school, substantive noise buffer and visual amenity are required to make the development acceptable;
- The NEAP, and features around connectivity with the site, countryside and school are to promote non-vehicular access, and for the use of phase 3 SuDs are important regarding the impacts on the River Derwent SAC and air quality and health and well-being, to make the development acceptable in planning terms.
- The proposed MOVA system was identified by the Highway Authority to maximise junction efficiency in operation

SD4: The identified development principles concerning layout, architectural detailing and retention of trees are reflective of the design context and presence of protected trees. It is considered that these are justified and consistent with national policy, and will provide an effective steer to consider these site-specific matters.

SD3 and SD4:

The Electric Vehicle Charging capability is seen as essential if electric vehicles are to become standard. The LPS SP17 identified that to protect and improve air quality it will

support measures to encourage non-car based means of travel and the use of low emission vehicles which is important for improving air quality in Malton and Norton. The Sites Document is the place to specify that. The Government's reducing emissions agenda is also a material consideration, with the draft NPPF para 106 specific reference is made to in terms of parking provision: "ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug in other ultra-low emission vehicles" and in 110 that developments "Be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra- low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations" this is within the domestic curtilage.

The need to consider minimising light pollution is also in the NPPF para 178 c) "limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation". Ryedale is a predominantly rural area, and development sites should respect this. The development principle is not onerous and is sufficiently flexible to allow developers to respond without impacting on development viability.

#### Policy SD3 Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton

3.14 Is there evidence to demonstrate that the provision of the link road is deliverable?

The Developers provided headline viability work (which could be provided confidentially to the Inspector) which demonstrated that the link road and the other elements of infrastructure on the site and affordable housing provision was plan-compliant.

3.15 Is the requirement for a MOVA system at the junction of Scarborough Road and Westfield Way justified?

The Local Highway Authority advised that the use of MOVA systems on junctions would ensure that junction capacity is maximised.

#### Policy SD4 Land to the west of Old Maltongate (Ryedale House), Malton

3.16 Have plans been put in place for the relocation of the Council offices? What are the timescales for relocation? Is an alternative site(s) secured?

The relocation is expected to occur in 2020. A planning application will be submitted in November submitted on land which is currently used as a community building owned by the District Council for a Public Sector Hub.

#### Residential Land allocations in Local Service Centres (Market Towns)(Pickering, Kirkbymoorside) (SD2/SD5/SD6/SD7/SD8/SD9)

3.17 The following questions apply to each of the housing sites in the Local service centres (market towns) (Pickering, Kirkbymoorside) (SD2/SD5/SD6/SD7/SD8/SD9).

In providing this response SD5 is minded to approve application for 239 dwellings (17/01220/MFULE) and SD9 has planning permission for 6 dwellings (17/00969/FUL). Therefore it is proposed that, subject to SD5's determination, as a factual amendment that they are identified as commitments. On that basis, this statement does not specifically consider these sites within this statement. They have been considered within the context of the adopted LPS, and any material considerations and considered acceptable in planning terms on that basis.

a. What is the background to the site allocation? How was it identified and which options were considered?

SD6: A site which was submitted early in the plan-making process, it is a site which subject to the identification of the area at higher flood risk on the west to be excluded from the developable area, and performed well through the SSM. It was identified as an option choice in 2015, for contributing to meeting the residual requirement. It does not have any remaining strip fields, and access is onto the A169.

SD7: A site which was submitted early in the plan-making process. It is a site which performed well in the SSM in respect of its accessibility. The site is part of an identified VIUA, and part of an identified strip field system, and was identified as a Group 2 site on that basis, as the Strip Field systems are a finite historic asset. This sensitivity needed to be considered within the context of the site's situation relative to existing modern estate development, and the presence of the sports field to immediate south. The Town Council has given longstanding support for the identification of this site to meet the outstanding requirement for housing. In the 2015 Sites consultation the Council consulted on this site with a small selection of other sites to the north of the settlement (described as Option2) including 265 (SD9 which now has permission) and 201 (now SD8) and site 345. The Council has not received to date any information about the deliverability or developability of site 345. Option 1 involved the release of land to the south of the settlement for a specific local employer to relocate. Therefore it is considered, on balance, that a release of the field from the VIUA was necessary, balanced against a range of sustainability considerations. Other sites submitted would have wider, more significant issues such as coalescence with Keldholme, or be contrary to Policy SP2 of the LPS in relation to housing being located to the north of the A170.

SD8: A site which was submitted early in the plan-making process. It is a site which performed reasonably in the SSM in respect of its accessibility. The site is adjacent to existing modern estate development, and well related to the settlement's built form. In the 2015 Sites consultation the Council consulted on this site with a small selection of other sites to the north of the settlement (described as Option2) as discussed above.

b. What is the scale and type/mix of uses proposed?

SD6: The site submitter has identified that this is a site capable of c. 110 dwellings. This would be for a mixture of market and affordable houses in accordance with the LPS. The site would also have a LEAP, and would have an important Green Infrastructure corridor on the western extent of the site.

SD7: The site developer has identified that there would be yield of 45 dwellings as mixture of market and affordable units. The site is a medium-sized site and there are no significant constraints or infrastructure requirements.

SD8: As a small site this would be expected to deliver housing and a plan-compliant level of affordable housing.

c. What is the basis for this and is it justified?

SD6: The application of the sequential test for flood risk precludes the development of the full site. The proposed GI corridor will provide a landscape buffer to Vivis Mill and so it is considered justified to reduce the site extent accordingly. The identified yield has also been identified as being reasonable with the context of a development density of between 30 and 40 dwellings per hectare.

SD7: The Site Developer has identified the yield of 45 dwellings as mixture of market and affordable units. The site is a medium-sized site and there are no significant constraints or infrastructure requirements.

SD8: The site is situated close to modern estate development and is a size which would not have significant infrastructure requirements placed upon it.

d. How were the site areas and dwelling capacities determined? Are the assumptions justified and based on available evidence having regard to any constraints and the provision of necessary infrastructure?

SD6: The yield has been identified as being reasonable with the context of a development density of between 30 and 40 dwellings per hectare.

SD7: The capacity was identified at between 30-40 dwellings per hectare, taking into account infrastructure. The developers have indicated that their proposed scheme is likely to 45 dwellings. This is density of just over 30 dwellings per hectare, and is reflective of the site's lack of wider infrastructure requirements, and the lower density of surrounding development.

SD8: The yield of 18 is indicative. The capacity at 30 dwellings per hectare plus a development factor which reduced the site area by circa 30% also takes account of roads, although at this site there will be no site infrastructure other than the road layout, and any surface water management required.

e. What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and completions/construction?

SD5: At the time of writing a permission in principle has been made to approve a full application for 239 dwellings, subject to the completion of a s.106 agreement relating to affordable housing.

SD6: No planning application has been submitted

SD7: The site submitter has indicated to the Council that a planning application is likely to be submitted in January 2019.

SD8: No planning application has been submitted

SD9: Planning permission has been granted.

f. What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

SD6: Green Infrastructure Corridor to west of the site, market housing and affordable housing, public open space, and enhance entrance to the town on this side of Malton Road;

SD7: Market housing with affordable housing;

SD8: Market housing with affordable housing;

g. What are the potential adverse impacts of developing the site? How could they be mitigated?

SD6: Representor 1028 (SD6) identified concerns about the impact of the setting of Vivis Mill. The Council has consequently prepared a Heritage Impact Statement, and Historic England have been satisfied with its findings. Historic England have suggested a form of words which could be added to the development principles. The Council have no objections to the inclusion of this text.

Both SD7 and SD8 are adjacent to residential development, and as such matters of amenity will need to be considered through the development management process.

SD7 is a site which was identified as part of the VIUA which runs to east of Kirkbymoorside. The Sustainability Appraisal process has identified that this loss of the field is acceptable in sustainability terms, but it will be necessary to ensure that the eastern edge is carefully considered and this is identified as one of the Development Principles 4 and 5.

h. How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

SD6: Developable area of site is within Flood Zone 1. No surface water issues. FRA would be required, and use of SuDs would be expected as part of the Development Principles. There is an identified part of the site which is both Flood Zone 2 and 3. This area has been specifically identified in the Development Principles to be undeveloped. This is in accordance with the application of the Sequential Test regarding flood risk and will provide an important Green Infrastructure corridor. It is also to provide a landscaping buffer to the Grade II Listed Vivis Mill.

SD7 and SD8: Site is in Flood Zone 1. No surface water issues. FRA would be required, and use of SuDs would be expected as part of the Development Principles.

i. What are the infrastructure requirements/costs and are there physical or other constraints to development? How would these be addressed?

SD6 has some land which is excluded from the developable area, but in doing so improves the sustainability considerations of the site (as discussed above). The site submitter is aware and understands the benefits of this land's exclusion from the developable area. Sites SD6 SD7 and SD8 do not display any known or likely abnormal infrastructure requirements.

j. How have the effects of the allocations been considered on the strategic and local road network?

SD6, SD7 and SD8:

SD6 (and SD5) were subjected to junction capacity evaluation through the Local Plan Transport Modelling. Both Highways England and the Local Highway Authority have not identified any concerns either in terms of capacity, or any junction positioning, alignment and any other highway matters.

Site SD7 and SD8 were considered by the Local Highway Authority in terms of impact on the local highway network, and were considered indirectly by Highways England. No concerns were raised.

k. Is the development proposed viable and deliverable within the plan period?

SD6, SD7 and SD8: are Greenfield sites with no identified site constraints. They are small to medium/large scale in size, and on that basis have limited infrastructure requirements placed upon them. As such it is not expected that there are any viability issues regarding their deliverability. Concerning SD7 the site submitter has identified to the Council that a planning application is likely to be submitted in early 2019. SD6 and SD8 do not have an identified developer. There is no evidence, however, to suggest that there are any viability issues with the site's delivery. It is understood, from our records, that the identified owners have owned the land for a considerable period of time; in excess of ten years.

I. Are the development principles effective, justified and consistent with national policy?

Yes. They reflect both site specific considerations, and policy amplification from the adopted LPS. Further Development Principles are likely to be added concerning archaeology, designated heritage assets and the consideration of the Safeguarded Land. The Council has no objection to their inclusion.

SD6: the landscaping, open space green infrastructure development principles are to ensure that the site provides an attractive entrance site to the town, respects designated heritage assets (Grade II Vivis Mill and the Grade I Listed Church of St Peter and St Paul), and to provide plan-compliant recreational offer. The access details are to ensure that the non-vehicular modes of transport are maximised, as required by the Local Highway Authority.

SD7: The proposed height constraints, landscape buffer and particular attention to the eastern boundary are as a result of the elevated position of the site, and its open eastern elevation. The access requirements have been advised by the Local Highway Authority.

SD8: The proposed height constraints and boundary features are in response to the elevated nature of the site. The identification of the access is based on the advice of the Local Highway Authority.

Concerning SD6, SD7 and SD8:

The sites have not been identified as having any sensitivities regarding the use of SuDs, and whilst the developable areas of the sites are Flood Zone 1 it will be necessary to deal appropriately with surface water management.

The Electric Vehicle Charging capability is seen as essential if electric vehicles are to become standard. The Government's reducing emissions agenda is also a material consideration, with the draft NPPF para 106 specific reference is made to in terms of parking provision: "ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug in other ultra-low emission vehicles" and in 110 that developments "Be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra- low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations" this is within the domestic curtilage.

The need to consider minimising light pollution is also in the NPPF para 178 c) "*limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation*". Ryedale is a predominantly rural area, and development sites should respect this. The development principle is not onerous and is sufficiently flexible to allow developers to respond without impacting on development viability.

Residential Land allocations in Local Service Centres (Service Villages) (Amotherby, Slingsby)(Policies SD10/SD11)

3.18 The following questions apply to each of the housing sites in the Local service centres (Service Villages) (Amotherby; Slingsby) (SD10/SD11).

a. What is the background to the site allocation? How was it identified and which options were considered?

SD10: A site which performed well through the SSM appraisal process, relative to other sites submitted but in the 2015 Sites Consultation was not identified as a 'Group 3' site due to ownership complexities. The site has been submitted prior to the 2009 Ryedale Plan Consultation. These ownership issues were subsequently resolved. In conjunction with issues on the former preferred site concerning noise from an adjacent business, this resulted in this site (SD10) being considered to be a suitable proposed allocation.

SD11: The site was submitted initially by the landowner of the western field, and subsequently the field to the east, owned by another landowner was submitted. The sites were submitted just prior to the 2009 Ryedale Plan Consultation. The site performed well, relative to the other sites submitted.

b. What is the scale and type/mix of uses proposed?

Both SD10 and SD11 are considered to be medium-scale in their size, and are primarily focused on residential development. SD11 was submitted by the landowner with land identified for a play area and a car park for the school.

c. What is the basis for this and is it justified?

SD10: The indicative masterplans produced have a yield of between 44-45 units, and the LPSD has identified a conservative yield of 40 dwellings. This is also on the basis that the open space provision and 'kiss and drop' facility are provided for the school. The village does not have a children's play area, and the village hall is south of the B1257. The Council has received over the duration of the Ryedale Plan's production concerns about the level of traffic congestion during school drop-off and collection. It is noted, however, that the Local Highway Authority had not identified this as an issue. The site was identified on the basis that it represented the best performing site for housing, when compared to other sites submitted at the settlement.

SD11: The yield was calculated on the basis of being c.30 dwellings per hectare, the indicative masterplans previously submitted had been higher in their density. There is also a need to reflect on the land needed to ensure that the Trees are protected, and indeed the setting is enhanced, as the trees are within, and are a significant part of the character of the Conservation Area.

d. How were the site areas and dwelling capacities determined? Are the assumptions justified and based on available evidence having regard to any constraints and the provision of necessary infrastructure?

SD10: The yield was identified by the developer, the indicative general density is c.30 dwellings per hectare, which is typical within the context of Ryedale. It also reflects that there are areas of the site which are proposed for other uses.

SD11: The LPSD indicative yield is 36 dwellings and is between 30-40 dwellings per hectare; a density which is typical within the context of Ryedale. It also considered the two fields simultaneously. An outline planning application has now been submitted for 38 dwellings with all matters except access reserved. The Council is, at the time of writing, seeking more matters to not be reserved concerning layout and scale.

e. What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and completions/construction?

SD10: No planning application has been submitted.

SD11: An outline planning application has been submitted.

f. What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

SD10: The provision of housing, including affordable housing are the principal benefits. Amotherby has seen very little housing during the plan period. The Development Principles also identify the provision of a children's play space, and a 'kiss-and-drop' facility in the vicinity of the school to improve the parking situation in the village. These are identified by the site submitter in their supporting material. These are not elements which are required to make the development acceptable.

SD11: The provision of housing, including affordable housing.

g. What are the potential adverse impacts of developing the site? How could they be mitigated?

SD10: There are no adverse impacts in principle. Ground water protection measures and appropriate noise mitigation (from the road) may be required, but these can be considered prior to the submission of an application.

SD11: The line of trees which are situated on the western extent of the site are important to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and are within the Conservation Area. Their preservation will be important, and ensuring that there is an adequate root protection. This is achievable. Access is also identified from Aspen Way to avoid undertaking operations which could harm the health and physical integrity of the trees. Historic England have identified a form of words to provide them with sufficient comfort concerning the development principles of the site. The Council would have no objections to its inclusion.

h. How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

SD10: Site is in Flood Zone 1. No surface water issues. FRA would be required, and use of SuDs would be expected in the compatible part of the site.

SD11: Site is in Flood Zone 1. No surface water issues. FRA would be required, and use of SuDs would be expected as part of the Development Principles

i. What are the infrastructure requirements/costs and are there physical or other constraints to development? How would these be addressed?

SD10: The sustainability appraisal process has confirmed that there are no identified or potential constraints which would undermine the delivery of the site. The site submitter is aware that the site has a PRow running through the site and the need to retain that (subject to diversion). The site submitter has also proposed the development of an area of Children's play space, and a 'kiss-and-drop' facility for the school. These were identified in earlier representations as being facilities which the community would benefit from. Although the Parish Council are not supportive of the proposed allocation (Representor1006 SD10)

SD11: there are not expected to be any physical constraints, based on technical studies of the sites undertaken. The Trees which are subject to a Tree Preservation Order will need to be given adequate protection, and ensure their retention in the future, in relation to buildings.

j. How have the effects of the allocations been considered on the strategic and local road network?

Both SD10 and SD11: The sites have been considered by the Local Highway Authority who do not raise any local highway issues. They have been deemed to be unlikely to have an impact on the SRN by Highways England given their size and their location.

k. Is the development proposed viable and deliverable within the plan period?

SD10: There are no development constraints on the site which would render a scheme unviable in principle. The site submitters have confirmed that they are expecting to deliver a plan-compliant scheme in terms of affordable housing. It is a Greenfield site in a settlement where there has been very limited development, in a location which would be attractive to prospective purchasers. The site is adjacent to the southern part of the village, distanced from BATA, and close to the primary school.

SD11: An outline planning application has been submitted. There are no development constraints on the site which would render a scheme unviable in principle. It is a Greenfield site in a particularly desirable village.

l. Are the development principles effective, justified and consistent with national policy?

Yes. They reflect both site specific considerations, and policy amplification from the adopted LPS. Further Development Principles are likely to be added concerning archaeology, designated heritage assets and the consideration of the Safeguarded Land, to which the Council has no objection to their inclusion.

SD10: A number of the development principles are to inform the layout and design of the site within the context of the AONB.

There is a need to ensure that the Public Right of Way is retained through the site. Its precise siting is likely to need adjustment and this would be separate to the planning process- with consultation with the Rights of Way Officer.

The B1257 access is acceptable to the Highway Authority and ensures that traffic is not directed into the village along Meadowfield.

The site submitter has proposed to release land for a 'kiss-and-drop' facility for the school and play area. These are indicated on the masterplans submitted after the 2015 Sites Consultation.

SD11: The site is under the ownership of two landowners, and in order to ensure that a comprehensive scheme is brought forward the development principles seek to ensure that access is provided to the eastern field boundary to ensure there is no subsequent access/ransom issues.

A range of the Development Principles are around the heights of buildings, layout landscaping and retention of trees, this is to ensure that the development respects the context of the surrounding area, and pays due regard to the importance of the trees and the Conservation Area, the Trees are within the Conservation Area and subject to a Tree reservation Order. A form of words has been suggested by Historic England in regard to this matter, as a suggested development principle, and the Council have no objections to its inclusion.

Both SD10 and SD11:

Sustainable drainage will be expected to be incorporated into the schemes, the sites are in Flood Zone 1.

The Electric Vehicle Charging capability is seen as essential if electric vehicles are to become standard. The Government's reducing emissions agenda is also a material consideration, with the draft NPPF para 106 specific reference is made to in terms of parking provision: "ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug in other ultra-low emission vehicles" and in 110 that developments "Be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra- low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations" this is within the domestic curtilage.

The need to consider minimising light pollution is also in the NPPF para 178 c) "*limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation*". Ryedale is a predominantly rural area, and development sites should respect this. The development principle is not onerous and is sufficiently flexible to allow developers to respond without impacting on development viability.