

Examination of the Ryedale Plan- Local Plan Sites Document

Hearing Statement – Ryedale District Council

Statement 7 – Matter 7 - Specific Sites: Flamingo Land/ National Agri-Food Innovation Campus (NAFIC) (Policy SD15)

Matter 7-Specific Sites: Flamingo Land/National Agri-Food Innovation Campus (NAFIC) (Policy SD15)

7.1 Issue-Whether the proposed specific site allocations are justified, effective and consistent with national policy and the LPS?

a. What is the background to the site allocations? How were they identified and which options were considered?

Both Flamingo Land and the NAFIC site are large sites within the open countryside. They are in current use. These sites were specifically identified in a previous development plan (Ryedale Plan 2002) - to provide support in principle for the expansion/reconfiguration of uses within the current site extents. The identification of the sites in the LPSD is to continue that policy support in principle. The sites have local significance, and the NAFIC site has LEP interest. The Council considered that it was important to retain a policy response which helped to support investment in these sites. Flamingo Land is subject to its own Development Limits. The NAFIC site has a boundary extent as shown on the Policies Map, and is adjacent to the York Green Belt.

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

There are no applications for planning permission under consideration. The approach is to support the principle of business expansion and reconfiguration within those boundaries, subject to the Policies of the LPS. Both sites have the benefit of planning permission for the existing uses. A Certificate of Lawful Existing Use or Development (CLUED) has been granted on land at Flamingo Land. The Local Planning Authority has no objections to the consequential alteration of the Development Limits to include land that is subject to that CLUED.

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

Concerning Flamingo Land, the site area reflects the current Development Limits of the previous plan. At the time of Publication of the Policies Map the Council were not aware of ambitions for expansion of the site. Representation 1076 has identified that there has already been some expansion of the site, and the Council has no objections to amending the Development Limits to include this area of the site to reflect the existing development. The representations have also sought to include criteria which would be applied to any proposal brought forward as a planning application.

Concerning the NAFIC site, the site extent is not defined by a Development Limit, but is a reflection of the existing extent of the site from its time as a site occupied by the then Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, and the adjacent Green Belt boundary. To date, the LEP's ambitions for the site are to utilise the space and buildings within the existing defined site area.

d. What are the potential adverse impacts of the allocations and how could these be mitigated?

Intensification/reconfiguration of uses at both sites have the potential to increase traffic movements and the potential for landscape and visual impacts. Planning applications would be considered through the development management process if/when applications are made. Proposals would still need to be considered against the policies of the LPS, and any proposals would be considered by Highways England to evaluate their impact on the SRN.

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

There are no specific proposals to consider. The Policy is designed to be supportive in principle of additional development in these sites. The matters around infrastructure and costs would be considered by the operators/owners of the site in making a planning application, in consideration with the policy framework of the LPS.

The LEP is aware that ambitions for the NAFIC site could have requirements for significant improvements to junction capacity on the A64, which is part of the Strategic Road Network.

f. Against which criteria would a proposal for expansion of an existing employer be assessed?

Proposals for expansion or intensification of either site would be subject to Policies SP1 Spatial Strategy and SP6 Employment land of the LPS, SP8 Tourism and SP9 Land-based economy. Policies of SP12 (Heritage), SP13 (Landscapes), SP14 (Biodiversity), SP15 (Green Infrastructure), SP16 (Design), SP17 (Natural Resources), SP18 (Renewable and Low Carbon Energy), SP19 (Presumption in favour of sustainable development), SP20 (Generic Development Management Issues) and SP21 (Occupancy Conditions) and SP22 (Developer contributions and obligations) would also be considered.

g. How would a proposal for an alternative use be considered?

Against the policies of the LPS and LPSD, depending on the proposed use. See above.

h. Is the development proposed viable and deliverable within the Plan period?

The policy does not propose development, but offers policy support in principle. The policy is not to provide development land to meet the identified employment land supply in the LPS.