



The Ryedale Plan

Local Plan Sites Document and Policies Map

Representation Statement

(Regulation 20 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England)
Regulations 2012)

Submission March 2018

Contents:

Summary of the Publication Consultation Representations

Appendices

1. Who was Consulted and How
2. Representations by Respondent
3. Representations by policy/map/document section

Summary of the Publication Consultation and Representations Made

Publication of the Ryedale Plan commenced on 11 November 2017 until 22 December 2017. A copy of the letter is appended in Appendix 1.

The Council consulted with 1828 consultees, these are made up of:

- Specific Consultees and Duty to Co-operate Bodies (which are listed in the appendix);
- Landowners of the proposed VIUAs;
- Site submitters of all the sites;
- those individuals/organisations who wished to be consulted on planning policy matters (listed in the appendix) this includes members of the Public;
- Adjacent and other Local Authorities including North Yorkshire County Council and the North York Moors National Park Authority
- Parish Councils within the Ryedale District and adjacent Parish Councils;

A link to the Publication of the Local Plan Sites Document and Policies Map website is provided below:

<http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/local-plan-sites/publication-of-local-plan-sites-document-policies-map>

The council received responses from 115 representors (one anonymous). These are broadly broken down into the following matters:

General Matters

- 4 responses of no comment;
- 7 Responses of support or no objections (including those from Natural England and the Environment Agency and North York Moors National Park Authority as in respect of the Duty to Co-operate);
- General guidance/observations regarding housing land supply, matters regarding trees and development, provision of Green infrastructure and provision of non-vehicular modes of transport
- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust, whilst being supportive of the approach taken to assess the sites through the SSM, and the HRA is concerned that there will be insufficient land allocated for compensatory biodiversity and as such master plans may be required with further land.

- Responses from the County Council and Local Access Forum wanted to see more evidence of non-vehicular modes of transport promoted in the Development Principles and the use of Green Infrastructure;
- Kirkbymoorside Town Council made reference to the provision of further employment land at the town; and the avoidance of development to the south of the town due to the presence of the A170 and identified sustainability details which they would like to see taken forward into new developments, as a recognition of the Town's Transition Town Status
- 4 responses, regarding matters regarding the air quality at Malton including the implementation of complementary measures, and the scope and findings of the air quality study;
- The Local Access Forum have sought improved connectivity using non-vehicular modes of transport and enhancing Public Rights of Way

Proposed allocations clarifications

- Highways England sought clarification on the impact of the proposed sites on the junctions onto the A64 (SRN) and were concerned about the impact of committed sites and the impact of the identification of expansion land for employers and the specific policy for Flamingo Land and the National Agri-Food Innovation Campus on the SRN;
- The County Council has provided a response concerning its respect roles as:
 - Local Highway Authority, regarding collaboration on transport modelling and ensuring no unacceptable impact on the highway- particularly in relation to junction capacity
 - Local Education Authority in respect of educational facilities required as a result of proposed developments they have confirmed that a new school will be required in Norton, based on planned development, and that the delivery of this will be through a combination of CIL and funding.
 - The minerals and waste team have provided details of how sites would be considered in respect of the minerals safeguarding policy in the emerging Minerals and Waste Joint Plan.
 - Updated information has been provided in relation to Extra Care provision
 - General guidance has been provided regarding the consideration of landscape in the Site Selection Methodology.
- Historic England were concerned about the impact on the archaeological impact on the Vale of Pickering, particularly at Pickering and Malton as part of SD12

(Employment Land) and sought clarification regarding the impact on the setting and significance of designated heritage assets at Slingsby (Conservation Area, Listed Buildings and Slingsby Castle Schedule Monument, and at Pickering concerning the proposed allocations concerning the setting of the Listed Vivis Mill and cottage;

Proposed allocations support

- 2 responses which sought to define the extent of the Broad Location for Employment Land identified at Eden Camp from The NYCC and the site submitter.
- The identification of the Livestock Market within the Town Centre Commercial Limits has been supported by the landowner.
- 3 Representations of support for SD3, including the site submitter (with some clarification sought around the Development Principles (MOVA junction and external electric charging points, Cllr Paul Andrews and Norton Town Council (subject to the provision). Natural England commented on the importance of the mitigation measures identified in the Development Principles as part of the Appropriate Assessment work. Karro Foods, an adjacent landowner have sought clarification regarding noise to ensure the development does not prejudice their current, and future operations.
- Responses for all but two of the proposed allocations in support of the site's inclusion by the site submitter (the two which provided later material are concerned with SD10 and SD11).

Proposed allocations Objection

- The AONB Manager has raised concerns re SD10, but the concerns are not set out.
- Amotherby Parish Council objections were made to the proposed allocation (SD10) Amotherby Parish Council identified that since the shop has closed, the villages of Amotherby and Swinton should not be identified as a Service Village. They identified site 635 should be brought forward.
- 18 respondents raised concerns about proposed site allocation SD5, Whitby Road. Of these 17 responses were also made in relation to a planning application which has been submitted on the site:
 - Loss of trees
 - Potential flooding through surface water
 - Overlooking and privacy issues
 - Highway safety
 - Capacity of social infrastructure
 - Scale of site
 - Potential archaeology

- Two representations from other option choice site submitters (Fitzwilliam Malton Estate and Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation have raised concerns about the deliverability of SD3.
- 2 Objections to the inclusion of SD7 on the basis of the land being in the area of high landscape value and within a VIUA , loss of open space for dog walking
- SD7 – two representations made in support of extending the proposed allocation to include site reference 666 (one includes the agent for proposed allocation SD7).
- 3 objections to the proposed allocation of SD4 in principle.

VIUA matters

- 17 responses of support for the VIUA designations- these relate primarily to the proposed VIUA between Langton and Welham Roads in the form of a generally standardised letter, with three more expanded responses, but all identified reasons for the designation. Two responses supported the proposed VIUA designations at Old Malton; These supported both the designation and rationale around the designation.
- Weaverthorpe Parish Council have proposed two new, previously unidentified VIUAs.
- Individual objections to VIUA designation at Norton, Malton, Langton, Thornton le Clay Ampleforth and Kirkbymoorside (the latter is not actually within a VIUA);
- Individual objections regarding the omission of VIUAs Castle Howard Road, Malton and Weaverthorpe;

Treatment of Commitments

- Highways England sought clarification on the impact of the proposed sites on the junctions onto the A64 (SRN) and were concerned about the impact of committed sites and the impact of the identification of expansion land for employers and the specific policy for Flamingo Land and the National Agri-Food Innovation Campus on the SRN;
- A number of those representors whose sites have not been proposed as allocations have sought to identify sites at Kirkbymoorside and Sherburn as having deliverability issues. These are two of the three sites Gladman Ltd have an interest in within the District.

Settlement Hierarchy

- 4 respondents were concerned that there would be no allocations made at the Other Villages. These related to pre-existing site submissions and one new site submission To a small number of sites which are not within the Settlement Hierarchy identified for allocations in principle: at Langton, Claxton, Broughton, Sand Hutton.

Objections to Site Omissions

- 15 respondents object to their land submissions being omitted.

These have ranged from those sites identified as option choices in 2015 (sites 387/205 and 116 in Pickering and Site 324 Malton- the latter site is now a proposed VIUA) sites within the settlements where allocations may be identified (site 203 Pickering, 666 Kirkbymoorside, sites in south eastern Kirkbymoorside, site 259 Kirkbymoorside, site 160 and 632 at Ampleforth, site 635 in Amotherby, site 417 in Norton, site 149 in Norton and site 121 in Norton. Sites 660, 184 and 655 in Norton have been submitted as a strategic, mixed use site. Sites 648 and 649 which are also sites in Norton and identified as being a proposed VIUA. 252 Nawton, and 147 and 267, Beadlam.

Whilst some have sought to have their sites included as well as the proposed allocations, maintaining their sites are sustainable, others have sought to object to the proposed allocations on the basis of lack of viability evidence (particularly in relation to SD3).

Site Assessment of not proposed allocations (i.e. supporting their exclusion)

- Nawton Parish Council objected to the identification of a site (173/255) as a group 4 site, respectively, they suggested alternative site 481 to provide a link to the school.
- Representation on site 160, Ampleforth should be re-graded to a group 2 site due to the access issues.
- Individual support for the exclusion of site 387, Pickering

Policies Maps

- A small number of inaccuracies were identified with the Policies Maps:
The boundary of the AONB at Slingsby;
The extent of the Norton Lodge proposed allocation SD3;
The absence in the key of SINC sites;
The absence of Stonegrave Minster as a Scheduled Monument

SD15 Flamingo Land and NAFIC site

- Individual support for the retention of specific policies regarding the Flamingo Land Site, with clarification around the Development Limits and a Lawful Development Certificate.
- Highways England sought clarification on the impact of the proposed sites on the junctions onto the A64 (SRN) and were concerned about the impact of committed sites and the impact of the identification of expansion land for employers and the specific policy for Flamingo Land and the National Agri-Food Innovation Campus on the SRN;

SD13 – Expansion Land for Existing Employers

- The agent on behalf of the landowners of site 259 have raised concerns regarding the identification of the site for expansion land for the existing enterprise to the north. They have sought for a mixed use to include residential development. The SD13 land does not cover the full site.
- A local business Vellco Tyres sought to have land identified under SD13 in Weaverthorpe for their enterprise.

Appendix 2 sets the summarised responses by Respondent and the Council's response.

Appendix 3 sets out the summarised response by policy/matter and the Council's response.

Appendix 1

Specialist Place

Jill Thompson

01653 600 666 ext:327

jill.thompson@ryedale.gov.uk

9 November 2017

Dear Sir/Madam

Publication of the Ryedale Plan: Local Plan Sites Document and Policies Map

I am writing to inform you that the Local Plan Sites Document and Policies Map have been published for a six week period of consultation.

You have been notified of this stage in the production of these documents for one of the following reasons:

- Your organisation is a general or specific consultee in the plan-making process
- You have previously indicated a desire to be kept informed of progress in the preparation of the development plan
- You have provided responses to earlier consultations as part of this process
- You have submitted (or you act on behalf of) someone who has submitted land to be considered for future development

Both documents together with supporting information are available to view on the Council's web-site www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/local-plan-sites-publication They are also available to view at the District Council's Offices, Ryedale House, Old Malton Road, Malton, North Yorkshire, YO17 7HH during the office hours 9.00am – 4.00pm (Mon-Fri).

If you wish to make representations on these documents you should do so during this current consultation period. Following this consultation, the documents will be submitted for a formal examination in public and the representations made at this stage will be those that are considered as part of the examination process.

Details of the procedure for making representations are provided overleaf. Guidance notes for making representations and an online representation form are also available on the web-site.

If you require any further information or clarification about the consultation please send your queries to jill.thompson@ryedale.gov.uk

Yours Faithfully

J Thompson

Jill Thompson
Principal Specialist (Place)

Statement of Representations Procedure

The Ryedale Plan: Local Plan Sites Document (Development Plan Document) and Local Plan Policies Map. (Development Plan Document)

The Ryedale Plan: Local Plan Sites Document contains site specific land allocations for a number of land uses in order to ensure that the development requirements of the Local Plan Strategy are met. The document also contains some site specific protection policies.

The Ryedale Plan: Local Plan Policies Map illustrates geographically, the proposals in the Local Plan Sites Document and policies from the adopted Local Plan Strategy.

The Local Plan Sites Document and Policies Map cover the area of the District of Ryedale that is outside of the North York Moors National Park. Both documents cover the period to 2027.

Representations on either or both of these documents must be received before **4.00 pm on 22 December 2017**.

Representations must be made in writing. They can be:

- submitted on-line using the form provided at www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/local-plan-sites-publication
- emailed to localplan@ryedale.gov.uk
- sent to the attention of Jill Thompson, Specialist (Place) Team, Ryedale District Council, Ryedale House, Old Malton Road, Malton, North Yorkshire, YO17 7HH.

Representations may be accompanied by a request to be notified at a specified address of:

- The submission of the local plan documents for independent examination
- The publication of the recommendations of the person appointed to carry out an independent examination of the local plan
- The adoption of the documents

Who was Consulted

Publication Consultation consulted:

583 Agents/Developers and Landowners;

1061 members of the Public; and

The specific and general consultees below:

Please note that The Duty to Cooperate Bodies are in bold

	Organisation
General Consultation Bodies	Rural Action Yorkshire
General Consultation Bodies	Community Education
General Consultation Bodies	NFU
General Consultation Bodies	North Yorkshire Business & Education Partnership Ltd
General Consultation Bodies	Malton & Norton Area Partnership
General Consultation Bodies	Circuit Planning Jehovah Witness
General Consultation Bodies	Constituency Office
General Consultation Bodies	National Farmers Union
General Consultation Bodies	The Caravan Club
General Consultation Bodies	The Camping and Caravanning Club
General Consultation Bodies	British Hotels, Restaurants and Caterers Association
General Consultation Bodies	British Horse Society
General Consultation Bodies	British Holiday and Home Park Association
General Consultation Bodies	Harrogate Police Station
General Consultation Bodies	Scarborough Police Station
General Consultation Bodies	North York Moors Association
General Consultation Bodies	English Golf Union
General Consultation Bodies	Forest Enterprise
General Consultation Bodies	The Wilf Ward Family Trust
General Consultation Bodies	The Woodland Trust
General Consultation Bodies	The National Trust
General Consultation Bodies	Federation of Yorkshire Sport
General Consultation Bodies	Fields In Trust
General Consultation Bodies	Yorkshire Coastliner Ltd.
General Consultation Bodies	Ryedale Citizens Advice
General Consultation Bodies	Andrew Cooper Partnership
General Consultation Bodies	Institute of Directors- Yorkshire
General Consultation Bodies	North Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority
General Consultation Bodies	North Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Service
General Consultation Bodies	Ryedale & Whitby Safer Neighbourhood Area
General Consultation Bodies	Diocesan Board of Finance
General Consultation Bodies	Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment
General Consultation Bodies	National Car Parks Ltd
General Consultation Bodies	Land Access and Recreation Association
General Consultation Bodies	Equality and Human Rights Commission
General Consultation Bodies	British Trust for Conservation Volunteers

General Consultation Bodies	Scarborough YJS
General Consultation Bodies	North Yorkshire Moors Railway
General Consultation Bodies	York & North Yorkshire Probation Trust
General Consultation Bodies	The Georgian Group
General Consultation Bodies	Confederation of British Industry for Yorkshire and the Humber
General Consultation Bodies	Campaign to Protect Rural England
General Consultation Bodies	Forestry Commission
General Consultation Bodies	Welcome to Yorkshire
General Consultation Bodies	North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue
General Consultation Bodies	Yorkshire Forward
General Consultation Bodies	The Theatres Trust
General Consultation Bodies	Lambert Smith Hampton
General Consultation Bodies	The Office of Godfrey Bloom
General Consultation Bodies	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
General Consultation Bodies	National Trust
General Consultation Bodies	Design Council
General Consultation Bodies	Future Energy Yorkshire
General Consultation Bodies	Yorkshire Country Women's Association
General Consultation Bodies	North East Yorkshire Geology Trust
General Consultation Bodies	Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber
General Consultation Bodies	Local Government Information Unit
General Consultation Bodies	The Woodland Trust
General Consultation Bodies	British Holiday and Home Park Association
General Consultation Bodies	Yorkshire & Humber Association (THACS)
General Consultation Bodies	North Yorkshire Partnerships
General Consultation Bodies	CAMRA
General Consultation Bodies	Slingsby Aviation
General Consultation Bodies	The Mount Veterinary Group
General Consultation Bodies	Springs Lane Caravan Park
General Consultation Bodies	J M Butlers Builders Ltd
General Consultation Bodies	JVT Homes
General Consultation Bodies	Ryedale Builders
General Consultation Bodies	B.A.T.A
General Consultation Bodies	Kingspan Metal Cons Ltd
General Consultation Bodies	Flamingoland
General Consultation Bodies	Barnes Nurseries
General Consultation Bodies	Zetechtics
General Consultation Bodies	The Co-operative Estates
General Consultation Bodies	Neaco Ltd
General Consultation Bodies	Harrison Hire & Sales
General Consultation Bodies	Boulton & Cooper Stephensons - Malton
General Consultation Bodies	T M Barker & Son
General Consultation Bodies	Sylatech Ltd
General Consultation Bodies	York and North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce
General Consultation Bodies	Ryedale Tourism Advisory Group

General Consultation Bodies	Pickering & District Civic Society
General Consultation Bodies	Campaign for Real Ale
General Consultation Bodies	Thorpe Bassett Parochial Church Council
General Consultation Bodies	Malton Revitalisation Group
General Consultation Bodies	Atmosphere
General Consultation Bodies	York and Ryedale Friends Of The Earth
General Consultation Bodies	Welham Park Residents Association
General Consultation Bodies	Local Access Forum
General Consultation Bodies	Yorkshire Wolds Railway Restoration Project
General Consultation Bodies	York and District Amalgamation of Anglers York City Arms Sports and Social Club
General Consultation Bodies	Cycling Touring Club
General Consultation Bodies	On behalf of Malton Residents
General Consultation Bodies	Malton Congregation of Jehovah Witnesses
General Consultation Bodies	Friends of the Earth
General Consultation Bodies	Woodland Trust
General Consultation Bodies	Pickering 2020
General Consultation Bodies	Staxton Playing Fields and Sports Association
General Consultation Bodies	Age UK Scarborough and District
General Consultation Bodies	Ryedale Carers Support
General Consultation Bodies	Kirkbymoorside - Our Future
General Consultation Bodies	Dyslexia Network Plus
General Consultation Bodies	Pickering 2020
General Consultation Bodies	Malton Squash Club Committee
General Consultation Bodies	Kirkbymoorside Environment Group
General Consultation Bodies	Malton Norton & District Lions
General Consultation Bodies	Westgate and Westfold Neighbourhood Watch
General Consultation Bodies	Ryedale Forum for Older People
General Consultation Bodies	Ryedale Friends of the Earth
General Consultation Bodies	Chair of Ryedale and North East Yorkshire Rural Transport Partnership
General Consultation Bodies	Kirkbymoorside Business Partnership
General Consultation Bodies	Local Access Forum
General Consultation Bodies	Ryedale Community Safety Partnership
General Consultation Bodies	Chair Of Pickering Participation Group
General Consultation Bodies	North Yorkshire Local Access Forum
General Consultation Bodies	North Yorkshire Cyclists Touring Club
General Consultation Bodies	Malton Tennis, Bowls and Squash Club
General Consultation Bodies	Link Group - Ryedale
General Consultation Bodies	Future of Helmsley Group
General Consultation Bodies	Malton and Norton Rotary Club
General Consultation Bodies	Malton and Norton Business in Action
General Consultation Bodies	Derwent Training Association
General Consultation Bodies	Ryedale Special Families
General Consultation Bodies	NE Yorkshire Geology Trust

General Consultation Bodies	DLG
General Consultation Bodies	Ramblers Association - Ryedale Group
General Consultation Bodies	Hatcase Lane Allotment Association
General Consultation Bodies	Ryedale Festival
General Consultation Bodies	North Yorkshire Local Access Forum
General Consultation Bodies	CPRE
General Consultation Bodies	Ryedale School
general Consultation Bodies	Bradford & Northern Housing Association
general Consultation Bodies	Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust
general Consultation Bodies	Harewood Housing Society Ltd
general Consultation Bodies	Ryedale Housing Association
general Consultation Bodies	Sanctuary Housing Association
general Consultation Bodies	The Rural Housing Trust (National Agricultural Centre Rural Trust)
general Consultation Bodies	Home Housing
general Consultation Bodies	Housing Federation- North
general Consultation Bodies	Yorkshire Community Housing
general Consultation Bodies	Broadacres Housing Association
general Consultation Bodies	Chevin Housing Group
general Consultation Bodies	Railway Housing Trust
general Consultation Bodies	Yorkshire Housing
general Consultation Bodies	York Housing Association
general Consultation Bodies	Place Newton Estate
general Consultation Bodies	Strickland Estate
general Consultation Bodies	Trustees Nawton Tower Estate
general Consultation Bodies	Ganton Estate
general Consultation Bodies	Birdsall Estates Co Ltd
general Consultation Bodies	The Strickland Estate
general Consultation Bodies	Langton Estate Office
general Consultation Bodies	Castle Howard Estate
general Consultation Bodies	Duncombe Park (Helmsley Estate)
general Consultation Bodies	Aldby Park Estate Office
general Consultation Bodies	Halifax Estates
general Consultation Bodies	Fitzwilliam (Malton) Estates
general Consultation Bodies	Ganton Estate
general Consultation Bodies	Peter Greenwood and Co
general Consultation Bodies	Hovingham Estate
general Consultation Bodies	West Heslerton Estate
general Consultation Bodies	Smiths Gore
general Consultation Bodies	The Crown Estate
general Consultation Bodies	Scampston Estate Office
general Consultation Bodies	Huttons Ambo Estate
general Consultation Bodies	Helmsley Town Council
general Consultation Bodies	Kirkbymoorside Town Council
general Consultation Bodies	Norton Town Council

general Consultation Bodies	Malton Town Council
general Consultation Bodies	Pickering Town Council
general Consultation Bodies	Rye & Thornton Internal Drainage Board
general Consultation Bodies	North Yorkshire Police
general Consultation Bodies	Scarborough & Ryedale North Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Service
general Consultation Bodies	The Road Haulage Association, Northern Regional Office
general Consultation Bodies	RWE Npower Renewables Ltd
general Consultation Bodies	North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service
general Consultation Bodies	Transport 2000 North Yorkshire
general Consultation Bodies	Royal Mail Legal Services (Property Law)
general Consultation Bodies	Tees, East and North Yorkshire Ambulance Service NHS Trust
general Consultation Bodies	Yorwaste
general Consultation Bodies	Keyland Developments
general Consultation Bodies	The Vale of Pickering Internal Drainage Boards
general Consultation Bodies	NHS Property Services Ltd
general Consultation Bodies	AMEC Environment & Infrastructure UK Limited
general Consultation Bodies	BT Correspondence Centre
general Consultation Bodies	Manor House
general Consultation Bodies	Freight Transport Association, Northern Region
general Consultation Bodies	Three
general Consultation Bodies	c/o Lady Lumley School
general Consultation Bodies	Foss (2008) IDB
general Consultation Bodies	Deloitte Real Estate
general Consultation Bodies	Arqiva
general Consultation Bodies	York Consortium of Drainage Boards
general Consultation Bodies	Prospect Design
general Consultation Bodies	Ellis Patents
general Consultation Bodies	Defence Infrastructure Organisation
general Consultation Bodies	Department of Culture Media & Sport
general Consultation Bodies	Learning and Skills Council
general Consultation Bodies	Health and Safety Executive
general Consultation Bodies	Forestry Commission
general Consultation Bodies	Home Office
general Consultation Bodies	Ministry of Justice
Specific Consultees	Northern Powergrid
Specific Consultees	Open Reach Operations North
Specific Consultees	Northern Gas Networks
Specific Consultees	Vodafone and O2
Specific Consultees	Northern Electric Distribution Ltd.
Specific Consultees	United Utilities Operation Ltd
Specific Consultees	Transco PLC
Specific Consultees	National Transcommunications Ltd.
Specific Consultees	Yorkshire Water
Specific Consultees	Scarborough and North East Yorkshire Health Care NHS Trust
Specific Consultees	Northern Gas Networks

Specific Consultees	EE
Specific Consultees	British Telecommunications plc.
Specific Consultees	Telecom Securicor Cellular Radio (O2)
Specific Consultees	Ofcom
Specific Consultees	Cable and Wireless Global
Specific Consultees	North Yorkshire County Council
Specific Consultees	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
Specific Consultees	North York Moors National Park Authority
Specific Consultees	City of York Council
Specific Consultees	Scarborough Borough Council
Specific Consultees	Hambleton District Council
Specific Consultees	Policy and Partnership Unit
Specific Consultees	North Yorkshire Strategic Partnership
Specific Consultees	Howardian Hills AONB
Specific Consultees	Historic England
Specific Consultees	Constituency Office
Specific Consultees	The Office Of Police & Crime Commissioner for North Yorkshire
Specific Consultees	Harrogate Borough Council
Specific Consultees	Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority
Specific Consultees	Selby District Council
Specific Consultees	Harrogate Borough Council
Specific Consultees	Richmondshire District Council
Specific Consultees	Craven District Council
Specific Consultees	Brawby Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Aislaby(inc.Middleton and Wrelton) Parish Councils
Specific Consultees	Foston and Thornton-le-Clay Parish Councils
Specific Consultees	Slingsby, Fryton and South Holme Parish Councils
Specific Consultees	Langton Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Huttons Ambo Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Wharram Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Nawton Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Terrington Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Nunnington Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Barton-le-Street Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Ebberston & Yedingham Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Allerston and Wilton Parish Councils
Specific Consultees	Gilling East Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Scrayingham Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Warthill Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Kirby Misperton Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Rillington Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Foxholes Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Acklam Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Sherburn Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Salton Parish Meeting

Specific Consultees	Sproxton Parish Meeting
Specific Consultees	Gate and Upper Helmsley Parish Councils
Specific Consultees	Henderskelfe Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Coneythorpe Parish Council Meeting
Specific Consultees	Thorpe Bassett Parish Meeting
Specific Consultees	Barton-le-Willows Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Heslerton Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Sinnington Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Newton upon Rawcliffe Parish
Specific Consultees	Broughton Parish Meeting
Specific Consultees	Howsham Parish Meeting
Specific Consultees	Wharram le Street Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Burythorpe Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Scampston Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Habton Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Harton Parish Meeting
Specific Consultees	Barugh(Great & Little) Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Harome Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Lillings Ambo Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Ganton Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Kirby Grindalythe Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Thornton-le-Dale Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Marton Parish Meeting
Specific Consultees	Stonegrave Parish Meeting
Specific Consultees	Ampleforth Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Marishes Parish Meeting
Specific Consultees	Weaverthorpe Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Amotherby Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Thixendale Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Normanby Parish Meeting
Specific Consultees	Byland with Wass Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Wintringham Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Settrington Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Luttons Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Great Edstone Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Willerby Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Westow Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Scagglethorpe Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Pockley Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Edstone Parish Meeting
Specific Consultees	Fadmoor Parish Meeting
Specific Consultees	Wombleton Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Swinton Parish Clerk
Specific Consultees	Welburn (Kirkbymoorside) Parish Meeting
Specific Consultees	Cawton, Grimstone and Coulton Parish Councils

Specific Consultees	Crambe Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Welburn Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Cropton Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Leavening Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Hovingham & Scackleton Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Gillamoor Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Buttercrambe with Bossall Parish Meeting
Specific Consultees	Birdsall Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Sheriff Hutton Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Flaxton Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Oswaldkirk Parish Meeting
Specific Consultees	Claxton & Sand Hutton Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Bulmer Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Whitwell-on-the-Hill Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Beadlam Parish Council
Specific Consultees	Homes and Communities Agency (Homes England)
Specific Consultees	The Planning Inspectorate
Specific Consultees	Network Rail
Specific Consultees	Highways England
Specific Consultees	Sport England
Specific Consultees	Yorkshire Water Services
Specific Consultees	JMP Consultants Ltd
Specific Consultees	Environment Agency
Specific Consultees	North Gas Networks
Specific Consultees	Amec obo National Grid
specific Consultees	Natural England
Specific Consultees	Historic England
Specific Consultees	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
Specific Consultees	The Marine Management Organisation (MMO)
Specific Consultees	Mono Consultants obo Mobile Operators Association
Specific Consultees	Association of Police and Crime Commissioners
Specific Consultees	NHS England North Yorkshire & Humber Office
Specific Consultees	NHS Scarborough and Ryedale Clinical Commissioning Group
Specific Consultees	Office of Rail Regulation
Specific Consultees	The Coal Authority
Specific Consultees	York, North Yorkshire & East Riding LEP
Specific Consultees	Yorkshire Water Services Ltd.
Specific Consultees	Local Nature Partnership
Specific Consultees	Mobile Broadband Network Limited
Specific Consultees	Civil Aviation Authority
Specific Consultees	NHS Vale of York Clinical Commissioning Group
specific Consultees	Appleton-le-Moors Parish Council
specific Consultees	Arden with Ardenside Parish Council
specific Consultees	Brandsby cum Stearsby Parish Council

specific Consultees	Bransdale Parish Meeting
specific Consultees	Brompton Parish Council
specific Consultees	Brompton by Sawdon Parish Council
specific Consultees	Bugthorpe & Kirby Underdale Parish Council
specific Consultees	Old Byland and Scawton Parish Meeting
specific Consultees	Cottam Parish Meeting
specific Consultees	Coxwold Parish Council
specific Consultees	Danby Group (Westerdale, Danby) Parish Council
specific Consultees	East Ayton Parish Council
specific Consultees	Egton Parish Council
specific Consultees	Farlington Parish Meeting
specific Consultees	Farndale East Parish Council
specific Consultees	Farndale West Parish Council meeting
specific Consultees	Fimber Parish Council
specific Consultees	Folkton Parish Council
specific Consultees	Fridaythorpe Parish Council
specific Consultees	Full Sutton & Skirpenbeck Parish Council
specific Consultees	Fylingdales Parish Council
specific Consultees	Glaisdale Parish Council
specific Consultees	Goathland Parish Council
specific Consultees	Hartoft Parish Meeting
specific Consultees	Hawnby Parish Council
specific Consultees	Holtby Parish Council
specific Consultees	Huggate Parish Council
specific Consultees	Hutton Buscel Parish Council
specific Consultees	Hutton-Le-Hole Parish Council
specific Consultees	Ingleby Greenhow Parish Council
specific Consultees	Irton Parish Council
specific Consultees	Kilburn Parish Council
specific Consultees	Langtoft Parish Council
specific Consultees	Lastingham Parish Council Meeting
specific Consultees	Levisham Parish Council
specific Consultees	Lockton Parish Council
specific Consultees	Osmotherley Parish Council
specific Consultees	Rievaulx Parish Meeting
specific Consultees	Fadmoor Parish Meeting
specific Consultees	Rosedale East and West Side Parish Councils
specific Consultees	Seamer Parish Council
specific Consultees	Siltons & Kepwick (Cepwick, Never Silton) Parish Council
specific Consultees	Sledmere Parish Council
specific Consultees	Snainton Parish Council
specific Consultees	Spaunton Parish Council

specific Consultees	Stamford Bridge Parish Council
specific Consultees	Stockton on the Forest Parish Council
specific Consultees	Strensall & Towthorpe Parish Council
specific Consultees	Sutton under Whitestonecliffe Parish Council
specific Consultees	Thirkleby (with Osgodby) Parish Council
specific Consultees	Thwing and Octon Parish Council
specific Consultees	Thwing and Octon Parish Council
specific Consultees	Whenby Parish Council
specific Consultees	Wold Newton Parish Council
specific Consultees	Wykeham Parish Council
specific Consultees	Yearsley Parish Council

Report Grouped by Representor

1000 A Dale

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)	Yes			
Comment					
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites for the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1001 A Harrison

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Omissions	No	Effective		
Comment					
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Development in non-service villages should not have occupancy clauses imposed on them. There is room for development in many villages, but with this clause attached it makes the building of any more development non-viable, thus impacting on that village and its community.Development is being encouraged and focussed solely on the towns, which is very much to the detriment of the villages.It is perfectly reasonable to allow some development in villages, as well as in towns.There is pressure from central Government to support small and medium sized builders, the Ryedale policy does not help this, it prevents it. Whilst this policy in theory has merits, it does not work in practice as sites are not coming forward; they are blighted as the finished article is not worth the investment. Mortgage finance seems to be impossible.In my opinion the plan is 'unsafe' as it cannot deliver in allowing rural communities to thrive.					
Many houses have already been built in the gardens of existing houses in Moor Lane, Broughton. I would like to downsize from my current home and build a more suitable dwelling in the rear garden, but the current occupancy clauses mean that this is just not a viable option even though this would then open up a larger home for another family to move into Broughton and experience/add to the community here.					
The development line has also been drawn up around only my garden on this side of the street, even though there are houses either side of it, so a precedent has been set and a build in this particular place would only be filling in a line of dwellings that is almost complete.					

RDC Comment

The Local Plan Sites Document has been produced in accordance with the Local Plan Strategy. This has sought to deliver the majority of housing within the market towns, with some development at the Service Villages, and small-scale development to meet identified local needs. The change of approach could only be considered through a new strategic plan. The respondent did not identify where their property was to allow further comment.

1002 A Overton

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles				

Comment

The site density is too large for this size of plot, with only one access into and out of the site which is on a blind bend, therefore making crossing a very busy road at all times dangerous for pedestrian and traffic.

The congestion in Pickering is heavy at most times of the day especially along the A169 Whitby Road down to the roundabout and then out on the A170 Hungate Road to the traffic lights at Lidl. Such a big development site would cause more traffic , pollution, health and safety and air quality. Also the local doctors and dentist and schools do not have the capacity to cope with the extra people this site would bring into Pickering. There is also concern that emergency services would have difficulty accessing the site due to not enough parking spaces being allocated to the properties on the site. This site will take 6 years to build – 40 houses per year, so we will have six years of noise, dirt, pollution etc. to deal with. Plus we were told that bungalows for bungalows were being built on the site but this is not now the case – I live in a bungalow and I will have a two storey house built in front of me therefore blocking my light and privacy. It is bad enough a bungalow being built in front of me but not a two storey house. There are also concerns regarding the Tree Preservation Order on all the trees on this site together with the wildlife. I am also concerned regarding the drainage of this site and any possible flooding coming down.

RDC Comment

The Publication of the Local Plan Sites Document has coincided with the submission of a planning application. The proposed allocation of the site in the Development Plan sets out key parameters. The Local Planning Authority has considered the implications of the development of this site amongst many other sites around Pickering, and it has concluded that the site is acceptable in planning terms for residential development, and the strategic implications of this have been considered and matters of principle such as the provision of an acceptable access. Other site-specific matters, in terms of residential amenity, trees and biodiversity and surface water management will be considered through the consideration, and determination of the planning application to ensure the proposal is acceptable in planning terms. In terms of construction activities and their duration, this is not a reason for refusal, however, there will be conditions imposed on the operations, to ensure that there are no adverse impacts during construction.

1003 A Priestly

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)	Yes			
Comment					
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites for the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents at all times of the year. This area should be protected in order to maintain the rural atmosphere of this beautiful town.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1004 A Purser

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations	No	Justified		
Comment					
Site 156 should be removed from the plan. The development of site 156 would result in coalescence with Keldholme which contravenes objectives of the plan. It would also result in the loss of dog walking amenity land at a Town with deficiencies in Market Town amenity space. The site is also part of a medieval field system; is a VIUA and is within an Area of High Landscape Value which should mean that it is not suitable for development.					
The site is graded as a Group 2 site but another site (ref 431) which was grouped in Group 3 was not taken forward.					
RDC Comment					
Site 156 was chosen as a proposed allocation for a range of reasons. The loss of the site from the strip field system is acknowledged as the reason for a Group 2 status. However, account was taken of the fact that the field boundary is retained, the site does not extend beyond the sports field, therefore is not resulting in visual/physical coalescence. The relationship to Kirkbymoorside's built form was also taken into account, and it was considered that this, combined with the sustainable location of the site, as it is well located to the town centre, meant that it was considered on balance acceptable to be identified as an allocation. The Area of High Landscape Value and VIUA designations, and the impact on those designations was considered, and it was concluded that development of this site would not materially undermine the residual areas of land which are subject to those landscape designations. The Public Rights of Way will remain in place and provide access to the fields beyond. 431 is a large site, of which the southern half would have been particularly prominent. The Council also received no subsequent information about that site's capability of being developed.					

1004 A Purser

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD7 - Housing Allocation - Land to the south of Swineherd Lane, Kirkbymoorside: Development Principles				
Comment					
Site 156 should be removed from the plan. The development of site 156 would result in coalescence with Keldholme which contravenes objectives of the plan. It would also result in the loss of dog walking amenity land at a Town with deficiencies in Market Town amenity space. The site is also part of a medieval field system; is a VIUA and is within an Area of High Landscape Value which should mean that it is not suitable for development.					
The site is graded as a Group 2 site but another site (ref 431) which was grouped in Group 3 was not taken forward.					
RDC Comment					
Site 156 was chosen as a proposed allocation for a range of reasons. The loss of the site from the strip field system is acknowledged as the reason for a Group 2 status. However, account was taken of the fact that the field boundary is retained, the site does not extend beyond the sports field, therefore is not resulting in visual/physical coalescence. The relationship to Kirkbymoorside's built form was also taken into account, and it was considered that this, combined with the sustainable location of the site, as it is well located to the town centre, meant that it was considered on balance acceptable to be identified as an allocation. The Area of High Landscape Value and VIUA designations, and the impact on those designations was considered, and it was concluded that development of this site would not materially undermine the residual areas of land which are subject to those landscape designations. The Public Rights of Way will remain in place and provide access to the fields beyond. 431 is a large site, of which the southern half would have been particularly prominent. The Council also received no subsequent information about that site's capability of being developed.					

1005 A Resident of Welham Road

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)	Yes			
Comment					
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.					
RDC Comment					
Noted. This has no address on the representation.					

1006 Amotherby Parish Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD10 - Housing Allocation- Land to the south of Amotherby Primary School, Amotherby: Development Principles				
Comment					
<p>The allocation fails to meet the policy requirements of the Local Plan Strategy and the NPPF. The development is not small in scale and in this respect will be in conflict with SP1 of the Local Plan Strategy. It will be detrimental to the character of the settlement and its setting in conflict with SP1, SP12, Sp13 and SP20 of the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The site is too large and has a poor relationship with the village. Its development at the scale proposed will have an adverse impact on a substantially linear settlement.</p> <p>Development of the site may lead to an expansion of the school which will add to traffic congestion and there is no guarantee that the proposed kiss and drop facility would be of benefit to the village.</p>					
RDC Comment					
<p>The Local Plan Strategy makes it clear that the size of sites (para 4.18) is indicative.</p> <p>The District Council is of the view that the development of the site would not be detrimental to the character of the settlement and is well located to the village being immediately adjacent to the primary school which is centrally located in the village.</p>					

1006 Amotherby Parish Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations	No	Justified	Yes	Yes
Comment					
<p>The designation of Amotherby as a Service Village should be reassessed. This is due to the loss of a service (shop) originally deemed to be significant.</p> <p>The overprovision of housing in the Service Villages by 58 dwellings calls into question the need for any substantial development in Amotherby at all.</p> <p>The proposed allocation is not small scale and the proposed number of dwellings is excessive for Amotherby, inconsistent with definition in the Local Plan Strategy and is therefore unsound.</p> <p>If found sound, the number of dwellings on the site should be reduced to a number that complies with the definition of small scale.</p>					

RDC Comment					
Amotherby is identified as a Service Village in the development plan (Local Plan Strategy).The presence of a shop was one factor that supported its status in the settlement hierarchy. Despite the District Council regularly monitoring village service provision, the closure of the shop was not something that the District Council was aware of as it published the plan. The Local Plan Strategy makes it clear that the level of provision of services at the service villages will be taken into account as the sites document is prepared to reflect any change in circumstances. In this respect, there would not be a policy requirement to allocate land at Amotherby. The District Council is of the view that the proposed site is, in all other respects, a suitable site for housing development which provides the unique opportunity to secure benefits for the village and the school.					
The Local Plan Strategy makes it clear that the size of sites (para 4.18) is indicative.					
The Ryedale Plan aims to distribute development across the serviced village tier. Amotherby has had no recent development of any meaningful scale and no development which has supported the delivery of affordable housing in recent times. The 'overprovision' of housing at the service village tier is not at a scale which is considered to undermine the Local Plan Strategy. It reflects a positive approach to the granting of planning permissions at these settlements to address housing requirements.					

1006 Amotherby Parish Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations				
Comment					
If the Planning Authority persists with the designation of Amotherby as a Service Village and the proposed allocation (site 148) cannot be modified to make it sound and to meet requirements of the Local Plan Strategy, the Parish Council would favour the development of site 635.					
This would provide a more realistic number of dwellings (20), have less impact on the character of the village and with greater certainty that the development will come forward.					
RDC Comment					
The Local Planning Authority is of the view that the proposed site is a more appropriate development site for the village for a range of reasons. The Parish Council will be aware that a planning application to develop site 635 was recently refused by the Local Planning Authority.					

1007 C Barker

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles				
Comment					

Object to the application to build an estate of houses off The Whitby Road. (SD5)

I live on Corbie Way, and my bungalow backs on to proposed site.

The lack of privacy that this develop will cause to all the houses on Whitby Road, Corbie Way and Marshall Drive.

The increased risk of flooding. Many reports have been written about fields being built on and the increases of flooding.

I do not believe that the exit/entrance to the proposed site is safe, either for vehicles or pedestrians.

The effect that this increase in populations is going to have on the Schools and Doctors surgery, (there is still the ongoing building at Mickle Hill) This development is too big and unnecessary.

RDC Comment

The proposed allocation identifies the principle of development, and key parameters concerning site specific matters through the Development Principles. The response is made in relation to a submitted planning application on the site. The Highway Authority have advised that the access is acceptable in principle. Matters around residential amenity, surface water management are important and will need to be satisfactorily addressed. The Local Education Authority has identified no provision issues for the proposed allocations. The Doctors Surgeries and CCGs have been made aware over a number of years of the housing delivery across the District, prior to the adoption of the Local Plan Strategy, and during the production of the Local Plan Sites Document.

1008 C D Wilson

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations				

Comment

Object to the development of site 347 (Whitby Road, Pickering) for the following reasons:

- potential for flooding
- Loss of trees and hedgerows
- density will contribute to flooding
- Loss of privacy
- Dangerous siting of access road, road safety and congestion
- insufficient infrastructure (schools, Doctors, Dentists)

RDC Comment

The proposed allocation identifies the principle of development, and key parameters concerning site specific matters. The response is made in relation to a submitted planning application on the site. The Highway Authority have advised that the access is acceptable in principle. Matters around residential amenity, surface water management are important and will need to be satisfactorily addressed. The Local Education Authority has identified no provision issues for the proposed allocations. The Doctors Surgeries and CCGs have been made aware over a number of years of the housing delivery across the

District, prior to the adoption of the Local Plan Strategy, and during the production of the Local Plan Sites Document.

1008 C D Wilson

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles				
Comment					
Object to the development of site 347 (Whitby Road, Pickering) for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• potential for flooding• Loss of trees and hedgerows• density will contribute to flooding• Loss of privacy• Dangerous siting of access road, road safety and congestion• insufficient infrastructure (schools, Doctors, Dentists)					
RDC Comment					
The allocation identifies the principle of development, and key parameters concerning site specific matters. The response is made in relation to a submitted planning application on the site. The Highway Authority have advised that the access is acceptable in principle. Matters around residential amenity, surface water management are important and will need to be satisfactorily addressed. The Local Education Authority has identified no provision issues for the proposed allocations. The Doctors Surgeries and CCGs have been made aware over a number of years of the housing delivery across the District, prior to the adoption of the Local Plan Strategy, and during the production of the Local Plan Sites Document.					

1009 C Garner

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Omissions	No		No	
Comment					
Not sound, not legally compliant regarding policies map. Takes no cognisance of our desire to preserve Sand Hutton Walled Garden and its remaining walls. House could be built under paragraph 55 rules, i.e. as a passivhaus. No cognisance has been taken by RDC Planning Department to consider this approach. Should be more flexible to permit building outside the permitted villages, and development zones. Villages in terminal decline owing to lack of movement of householders except when they die.					
RDC Comment					

The Local Plan Sites Document is in accordance with the Local Plan Strategy, and embodies the purpose of Paragraph 55 of the NPPF. Passivhaus is not sufficient to meet the requirements of the fourth requirement of Paragraph 55. The Local Plan Strategy provides a range of specific means for the delivery of housing to meet identified local needs within areas of which are in the Other Villages or Open Countryside.

1010 C I Watson

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				
Comment	It is unreasonable and unnecessary to designate part of my private garden as valued landscape when because of heavy vegetation screening this could only be valued by me. (Kirkbymoorside - 209 and 556)				
RDC Comment	Visually Important Undeveloped areas are, in the vast majority, privately owned areas of land, which are unlikely to have public access. The site subject to this representation is not within the VIUA which runs down the eastern side of Kirkbymoorside. It is within a Conservation Area, and the land to the east is within the Area of High Landscape Value. This recognises that there are visual sensitivities, which would need to be considered if a development proposal is made.				

1113 Chris Robinson

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General					
Comment	As for the local plan:- If the road layouts at Broughton Road/Newbiggin, the roundabouts at Scagglethorpe end of bypass, the lack of proper junction at York Road end of bypass, the lack of any junction at Broughton Road onto bypass, the appalling lack of monitoring of parking on nearly every road in both towns, etc. etc. etc., are anything to go by then the plan will contain nothing more than the usual disgraceful waste of money with no benefits what so ever.				
RDC Comment	The Local Plan Sites Document is supporting the delivery of the Local Plan Strategy which sets out a series of objectives which were formulated from extensive consultation and engagement as part of the production of the Local Plan Strategy. The Council has worked closely with both Highways England and The County Council Highway Authority, alongside a range of service delivery providers, to ensure that growth is realistically delivered, to meet identified needs, and in a manner which reflects a range of sustainability considerations.				

1011 Councillor P Andrews

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General		No	Justified		
Comment					
There should be a policy in place at Malton and Norton restricting all new development to sites which have direct access to a four way intersection with the A64 to avoid having to drive through the Town Centres. A policy should be added to the plan to this effect.					
RDC Comment					
This a strategic spatial approach which is not part of the Strategic Development Plan. It may have adverse consequences regarding the ability to make reasoned site choices and allow holistic consideration of sites. The sites which are proposed as allocations can access a grade-separated junction with access to the A64. They are also within walking distance of the town centres (Malton and Norton) to have opportunities for integrated connectivity.					

1011 Councillor P Andrews

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General		No	Justified		
Comment					
For Malton and Norton, the Plan will be unsound unless and until the roundabouts at Brambling Fields are rebuilt and an HGV restriction is made for the level crossing which remedies traffic congestion to the satisfaction of the local community.					
RDC Comment					
The Highway Authority (Highways England and North Yorkshire County Council) have not identified any operational deficiency in relation to the Brambling Fields Junction. The HGV Restriction is being brought in imminently by the County Council who have the legal capability to undertake the restriction.					

1011 Councillor P Andrews

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations	No	Justified		
Comment					
All extant planning permissions should be taken into account in assessing land allocation requirements. It is understood that sites granted on appeal (Langton Road) have not been included in the calculations. The figures should be revised to reflect this.					

RDC Comment					
The Council is confident that the approach of the identification of deliverable commitments and proposed allocations, in combination with the identified land supply buffer and the operation of the 'zone of tolerance' is a positive, and responsive approach to ensuring the Local Plan Strategy housing requirements are delivered. Langton Road has been included in the land supply calculations. The ATS site has not been included in the land supply calculations as the landowner has confirmed that the current permission is not viable.					

1011 Councillor P Andrews

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations	No	Justified		
Comment					
Support the inclusion of the Beverley Road site as a residential land allocation. Object to all other land allocations for residential development in Malton and Norton. The land allocation at Ryedale House should be deleted and any other land allocations other than extant permissions and the Beverley Road site.					
RDC Comment					
Note support for Beverley Road site. The delivery of housing on the Ryedale House would be subject to specific parameters regarding scale, design and massing of the development.					

1011 Councillor P Andrews

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles	Yes	Justified		
Comment					
Support the inclusion of the Beverley Road site as a residential land allocation.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1011 Councillor P Andrews

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD4 - Housing Allocation - Land to the west of Old Ryedale District Council				

	Maltongate (Ryedale House), Malton: Development Principles				
Comment					
The land allocation at Ryedale House should be deleted.					
RDC Comment					
The Council have carefully considered the principle of residential development, through the site selection methodology, and concluded that subject to general development parameters and site specific consideration which are set out in the Local Plan Strategy and the Development Principles, respectively, the site represents a sustainable location for housing. The site assessment process undertaken by the LPA , and that undertaken by the District Council through a Independent Chartered Surveyor have found no unsurmountable constraints on delivery.					

1011 Councillor P Andrews

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD4 - Housing Allocation - Land to the west of Old Maltongate (Ryedale House), Malton: Development Principles	No	Justified		

Comment

Object to the proposed allocation of land at Ryedale House. The maintenance of Ryedale House has been neglected and the Council has not managed its resources wisely. There is other public sector land adjacent to the site and the allocation of the Ryedale House site may be the thin end of the wedge. The land fits in with green spaces on the other side of the road and provides a natural break between Malton and Old Malton. The proposed allocation should be deleted from the plan.

RDC Comment

The condition of Ryedale House is not a material planning consideration- it is not a building Listed for its historic or architectural merit. The Development Principles make specific reference to the need for retaining frontage and reflecting the design character of buildings in the area. The site is a brownfield site. It is not clear what is meant by the 'thin end of the wedge'.

1012 D A and J M Drinkwater

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)	Yes			

Comment

Support the proposed VIUA for land east of Welham Road. The Council is entitled to review and consider new sites for the area and to formulate a new

policy for the Plan. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II listed buildings including historic racing stables. The PROW which run adjacent to the proposed VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.

RDC Comment

Noted.

1013 D A Coe

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				
Comment					
Object to the VIUA of plot 85 Low Street Thornton le Clay. Small area, on three side dwellings with a 15 metre road frontage. Not viewed when approaching the village, but only when passing it and so makes no contribution to the character and form of the village. The site is of no historical/archaeological interest nor near any such site or building- site does not fit any criteria used to identify VIUAs.					
RDC Comment					
Council considers that form and character impacts regarding Visually Important Undeveloped Areas can be experienced from within the Settlement- as part of its character, and showing the intervisibility with other properties. As such it continues to meet the relevant test -Contribution the space makes to the overall form and character of the settlement.					

1014 D and A Bales

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations	No			
Comment					
Object to the proposed allocation at Whitby Road, Pickering. Concerns relate to:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access and highway safety • Density of development which is not in keeping with the area • Potential for flooding • Loss of trees and hedges • Unclear why the site is now considered to be suitable for development when previously it was considered unsuitable 					
RDC Comment					
The proposed allocation identifies the principle of development, and key parameters concerning site specific matters. It (as an allocation) represents the					

progression of planning policy since the 2002 Ryedale Local Plan. Allocations are made in response to the adopted Development Plan (Local Plan Strategy) and a required to deliver the housing requirement. The site was identified in the 2015 Sites Consultation as an Option Choice, and has performed well through the site assessment process. The response is made in relation to a submitted planning application on the site. The Highway Authority have advised that the access is acceptable in principle. Matters around density, residential amenity, surface water management are important and will need to be satisfactorily addressed.

1014 D and A Bales

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles				
Comment					
Object to the proposed allocation at Whitby Road, Pickering. Concerns relate to:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access and highway safety • Density of development which is not in keeping with the area • Potential for flooding • Loss of trees and hedges • Unclear why the site is now considered to be suitable for development when previously it was considered unsuitable 					
RDC Comment					
The proposed allocation identifies the principle of development, and key parameters concerning site specific matters. It (as an allocation) represents the progression of planning policy since the 2002 Ryedale Local Plan. Allocations are made in response to the adopted Development Plan (Local Plan Strategy) and a required to deliver the housing requirement. The site was identified in the 2015 Sites Consultation as an Option Choice, and has performed well through the site assessment process. The response is made in relation to a submitted planning application on the site. The Highway Authority have advised that the access is acceptable in principle. Matters around density, residential amenity, surface water management are important and will need to be satisfactorily addressed.					

1015 D Cartman

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)	Yes			
Comment					
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites from the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and					

bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.
RDC Comment
Noted.

1016 Derwent Practice Dr H Taylor

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Comment					
In the Plans for further new housing in Norton allowance has been made for a new surgery. I presume that this means that we will be able to bid for the money to expand our practice premises to accommodate the increase in the population. I would be grateful to if you could let me know the scale and process for this.					
RDC Comment					
Unclear whether this is a representation on the plan. The allocation at Norton does not in itself trigger the need for a new surgery. CIL is the mechanism to generate funds for infrastructure improvements. The spending of this is decided by Members of District Council, based on priorities identified by delivery organisations.					

1017 E Hazelwood Bell

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations	No			
Comment					
Object to the proposed development of site 347 (Whitby Road, Pickering). Concerns relate to:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • highway safety and congestion with increased pollution and fumes • layout and density which is not in keeping with a semi-rural area • loss of trees and impact on nature conservation • loss of light, privacy and outlook to the detriment of the residential amenity of neighbours • flood risk , in particular at the southern boundary and the potential for increased risk of flooding on adjacent/nearby lower ground 					
RDC Comment					
The proposed allocation identifies the principle of development, and key parameters concerning site specific matters. Allocations are made in response to the adopted Development Plan (Local Plan Strategy) and a required to deliver the housing requirement. The site was identified in the 2015 Sites					

Consultation as an Option Choice, and has performed well through the site assessment process. The response is made in relation to a submitted planning application on the site. The Highway Authority have advised that the access is acceptable in principle. Matters around density, residential amenity, surface water management, and the impacts on protected trees are important and will need to be satisfactorily addressed.

1017 E Hazelwood Bell

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles				
Comment					
Object to the proposed development of site 347 (Whitby Road, Pickering). Concerns relate to:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • highway safety and congestion with increased pollution and fumes • layout and density which is not in keeping with a semi-rural area • loss of trees and impact on nature conservation • loss of light, privacy and outlook to the detriment of the residential amenity of neighbours • flood risk , in particular at the southern boundary and the potential for increased risk of flooding on adjacent/nearby lower ground 					
RDC Comment					
The proposed allocation identifies the principle of development, and key parameters concerning site specific matters. Allocations are made in response to the adopted Development Plan (Local Plan Strategy) and a required to deliver the housing requirement. The site was identified in the 2015 Sites Consultation as an Option Choice, and has performed well through the site assessment process. The response is made in relation to a submitted planning application on the site. The Highway Authority have advised that the access is acceptable in principle. Matters around density, residential amenity, surface water management, and the impacts on protected trees are important and will need to be satisfactorily addressed.					

1018 East Riding of Yorkshire Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General		Yes			Yes
Comment					
In respect of the content of the Publication Plan and Policies Map, East Riding of Yorkshire Council do not have any comments to make.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1019 Environment Agency

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General		Yes		Yes	Yes
Comment					
We are pleased to see that our previous comments have been addressed. As such, insofar as those matters within our remit are concerned, we consider the document to be legally compliant and sound. We also believe that it complies with the duty to co-operate					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1020 F Campion

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)	No			
Comment					
Strongly support the proposed VIUA between Welham Road and Langton Road, north of Bazeley's Lane and do not believe that development is appropriate in the area.					
The area of land which is the subject of outline planning permission should also be included in the proposed VIUA in the event that the permission expires.					
The VIUA is supported as this is not an area which is designated as apriority for development in the Local Plan. 'Area A' (map attached) forms part of an important division between the historic settlement of Whitewall and Norton. Whitewall House and stables are Grade II listed and are the oldest racing stables in Malton and Norton and the paddock in front has until recently been part of the training facilities.					
Development in front of Whitewall would be catastrophic in terms of setting and noise. Bazeley's Lane is a Bridleway and SUSTRANS route which offer excellent views over the land by users of the lane.					
The Area (Area A+B) are at the heart of Norton's racing industry and this is a sensitivity in this area. Development in this area would change its rural character and will be detrimental to the horse racing industry, setting of historic buildings and be detrimental to road safety on Bazeley's Lane.					
RDC Comment					
The support for the designation of the area of land between Welham and Langton Roads is noted. The Council has sought to explain that the designation of VIUA's is not concerned with intrinsic landscape character/quality. Whilst the area of land subject to the outline permission was consulted on as a potential VIUA, the Council is of the view that there is a very strong prospect of the application being taken forward. (A reserved matters application has been submitted).					

The proposed VIUA designation has a set of criteria by which it is applied, and the setting of Listed Buildings and the ability of land to influence form and character are part of the criteria that are used by the LPA. Matters around the impact of traffic are not part of the consideration framework for the VIUA designation, and the designation has not been proposed on the basis of that matter. The District Council appreciate the concerns in this respect.

1020 F Campion

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				
Comment					
The protection of the whole swathe of Norton (the approach to Norton from the south from Whitewall Hill, Langton Road and Beverley Road) should also be considered because together they constitute the main body of the racehorse training area of Norton.					
RDC Comment					
It is not the role of the VIUA designation to control potential conflicts between land uses. The purpose of the designation is to identify and retain undeveloped areas of land which contribute to the form and character of settlements and the setting of settlements and heritage assets.					

1056 F Ellis

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General		No			
Comment					
Object to the proposed development of site 160 at Ampleforth. Access to the site from Station Road and egress is wholly unsuitable and this is recognised by the competent statutory consultee. At this stage I shall be making no further objections. Be advised that I am an appellant in an Upper Tier Tribunal Appeal. Before lodging substantial objections to the development of site 160, I intend to await the outcome of the appeal as the matters raised in the appeal are directly relevant to future development in Ampleforth.					
RDC Comment					
Site 160 is not identified for allocation. The Council has become aware of new information which would result in the sites performance change from a Group 4 site to a Group 2 site due to concerns regarding delivery of an access. No allocations are proposed at Ampleforth due to completions within the Plan Period.					

1021 F T Gooder

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD12 - Omissions	No			
Comment					
Sites 542 and 543. 542 Previously developed site of agricultural use. Allocated as an employment site in the 2006 Employment Land Review. Continued into the 2010 Employment Land Review, which mentioned flood risk. Consider that Beck House is outside Flood Zones 2 and 3. Disagrees with the SSM findings of significant flood risk, harm to the Derwent SAC and Harm to the setting of St. Mary's priory church. The site is further away from the church than the proposed sites. Re-development offers the potential to mitigate against pollution threats from intensive agriculture. Shouldn't be in group 1. Access can be delivered to Highways England Standards- documents provided, to confirm development of B1, B2, B8 uses and a petrol filling station.					
RDC Comment					
The Council is confident that it has identified the commitments and a proposed broad location for the sustainable supply of employment land to meet planned requirements and future growth. Agricultural buildings are not classified as brownfield land. The employment land review is a piece of evidence which informs planning policy. The site extent of site 68 would have some areas of Flood Zone 3, and the sites would be either adjacent or proximal to a tributary of the River Derwent SAC. The sites 68,542 and 543 did not pass stage one due to it not being proximal to Malton/Norton, nor an established or under construction industrial Estate/Business park, to provide strategically located employment land to deliver within the plan period employment land needs. The Local Planning Authority is confused with the reference to the SSM findings, as such conclusions regarding St. Mary's were not made regarding these sites. The access to the site was a concern, but until Publication, no documentation was provided to be able to consider it. Whether the sites now have a satisfactory access still does not overcome the lack of ability to contribute to strategic planning considerations.					

1022 Forestry Commission

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General					
Comment					
Not in a position to respond to Local Plan consultations. Information to assist in the assessment of sites provided.					
RDC Comment					
Noted. The strategic consideration regarding Ancient Trees is set out in the Local Plan Strategy, adopted post NPPF, in Policies SP14 and SP15 in particular, which are concerned with Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure. No sites proposed as allocations have Ancient Trees or protected trees which would need to be removed in order for development to occur. Where there are important trees, their retention, protection and promotion of their role in biodiversity, character and appearance of settlements, recreational/aesthetic value is considered through the site evidence base, and flows into the Development Principles, which are expected to be incorporated into proposals.					

1023 G Mort

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)	Yes			
Comment					
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables and contributes to the character of heritage assets. The footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1024 G Perry

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)	Yes			
Comment					
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites for the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables and contributes to the character of heritage assets. The footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1025 Gladman

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations				
Comment					
Sets out national tests of soundness. Refers to the Housing White Paper of 2017 and Autumn Budget regarding Government's commitment to the delivery of housing. Gladman consider that it is appropriate that development is focussed upon the main settlement of Malton and Norton, as these represent the most sustainable locations for growth. However, the Council should recognise that directing further growth to Ryedale's smaller settlements will result in a number of benefits for their ongoing vibrancy.					
RDC Comment					

The Local Planning Authority is responsive to the tests of soundness. It is also acutely aware of the emphasis placed on the delivery of new housing, in the right locations, to meet needs within our District. Ryedale District Local Planning Authority has a post NPPF adopted Development Plan in which the objectively assessed housing need is being met as confirmed in the 2016 SHMA. Local Planning Authority has applied the principles of the established Development Plan, and released land for housing in advance of the allocations resulting in a robust, trajectorised land supply which is well in excess of 5 years. The Local Plan Sites Document reflects the Local Plan Strategy, and creates opportunities for housing in the smaller settlements.

1025 Gladman

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles				
Comment					
Whilst the identification of strategic allocations (SD3) is an approach that can be 'made sustainable' through the timely provision of associated infrastructure, it is essential that local plans take into account the risks associated with the delivery of any such schemes and the knock-on effect that this can have in terms of housing delivery. It is considered essential that the Council are confident and can robustly demonstrate that the sites that are proposed for residential development are suitable and deliverable.					
As the Council will be aware, a failure in the ability of any allocations to deliver over the plan period, will lead to significant undersupply for the authority.					
RDC Comment					
The site in Norton, SD3, is not a strategic allocation, but will deliver key infrastructure requirements. The Local Planning Authority will consider speculative planning applications in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. We have an established monitoring framework.					

1026 Helmsley Town Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General					
Comment					
No comment.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1027 Highways England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General		No	Justified		
Comment					
It is apparent that since the publication of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, there have been material changes in terms of the large number of development sites which are now constructed/committed/proposed and to the Brambling Fields junction. The document is therefore less relevant than at the time of initial publication, from the perspective of Highways England.					
RDC Comment					
The development sites, including committed sites are within the overall quantum of development and the spatial framework of the Local Plan Strategy. In this respect, the information in the IDP remains relevant.					

1027 Highways England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Paragraph		No	Justified		
Comment					
Clarity is sought on how the figures (completions, commitments and outstanding requirements) fit together.					
RDC Comment					
The Role of the Local Plan Sites Document is to deliver the housing, employment and retail requirements of the Local Plan Strategy. The Local Plan Sites Document identifies this by: factoring in the number of completions since 2012 (The commencement of the Plan Period) and adding the yield of commitments which are sites subject to permission and which are of a significant size (i.e. over 10 dwellings), and are deemed to be deliverable (ATS site was excluded). This is done at the respective tiers of the Settlement Hierarchy. The residual number is then used to derive what is residual housing requirement at each settlement which is then used to inform the allocations.					
The information is brought together in Appendix 2.					

1027 Highways England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD1 - Existing Residential Commitments	No	Justified		
Comment					
Highways England does not support the approach of continuing to support sites in principle in the event the current permission expires. There may have					

been a material change in the operation of the SRN since the time the permission was granted. It is expected that Highways England would be consulted on each planning application to re-assess the impact on the SRN.

RDC Comment

The Local Planning Authority is only committing sites which have been considered through the adopted development plan since April 2012 and recognising their ability to contribute to the delivery of the housing requirement as set out in the adopted development Plan. This is over 700 dwellings, the rest are under construction. If we were unable to rely on such permissions we would be committed to allocating land well above the Ryedale Plan-Local Plan Strategy's requirements and tolerances, which would be, contrary to the adopted strategic plan (which was supported by Highways England), place significant pressure on the settlements subject of these sites, and result in a material change to the operation of the SRN, as at present those committed sites have planning consent and would still come forward (as we have evidence that they are deliverable) alongside the extra allocations. If planning applications were made Highways England would be consulted in accordance with the prescribed requirements.

1027 Highways England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD12 - New Employment Land Allocations	No	Justified		
Comment					
The cumulative impacts of allocated sites in SD2, SD12 and SD15 should be assessed in terms of their impact on the SRN. The 2016 Jacobs work only considered impact on the local network.					
RDC Comment					
Sites allocated in SD2 and SD12 represent a contribution to the quants of Development which the Highways England endorsed as part of the Strategic Plan, the Local Plan Strategy. These sites (and the completions and commitments) do not exceed those tolerances.					
SD15 is designed to support in principle, further development within these sites. At present there are no specific proposals which can be quantified in terms of their impact on the SRN. This would be something that would need to be undertaken if and when subsequent planning applications are received.					
Work undertaken by Jacobs in response to Highways England comments has demonstrated that the operation of the three A64 junctions is well with operating capacity with planned growth/proposed allocations.					

1027 Highways England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD12 - New Employment Land Allocations	No	Justified		
Comment					
Highways England does not support the approach of continuing to support sites in principle in the event the current permission expires. There may have					

been a material change in the operation of the SRN since the time the permission was granted. It is expected that Highways England would be consulted on each planning application to re-assess the impact on the SRN.

RDC Comment

The Local Planning Authority is only committing sites which have been considered through the adopted development plan since April 2012 and identifying them to meet the employment land requirement as set out in the adopted development Plan. Most of the employment land is provided through existing permissions. If we were unable to rely on such permissions we would be committed to allocating land well above the Ryedale Plan-Local Plan Strategy's requirements and tolerances, which would be, contrary to the adopted strategic plan (which was supported by Highways England), place significant pressure on the settlements subject of these sites, and result in a material change to the operation of the SRN, as at present those committed sites have planning consent and would still come forward (as we have evidence that they are deliverable) alongside the extra allocations. If planning applications were made Highways England would be consulted in accordance with the prescribed requirements.

1027 Highways England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD13 - Expansion Land for Existing Employers	No	Justified		
Comment					
Highways England does not support the approach of continuing to support sites in principle in the event the current permission expires. There may have been a material change in the operation of the SRN since the time the permission was granted. It is expected that Highways England would be consulted on each planning application to re-assess the impact on the SRN.					
RDC Comment					
The expansion land for existing employers covers three sites in Kirkbymoorside and Amotherby, they are established businesses, the sites are not subject to a permission. Highways England is consulted on the planning applications in accordance with the statutory guidelines.					

1027 Highways England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD13 - Expansion Land for Existing Employers	No	Justified		
Comment					
It is possible that the expansion of existing businesses could have an impact on the SRN. Highways England would require that an assessment is undertaken prior to any expansion that suitably details the impacts of the development.					
RDC Comment					
Noted. Any proposals on the land identified in SD13 would require the submission of a planning application, or in the first instance a pre-application enquiry,					

as it is not clear what if any changes could result from expansion/reconfiguration of the premises in terms of extra traffic generation. As part of our Local List Validation, substantive proposals Transport Assessments and Travel Plans would be required accordingly to provide the Highway Authority, and Highways England (if required) with an assessment of the impact of the proposal on the highway network.

1027 Highways England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD15 - Flamingo Land and the National Agri-Food Innovation Campus	No	Justified		
Comment					
The cumulative impacts of allocated sites in SD2, SD12 and SD15 should be assessed in terms of their impact on the SRN. The 2016 Jacobs work only considered impact on the local network.					
RDC Comment					
SD15 is designed to support in principle, further development within these sites. At present there are no specific proposals which can be quantified in terms of their impact on the SRN. This would be something that would need to be undertaken if and when subsequent planning applications are received.					

1027 Highways England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD15 - Flamingo Land and the National Agri-Food Innovation Campus	No	Justified		
Comment					
Highways England requires further information regarding the size of any potential expansion prior to confirming acceptability of the expansion of these sites.					
RDC Comment					
The policy aims to provide support in principle for the reconfiguration or intensification of uses within these sites. There are no specific expansion proposals at present. The LPA will consult HE on any future proposals to expand these uses if HE consider this to be necessary.					

1027 Highways England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations	No	Justified		

Comment
The cumulative impacts of allocated sites in SD2, SD12 and SD15 should be assessed in terms of their impact on the SRN. The 2016 Jacobs work only considered impact on the local network.
RDC Comment
Sites allocated in SD2 and SD12 represent a contribution to the quanta of Development which the Highways England endorsed as part of the Strategic Plan, the Local Plan Strategy. These sites (and the completions and commitments) do not exceed those tolerances.
SD15 is designed to support in principle, further development within these sites. At present there are no specific proposals which can be quantified in terms of their impact on the SRN. This would be something that would need to be undertaken if and when subsequent planning applications are received.
Work undertaken by Jacobs in response to Highways England comments has demonstrated that the operation of the three A64 junctions is well within operating capacity with planned growth/proposed allocations.

1028 Historic England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General		No	Justified		
Comment					
Sustainability Appraisal (Objective 5)					
Land allocations SD3, SD6, SD10 and SD11; at Thornton Road Pickering and north of the A64/A169 are likely to have a direct physical impact on non-designated archaeology some of which could potentially be of national importance. The reasons why it is considered to allocate a site which will result in the loss of nationally important archaeology will need to be justified in the plan. It is also essential that the plan sets out how prospective developers would be expected to address the archaeological resource.					
Strongly advise that the Council's conservation staff and the County Heritage Unit are actively involved in the preparation of the plan and they are best placed to advise.					
RDC Comment					
The Council's conservation staff and the County Heritage Unit have been actively and continually involved in the preparation of the plan. The strategy for distributing development has been justified as part of the process of adopting the Local Plan Strategy and within the context of the significance of the Vale of Pickering. The Council has no objection to the inclusion of the proposed appendix to provide further information to developers and which will be used to support the application of Policy SP12 of the Local Plan Strategy.					

1028 Historic England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD10 - Housing Allocation- Land to the south of Amotherby Primary School, Amotherby: Development Principles	No	Justified		
Comment					
The area lies within an extensive archaeological landscape which stretches along the Vale of Pickering with a high probability that the area will contain archaeological remains potentially of national significance. It is essential that the plan alerts prospective developers to the likelihood that they may encounter important archaeological remains and that it explains how they might need to deal with this. (Suggested wording for the policy and for an appendix to the document, based on the approach taken by Scarborough Borough Council is provided).					
RDC Comment					
Noted. The Council would have no objection to the inclusion of the proposed appendix which would operate / be applied in conjunction with Policy SP12 of the Local Plan Strategy.					

1028 Historic England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD11 - Housing Allocation - Land to the south of Aspen Way, Slingsby: Development Principles	No	Justified		
Comment					
The area lies within an extensive archaeological landscape which stretches along the Vale of Pickering with a high probability that the area will contain archaeological remains potentially of national significance. It is essential that the plan alerts prospective developers to the likelihood that they may encounter important archaeological remains and that it explains how they might need to deal with this. (Suggested wording for the policy and for an appendix to the document, based on the approach taken by Scarborough Borough Council is provided).					
RDC Comment					
Noted. The Council would have no objection to the inclusion of the proposed appendix which would operate / be applied in conjunction with Policy SP12 of the Local Plan Strategy.					

1028 Historic England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD11 - Housing Allocation - Land to the south of Aspen Way, Slingsby: Development Principles	No	Justified		

Comment
Part of this site lies within the Slingsby Conservation Area. In order to demonstrate that the allocation of this area is not incompatible with national policy or SP12 of the Local Plan Strategy, there needs to be an assessment of what contribution this undeveloped area makes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and what effect loss/development of the site might have on the designated area.
RDC Comment
The Council has considered the effect of the proposed allocation on the conservation area and this is summarised in the Site Selection Methodology and settlement background paper. The Council has prepared a further paper which expands on this to outline the considerations in more detail.

1028 Historic England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD12 - New Employment Land Allocations	No	Justified		
Comment					
The employment land allocation at Thornton Road lies within an extensive archaeological landscape which stretches along the Vale of Pickering with a high probability that the area will contain archaeological remains potentially of national significance. It is essential that the plan alerts prospective developers to the likelihood that they may encounter important archaeological remains and that it explains how they might need to deal with this. (Suggested wording for the policy and for an appendix to the document, based on the approach taken by Scarborough Borough Council is provided).					
RDC Comment					
The plan has identified sites for development which is in accordance with the spatial strategy established in the adopted Local Plan Strategy. The spatial strategy was fully justified as part of that process and in the knowledge of the significance of the Vale Of Pickering.					
In considering sites, the Council has sought the advice of the County Council's Heritage Unit at an early stage on all the sites subjected to the Site Selection Methodology, who advised on the likelihood of archaeological remains based on the HER. A number of sites which have become allocations have also undertaken archaeological evaluation, including trial trenching at some sites, which has been considered by the County Heritage Unit. The allocation of the sites proposed and broad location for employment have been made on the basis that they represent sustainably located sites. Policy SP12 of the Local Plan Strategy will be applied when planning applications are prepared and will be used to minimise loss of important archaeology.					
Archaeological evaluation undertaken as part of a planning application for the site confirmed that there were no archaeological features present on these previously developed site.					

1028 Historic England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations	No	Justified		

Comment
Several of the sites lie within an extensive archaeological landscape which stretches along the Vale of Pickering. There is a high probability that the area will contain archaeological remains, many of which are likely to be of national significance. The NPPF makes it clear that the status of non-designated archaeological remains of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments should be considered as if they were a designated asset. SP12 of the Local Plan Strategy recognises the importance of this archaeological landscape.
The reasons why it is considered appropriate to allocate sites which will result in the loss of nationally important archaeology in conflict with the Local Plan Strategy and national policy will need to be justified. It is suggested that this could be based upon the approach set out in para 2.32 of the adopted Scarborough Local Plan.
RDC Comment

The plan has identified sites for development which is in accordance with the spatial strategy established in the adopted Local Plan Strategy. The spatial strategy was fully justified as part of that process and in the knowledge of the significance of the Vale Of Pickering.

In considering sites, the Council has sought the advice of the County Council's Heritage Unit at an early stage on all the sites subjected to the Site Selection Methodology, who advised on the likelihood of archaeological remains based on the HER. A number of sites which have become allocations have also undertaken archaeological evaluation, including trial trenching at some sites, which has been considered by the County Heritage Unit. The allocation of the sites proposed and broad location for employment have been made on the basis that they represent sustainably located sites. Policy SP12 of the Local Plan Strategy will be applied when planning applications are prepared and will be used to minimise loss of important archaeology.

1028 Historic England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles	No	Justified		
Comment					
The area lies within an extensive archaeological landscape which stretches along the Vale of Pickering with a high probability that the area will contain archaeological remains potentially of national significance. It is essential that the plan alerts prospective developers to the likelihood that they may encounter important archaeological remains and that it explains how they might need to deal with this. (Suggested wording for the policy and for an appendix to the document, based on the approach taken by Scarborough Borough Council is provided).					
RDC Comment					
Noted. The Council would have no objection to the inclusion of the proposed appendix which would operate / be applied in conjunction with Policy SP12 of the Local Plan Strategy.					

1028 Historic England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD6 - Housing Allocation - Land to the West of Malton Road, Pickering: Development Principles	No	Justified		
Comment					
The area lies within an extensive archaeological landscape which stretches along the Vale of Pickering with a high probability that the area will contain archaeological remains potentially of national significance. It is essential that the plan alerts prospective developers to the likelihood that they may encounter important archaeological remains and that it explains how they might need to deal with this. (Suggested wording for the policy and for an appendix to the document, based on the approach taken by Scarborough Borough Council is provided).					
RDC Comment					
Noted. The Council would have no objection to the inclusion of the proposed appendix which would operate / be applied in conjunction with Policy SP12 of the Local Plan Strategy.					

1028 Historic England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD6 - Housing Allocation - Land to the West of Malton Road, Pickering: Development Principles	No	Justified		
Comment					
Vivers Mill, its outbuildings, Mill House and Mill Cottages are Grade II Listed buildings. In order to demonstrate that the allocation of this area is not incompatible with national policy or SP12 of the Local Plan Strategy, there needs to be an assessment of what contribution this undeveloped area makes to those elements which contribute to the significance of the Listed Building and what effect loss/development of the site might have on its significance.					
The Local Planning Authority will have to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving a Listed Building or its setting when planning applications for the development of allocated sites are submitted. This may mean that the site cannot be developed if the anticipated quantum of development is undeliverable.					
RDC Comment					
The Council has considered the effect of the proposed allocation on the significance of Vivers Mill and this is summarised in the Site Selection Methodology and settlement background paper. The Council has prepared a further paper which expands on this to outline the considerations in more detail.					

1029 Howardian Hills AONB Manager

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate

Policy	SD10 - Housing Allocation- Land to the south of Amotherby Primary School, Amotherby: Development Principles				
Comment					
Considerable concerns about the location of the proposed land allocation at Amotherby (Site 148) next to the boundary of the AONB and the potential impact on the setting of the AONB. It was not clear in previous material that the site was to be considered and this has led me to miss it in responses to previous consultations.					
RDC Comment					

The site in question has been put forward by landowners and has been part of consultations on the plan. In 2015 as part of the public consultation, the site was identified as a group 2 site due to land ownership complexities, which have since been resolved.

The LPA is aware of the sites location in relation to the AONB and has considered this as part of the plan process. It is the view of the Local Planning Authority that the development of the site would not have an unacceptable impact on the nationally protected landscape or its setting. The development would be strongly visually linked with the existing settlement in the landscape.

1029 Howardian Hills AONB Manager

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD13 - Expansion Land for Existing Employers	No	Justified		
Comment					
Accept that this is an allocation the company wish to retain but this is a particularly open part of the AONB on the dip-slope of the escarpment with wide ranging views. Any future development will need to be sympathetically located and designed to comply with SP13 and national policy.					
RDC Comment					

It is noted that the siting of this expansion land for Zwanenberg (Malton Foods) is on land within the AONB, which has particular landscape sensitivities. The policy is very specific in its application, and would still require compliance with SP13 of the Local Plan Strategy, and other policies of the Local Plan Strategy.

1029 Howardian Hills AONB Manager

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations	No	Justified		
Comment					

Considerable concerns about the location of the proposed land allocation at Amotherby (Site 148) next to the boundary of the AONB and the potential impact on the setting of the AONB. It was not clear in previous material that the site was to be considered and this has led me to miss it in responses to previous consultations.

RDC Comment

The site in question has been put forward by landowners and has been part of consultations on the plan. In 2015 as part of the public consultation, the site was identified as a group 2 site due to land ownership complexities, which have since been resolved.

The LPA is aware of the sites location in relation to the AONB and has considered this as part of the plan process. It is the view of the Local Planning Authority that the development of the site would not have an unacceptable impact on the nationally protected landscape or its setting. The development would be strongly visually linked with the existing settlement in the landscape.

1029 Howardian Hills AONB Manager

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy Map		No	Effective		
Comment					
It is misleading to label all of the sites as Local Geological Sites. A short form of correct wording would be 'Local Sites (biological and geological) (SP14)'.					
RDC Comment					
This is an error on the map legend. The above nomenclature could be used. This would represent a factual correction to the map.					

1029 Howardian Hills AONB Manager

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy Map	Oswaldkirk	No	Effective		
Comment					
The map (Oswaldkirk) is missing the green shading (and inclusion on the key) that should show the whole of the white area that isn't 'Area Outside of the Ryedale Local Plan' is within the Howardian Hills AONB.					
RDC Comment					
Noted. This is a mapping error and correction would be a factual amendment.					

1029 Howardian Hills AONB Manager

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy Map	Slingsby	No	Effective		
Comment					
The AONB boundary on the south side of the road is shown incorrectly at Slingsby. Copies of the Designation Map and the detailed boundary amendment required is provided.					
RDC Comment					
The GIS Layer provided by the AONB (via NYCC) was used. The error was not on the Council's part. The map will be updated in due course to reflect the correct boundary.					

1029 Howardian Hills AONB Manager

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy Map	Stonegrave	No	Effective		
Comment					
The monument symbol is missing from the Scheduled Monument of Stonegrave Minster.					
RDC Comment					
This is mapping omission and can be identified and updated as a factual update					

1030 I B Corfe

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations	Yes		Yes	Yes
Comment					
Support the decision not to allocate site 387/305 at Firthland Road, Pickering. Concerned about the very large quantity of traffic that would be generated trying to use the present completely inadequate access into and out of this part of the Town . It would be unsustainable with the present road layout. Also concerned about advertising material that Persimmon have produced which contains inaccurate information about facilities at the Town					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1031 I Conlan

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General					
Comment					
Human recreation of existing residents needs to be protected					
RDC Comment					
None of the allocations or commitments will result in a loss of recreational amenity- indeed through the proposals there will be enhanced opportunities for recreational activity.					

1031 I Conlan

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General	Other				
Comment					
Urge the Council to provide a pedestrian/cycle bridge over the railway to encourage walking and make it more attractive than to drive. This may help reduce congestion at the level crossing. Insist on the implementation of the HGV ban at the level crossing before any further building in Malton and Norton.					
RDC Comment					
The complementary measures are being undertaken by the County Council in their capacity as the Highway Authority. The District Council has undertaken transport modelling work and Air Quality Impact Assessment to assess the impact of different scenarios of development on the highway network to ensure that junction capacity is optimised and that air quality is not adversely effected. The proposed allocations in conjunction with existing commitments can be acceptably accommodated and the link road which is necessary to accommodate the traffic from the proposed Norton site (SD3) will also have advantages for the wider movement of traffic. This is in conjunction with highway improvements that have been completed or which are underway or which will be delivered in the future. These include the full grade separation at Brambling Fields (additional slip road); changes to the Pasture Lane/Wheelgate junction; the change in priority at the level crossing between Church Street and Welham Road; an HCV restriction; the Hugden Way/Beverley Road link; signal optimisation where feasible, together with cycle and pedestrian improvements.					
The Highway Authority has resolved not to take forward two of the 'complementary' measures which were originally thought to be necessary to encourage traffic to use the A64 Brambling Fields junction - The removal of the right hand turn lane at Castlegate and the one way restriction on Norton Road/Railway Street. It is understood that this is for air quality reasons.					

1031 I Conlan

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Ryedale District Council					

Policies	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations				
Comment					
Climate Change, Wildlife Diversity and Food Security are the top priorities. Therefore any use of Greenfield Sites that are otherwise productive and/or good wildlife habitats should be protected.					
RDC Comment					

1031 I Conlan

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				
Comment					
Any proposal to develop adjacent to the Howardian Hills AONB to be opposed such as along Castle Howard Road. Such development would harm a visually attractive area, and impact on the setting of the AONB in a harmful way and damage the amenity value for the dog walkers, and walkers and should be afforded the highest level of protection Green Space, or as a Visually Important Undeveloped Area.					
RDC Comment					
The Local Planning Authority has very carefully considered whether the land at Castle Howard Road should be a VIUA, and has concluded that whilst it provides an attractive edge to Malton, and forms part of the setting of the AONB, it is not considered that it meets the criteria established to assess undeveloped land for VIUA designation, as it does not influence the form and character of the settlement, and the Council has set out in detail in the background paper why it has not included this land within these designations.					

1031 I Conlan

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations				
Comment					
Any green space used not be offset with more growing crops elsewhere. Recovering brownfield sites for agriculture and wildlife diversification projects					
RDC Comment					

Accepting that brownfield sites can have a biodiversity value, the 'use' of land for wildlife projects would not necessarily require planning permission. The development principles in the Local Plan Sites Document outline site-specific green infrastructure/recreational/biodiversity enhancement; with the requirements of SP11, SP14, SP15 ensuring that on-site open space is delivered to meet a range of requirements. Agricultural activity on the land is not a planning consideration.

1031 I Conlan

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles				
Comment					
Climate change and sustainability considerations mean we need to encourage people to live as close as possible to their work place and/or use sustainable transport. Need to reduce traffic congestion and avoid air pollution. Greater car use is to be expected through the Beverley Road site unless sufficient employment opportunities are included. It is essential that a school and doctors surgery are sited as close as possible to allow Norton to become self sufficient.					
RDC Comment					
People's relationship between home and work has become more flexible with home working. The ability to link new residential development with new employment land is simply not consequential- and is very complex, and changes over time, based on a wide range of factors. The role of the local planning authority is to ensure that there is a supply of new homes to meet objectively assessed need, and provide employment land for latent demand and for existing and new businesses in the district. It cannot pre-determine the relationship between such land uses or actually deliver the uses. The ability to use sustainable modes of transport, through Travel Plans, would be sought, as a matter of course, and proposals which sought to move towards electric vehicles and less polluting vehicles. The Norton Lodge Site (SD3) is allocated with land for a school, and the LEA and District Council are aware that the delivery of the school will require a combination of CIL revenue and government funding.					

1031 I Conlan

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD4 - Housing Allocation - Land to the west of Old Maltongate (Ryedale House), Malton: Development Principles				
Comment					
Existing workplace and service accessibility needs to be protected - the Ryedale House site is well-suited for accessibility for staff and service users, with good connectivity to public transport, to move to an out of town location would be less accessible. They (including the Police site) should be protected.					

RDC Comment
The Local Planning Authority has considered to suitability of the site of Ryedale House alone for residential development. The Local Planning authority is aware that the District Council will be utilising existing assets and sites to ensure that services to the Local community are not compromised, in order to ensure compliance with other local plan strategy policies, such as SP11, and deliver more sustainable working practices for staff.

1032 J A and AC Nolan

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				
Comment					
Wholeheartedly endorse the proposed extension to the existing VIUA to include land adjacent to Peasey Hills and all sides of Old Malton. Fully agree with the comments made by Conservation Officer. St. Mary's Priory Church is Grade I Listed, and important to the whole community so protecting the visual aspect by extending the VIUA is appropriate. This would fulfil the Council's long avowed intention to maintain open space separation between Malton and Old Malton.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1033 J A Goforth

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				
Comment					
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites from the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1034 J and J Pashby

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Ryedale District Council					

Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				
Comment					
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1035 J Blackburne- Maze

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Omissions				
Comment					
Restore site 266 to being part of the previous line of the village framework. The site was removed in 1997/8. Site previously had farm buildings on it, should be brought back into the development framework. Would not be detrimental to the village and could provide the site for a house.					
RDC Comment					
The Ryedale Plan Local Plan Strategy sought to restrict development in the smaller (Other Villages) through the use of the Settlement Hierarchy, Development Limits and allowing infill development in certain circumstances to meet local needs. The Local Plan Sites Document is in conformity with that approach. The Development Limits in Broughton are split into two areas. Site 266 is in between the Development Limits. No whole scale review of Development Limits has been undertaken, based on the chosen development strategy set out in the Local Plan Strategy.					

1036 J Brown

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles				
Comment					
I wish to object to the proposed development at Whitby Road, Pickering, based on matters with which you will already be familiar, namely: Access issues.					

The layout and density of the proposed buildings.
Loss of trees currently under TPOs.
Detimental outlook for existing residents.
Drainage and flooding issues, particularly with reference to my property and others on Marshall Drive
RDC Comment
The proposed allocation identifies the principle of development, and key parameters concerning site specific matters. The site was identified in the 2015 Sites Consultation as an Option Choice, and has performed well through the site assessment process. The response is made in relation to a submitted planning application on the site. The Highway Authority have advised that the access is acceptable in principle. Matters around density, residential amenity, surface water management are important and will need to be satisfactorily addressed.

1037 J Farrow

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				
Comment					
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites from the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1038 J Fields

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Omissions				
Comment					
With regard to site no.109 at Thornton le Dale. I note that this site is classed as having high visual value. I believe that as the site is screened from the east by a mature shelter belt, having housing on the southern border & the remaining village to the west this will mean that there is no visual value to the site as it cannot be seen from the north.					

I would therefore ask that the site is considered for future inclusion in planned development of Thornton le Dale.
RDC Comment
A planning permission to the south of the site has resulted in Thornton le Dale (Ryedale Part) having residential development which contributes to the Service Village Tier. The Local Planning Authority consider that site 109 has some sensitivities concerning elevation.

1039 J Halliwell

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				
Comment					
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1040 J Howard

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)	Yes			
Comment					
Supports VIUA for land east of Welham Road and provides a rebuttal to representations made in response to earlier consultation (by Gladman Development Ltd)					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1041 J Howden

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				

Comment
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.
RDC Comment
Noted.

1042 J Priestley

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				
Comment					
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1043 J Rummel

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				
Comment					
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1044 K L Landahl

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				
Comment					
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1045 K Longmire

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				
Comment					
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1046 L M shirley

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				
Comment					
Support SP16 and Old Malton Map, all VIUAs around Old Malton, including land north of Westgate Lane. St Marys Priory Church is the only surviving Gilbertine Church in use. The open nature of the land surrounding the priory and village enhance the beauty of the of the priory and the village, it is imperative that these spaces remain as they are for future generations to enjoy.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1046 L M shirley

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy Map	Old Malton				
Comment					
Support SP16 and Old Malton Map, all VIUAs around Old Malton, including land north of Westgate Lane. St Marys Priory Church is the only surviving Gilbertine Church in use. The open nature of the land surrounding the priory and village enhance the beauty of the of the priory and the village, it is imperative that these spaces remain as they are for future generations to enjoy.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1047 L Medley

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				
Comment					
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1048 L Tyler

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				
Comment					
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents. Welham Road and Bazeley's lane are already very					

busy routes and would struggle to take anymore activity.
RDC Comment
Noted.

1049 Local Access Forum

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General		No		Yes	Yes
Comment					
The documents miss the opportunity for many of the large number of sites identified for development to incorporate walking and cycling as part of everyday methods of transport. The Public Right of Way network seems to be treated as separate facilities. It is hoped that when detailed schemes are put forward the principles of providing non-motorised paths will be incorporated in the specifications for sites.					
RDC Comment					
This is a matter which will be considered as part of the proposed allocation's future development. The Local Plan Strategy seeks to ensure that inclusive and interconnected non-vehicular access is provided as part of new developments in particular policies SP20, SP15. The role of LPSD is not to replicate all the considerations of the site's development, but site-specific ones- or ones which were not identified in the Local Plan Strategy. The Local Planning Authority has chosen to not have prescriptive master plans at this stage to ensure that the plan is responsive.					

1050 M Dunning

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				
Comment					
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1051 M France

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations				
Comment					
Baffled by the fact that site 347 (Whitby Road, Pickering) has been elevated to that of land being ripe for development when previously it has been deemed unsuitable.					
RDC Comment					
Site 347 was identified in 2015 as an option choice with four other sites. Therefore the site has not experienced a rapid change of position in its consideration for allocation. New allocations are made to meet future plan requirements in the emerging plan. On that basis, these are on land which hitherto had not been identified for development. The Local Plan Strategy is the adopted development plan- an it provides a steer which the Local Plan Sites Document has reflected.					

1051 M France

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations	No			
Comment					
Find it intriguing that the 40+sites identified for residential development at Pickering has suddenly reduced to 2 housing land allocations at the Town.					
RDC Comment					
The large number of site submissions is a reflection of landowner interest. The Local Planning Authority received 667 sites for consideration for allocation for a range of uses, Pickering, being a major town in the District received a number of those. The Development Plan production process assesses and refines down the wide range of site submissions to those which best met the objectives of the Local Plan Strategy, and perform the best through the Sustainability Appraisal process. This process also took account of existing permissions, and this has resulted in only two sites needing to be allocated at Pickering.					

1051 M France

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations				
Comment					
In theory the Council has granted sufficient permissions to satisfy the requirements of the Local Plan Strategy for the next 5 years and the strategy does state that the plan does not rely on strategic sites. (comment made in context of concerns over why the Whitby Road site at Pickering has been allocated).					

RDC Comment					
The Local Planning Authority needs to ensure there is sufficient land either through permissions or allocations to, as minimum, meet the Plan Period of which 9 years remain. Strategic Sites are sites which are of a scale/approach which is essential to the delivery of the strategy, and their failure to come forward would result in the failure to deliver the Plan. No such sites have been proposed in the allocations document- as by their definition and purpose they would be set out in the Local Plan Strategy. The Council has also built into the allocations and commitment a 20% land supply buffer.					

1051 M France

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles				
Comment					
Baffled by the fact that site 347 (Whitby Road, Pickering) has been elevated to that of land being ripe for development when previously it has been deemed unsuitable.					
RDC Comment					
Site 347 was identified in 2015 as an option choice with four other sites. Therefore the site has not experienced a rapid change of position in its consideration for allocation. New allocations are made to meet future plan requirements in the emerging plan. On that basis, these are on land which hitherto had not been identified for development. The Local Plan Strategy is the adopted development plan- an it provides a steer which the Local Plan Sites Document has reflected.					

1052 M J Linsley

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)	Yes			
Comment					
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1053 M Middlebrook

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)	Yes			
Comment					
I wish to commend the council for recognising that the area surrounding Old Malton in every direction should be designated as VIUA. It is vital that everything possible is done to protect the setting of the Old Malton conservation area. Wrapping the village with VIUA recognises the significant contribution that the surrounding open land makes to the character and setting of the village and also the important contribution it makes to the historical form and setting of Old Malton. The council has a long stated intention of keeping the separation between Old Malton and Malton and the VIUAs support this.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1054 M Seager

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Section	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				
Comment					
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1055 Malton Town Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations	No			
Comment					
No further development should be given permission in Malton until satisfactory 'complimentary' measures are in place.					
RDC Comment					
The complementary measures are being undertaken by the County Council in their capacity as the Highway Authority. The District Council has undertaken transport modelling work and Air Quality Impact Assessment to assess the impact of different scenarios of development on the highway network to ensure					

that junction capacity is optimised and that air quality is not adversely effected. The proposed allocations in conjunction with existing commitments can be acceptably accommodated and the link road which is necessary to accommodate the traffic from the proposed Norton site (SD3) will also have advantages for the wider movement of traffic. This is in conjunction with highway improvements that have been completed or which are underway or which will be delivered in the future. These include the full grade separation at Brambling Fields (additional slip road); changes to the Pasture Lane/Wheelgate junction; the change in priority at the level crossing between Church Street and Welham Road; an HCV restriction; the Hugden Way/Beverley Road link; signal optimisation where feasible, together with cycle and pedestrian improvements.

The Highway Authority has resolved not to take forward two of the 'complementary' measures which were originally thought to be necessary to encourage traffic to use the A64 Brambling Fields junction - The removal of the right hand turn lane at Castlegate and the one way restriction on Norton Road/Railway Street. It is understood that this is for air quality reasons.

1055 Malton Town Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD4 - Housing Allocation - Land to the west of Old Maltongate (Ryedale House), Malton: Development Principles				
Comment					
Object to the re-development of the Ryedale House site for housing.					
RDC Comment					
The Council is looking to relocate and reconfigure service provision with partners. The site is well located in relation to existing housing and accessible to the town, services, recreational facilities and is served by public transport. The traffic movements associated with the site as a residential use will be no greater than those associated with its current use.					

1057 Natural England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General		Yes		Yes	
Comment					
Natural England notes that your authority has undertaken an Appropriate Assessment of the plans, in accordance with Regulation 61 of the Regulations. Natural England is a statutory consultee on the Appropriate Assessment stage of the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.					
Your appropriate assessment concludes that your authority is able to ascertain that the plans and proposals will not result in adverse effects on the integrity of any of the sites in question. Having considered the assessment, and the measures proposed to mitigate for all identified adverse effects that could potentially occur as a result of the proposal, Natural England advises that we concur with the assessment conclusions, providing that all mitigation					

measures are appropriately secured and delivered.
RDC Comment
Noted and welcomed. Mitigation measures will be secured.

1057 Natural England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles				
Comment					
Impacts associated with water quality and discharges into the River Derwent SAC are proposed to be mitigated through the implementation of SUDs and drainage into mains sewers. We strongly advise the Local Planning Authority to ensure the SUDs are well maintained and remain fully functional in the long term.					
We recognise that Yorkshire Water is aware of proposed development sites and has factored this into their improvement programme to increase mains sewers capacity as a result. However, in relation to the additional capacity required to cope with the expansion we have concern that Yorkshire Water may not be able to meet SSSI phosphate targets through additional discharge. Natural England have separately asked for confirmation from Yorkshire Water via the PR19 process that phosphate targets will be able to be met in the future alongside any additional capacity, therefore we expect this issue will be addressed outside of these proposals.					
It is noted that at development site 218 there is an intention to implement a soakaway system rather than connection to mains sewage. In this area it is necessary to ensure that any sewage or water treatment system is sufficiently well maintained over time and that it is not located close to a water course. NECR171 (Natural England Commissioned report 171) provides guidance on recommended distances from a water dependent site/ receiving watercourse (e.g. 30m); this report needs to be taken into account in addition to the CIRA 697 guidance referred to in the Appropriate Assessment.					
RDC Comment					
Noted. The long term maintenance of SUDs is usually set out in conditions. Site 218 is not being taken forward as an allocation.					

1057 Natural England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles				
Comment					
We recognise that recreational disturbance impacts will be mitigated through the provision of on-site greenspace as well as wider green infrastructure					

improvements. The appropriate assessment identifies that with mitigation measures in place, there will still be some increased recreational activity along parts of the River Derwent Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Although this increased pressure may not be at a level at which the integrity of the designated site would be effected, Natural England advises that an Access Management Plan (e.g. signage and supply of information where possible) should also be required when development comes forward. This approach would ensure recreational disturbance impacts are minimised as far as reasonably possible; for example it is recognised there are already a number of informal access routes to the River Derwent SAC which may only become more established with increased recreational activity. A well designed Access Management Plan should also ensure that the use of green infrastructure and on-site greenspace provided by development will be maximised.

RDC Comment

Noted, this will be undertaken through the planning application process.

1057 Natural England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD4 - Housing Allocation - Land to the west of Old Maltongate (Ryedale House), Malton: Development Principles				

Comment

We recognise that recreational disturbance impacts will be mitigated through the provision of on-site greenspace as well as wider green infrastructure improvements. The appropriate assessment identifies that with mitigation measures in place, there will still be some increased recreational activity along parts of the River Derwent Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Although this increased pressure may not be at a level at which the integrity of the designated site would be effected, Natural England advises that an Access Management Plan (e.g. signage and supply of information where possible) should also be required when development comes forward. This approach would ensure recreational disturbance impacts are minimised as far as reasonably possible; for example it is recognised there are already a number of informal access routes to the River Derwent SAC which may only become more established with increased recreational activity. A well designed Access Management Plan should also ensure that the use of green infrastructure and on-site greenspace provided by development will be maximised.

RDC Comment

Noted, this will be undertaken through the planning application process.

1057 Natural England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles				

Comment
There are allocation sites with potential impacts on designated sites that fall outside of the scope of the Habitats Regulations Assessment discussed above. These sites are 116 and 347 which are approximately 1.5km from Newtondale Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Haugh and Gundale Slacks SSSI. The Local Plan Sites Document explains that adverse impacts on the interest features of the SSSIs are unlikely. Increases in recreational pressure can be avoided through the provision of on-site or local open space, which we advise should be implemented upon the development on these sites.
Although we do not have any other specific comments to make on site allocations, we recommend that all forthcoming sites and development proposals are assessed against SSSI IRZs that can be viewed on the MAGIC website (http://magic.defra.gov.uk/).
RDC Comment

1114 Nawton Parish Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General					
Comment					
We object to site 252 and 173 being classed in group 4. This field is not an infill and would cause mayhem with the proposed 20+ houses each needing 2 cars in order to get to work. 40 cars coming through the adjoining estate would put children at risk who play in the streets and ride their bikes safely in that area. The bus service is inadequate and does not get people to work in time.					
RDC Comment					
Site 252/173 is not being taken forward as an allocation, due to previous developments at the settlement. The Local planning authority stands by the group 4 status of the site, infill status is not relevant for housing sites, and the Council is guided by the Highway Authority who have not objected to the proposed access.					

1114 Nawton Parish Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General	SD2 - Omissions				
Comment					
The villages need a new entrance/exit to Ryedale School and the provision of a road south of Beadlam (site481) and extra houses, even on half of it, would be more appropriate site benefitting all.					

RDC Comment
Site 481, and a link road, was discussed as part of the site assessment work. This is a much larger site than the Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy were seeking to deliver at the Service Villages.

1058 Network Rail

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General	Other				
Comment					
Please note that the council has a statutory responsibility under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Procedure) Order 2015 (GPDO) to consult statutory rail undertakers where a proposal for development is likely to result in a material increase in the volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway or impact upon rail infrastructure. The GPDO also requires authorities to consult on all developments within 10m of the railway.					
Transport assessments which consider rail infrastructure must support all applications near railways. Developer contributions policy and supplementary guidance must ensure infrastructure risks are identified and mitigation secured.					
Network Rail would not seek contributions towards major enhancements.					
RDC Comment					
Noted. The planning applications made on the sites subject to allocation will be consulted upon in accordance with the GPDO, and assessed against our Local List validation criteria, and the Transport Assessments and Travel Plans will required.					

1058 Network Rail

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations				
Comment					
The emerging sites document proposes to locate employment and housing opportunities in the market towns in particular within Malton which is served by the only train station within the Ryedale Council area (and thus provides more opportunities to use public transport than the remainder of the district).					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1058 Network Rail

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations				
Comment					
<p>Malton Level Crossing is the most significant level crossing within Ryedale. Malton is a manually controlled (full) barrier crossing, operated by the Signaller located in the adjacent signal box. At present there are no plans to change the operation of the crossing control until at least 2030. In the meantime, concerns have been raised locally regarding traffic congestion and air pollution caused, in part, by the level crossing barrier down times; having timed these several times each year since 2013, the level crossings manager suggests level crossing barrier down time plays a very minor part (the barriers are typically raised for 55 minutes in each hour) in what is an already heavily-trafficked area, with adjoining road junctions on both sides of the crossing. In conjunction with future plans to enhance rail services on the York-Malton-Scarborough line (longer trains and new hourly service). Network Rail is part of a working group alongside North Yorkshire County Council, Ryedale District Council, TPE, Northern and community stakeholders with the aims of easing traffic congestion, reducing air pollution and enabling growth in the Malton and Norton area. The Local Plan will obviously form part of the work of this group, with particular study on the road network, pedestrian and traffic flows. The proposed allocations are likely to increase the use of Malton level crossing this should be acknowledged within the sites allocation document and emphasis placed on the need to reduce travel by car to town centre facilities.</p>					
RDC Comment					
<p>Noted. The plan as a whole, including the Local Plan Strategy and suite of evidence acknowledges that there will be an increase in traffic associated with growth. The need to improve cycling and pedestrian facilities is recognised in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and this will be supplemented with further congestion alleviation measures. RDC and NYCC are have commissioned work to identify such measures following confirmation of the increased rail services.</p>					

1058 Network Rail

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles				
Comment					
<p>Disappointed to note that the Housing allocation (SD3) within Malton does not seek measures to improve connectivity with public transport facilities or improvements to the existing station facilities to support travel by train. We would request that the housing allocation SD3 is amended to ensure the introduction of measures to support the use of public transport. Applications should be supported by Transport Assessments and Travel Plans. Identified improvements to support the use of public transport should be provided through CIL or section 106 contributions. In addition the presumption to support employment and housing land commitments if the current permission expires should acknowledge the need for renewal applications to consider how improvements to public transport to support sustainable travel objectives can be achieved.</p>					
RDC Comment					
<p>The site is accessible by public transport and is in an accessible location to access on foot/bicycle. It is proposed to be allocated as it is in accordance with</p>					

the Local Plan Strategy - a strategy which recognises that Malton and Norton offer the most significant public transport opportunities.

A planning application will be supported by a Transport Assessments and Travel Plans which would seek to maximise non-vehicular modes of transport and which would be used to secure improvements if required by the Local Highway Authority.

1059 North York Moors National Park

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General					Yes
Comment					
This is to put on record that this Authority has not raised any cross boundary issues under the Duty to Co-operate regarding this plan and considers the requirement for Ryedale District Council to jointly work with its neighbouring planning authorities fulfilled insofar as it relates to the National Park Authority.					
As you know our two Authorities have a strong record of co-operation, not least through production of a joint Local Plan for Helmsley in 2015. My last record of a formal Duty to Co-operate meeting is 21 October 2016 with Rachel Balmer to discuss the Ryedale site allocations document.					
RDC Comment					
Noted and welcomed.					

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General					
Comment					
Re. Archaeology: note that each site screened against the HER, and information provided on the likely impact on the significance of non-designated heritage assets or archaeological potential. NYCC happy to continue to work.					
RDC Comment					
Noted and welcomed.					

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General					

Comment

The LHA has been working with the Local Planning Authority (LPA) on the development of its highway evidence in support of site allocations. The cumulative impact of various site allocation scenarios has been tested through transport consultants, Jacobs, who have used the Malton and Norton strategic transport model to assess the impact in Malton and Norton, and for Pickering carried out an assessment using individual junction transport models for two key junctions within the town. This assessed the capacity constraints on the highway network at the end of the Local Plan period 2027, with and without the various proposed Local Plan scenarios put forward by the LPA for assessment. The analysis assessed the impact on the local road network as a direct result of proposed allocated sites and identified a number of mitigation measures required to facilitate the cumulative impact of development.

The Sites Document details the Local Plan's allocations with development principles for the sites; the LHA would seek for further detail to be provided within these development principles such as the requirement to provide a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement and Travel Plan if required.

The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), 2012, lists a number of infrastructure requirements for highway improvements. This was based on the Malton and Norton Strategic Transport Assessment 2010 and discussions between authorities. The IDP lists internal junction improvements in Malton and Norton to accommodate the further development as being a critical infrastructure requirement and it is the LHA understanding that these include the required mitigation measures.

The LHA will continue to assist the LPA in addressing the issues raised above to enable robust transport evidence that the LHA can fully support to be established.

RDC Comment

The LHA have has long-standing engagement in the transport modelling work, and accepted its findings. The requirements for the submission of a Transport Assessment/statement and Travel Plan are required, as standard, as part of the District Councils Local List Validating Requirements, the Development Principles are the site specific requirements required on the proposed allocations and so generic supporting information requirements were not added (since they are automatically sought) in the interests of reducing duplication and repetition.

The Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been updated prior to submission to reflect proposed allocations. Specific measures have been identified in the Development Principles to deliver any necessary transport infrastructure generated by the development, in accordance with advice from the LHA and as part of the junction capacity modelling work, and air quality impact assessment.

Transport evidence has been produced in conjunction with NYCC and mitigation measures are as agreed by both organisations. The Council will continue to work with NYCC as detailed schemes, accompanied by transport assessments provide on-going up to date evidence and will work with the County to identify further measures to address congestion at the Towns.

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General					
Comment					

The Local Plan as the ideal opportunity for the local planning authority to raise awareness and make an important contribution towards the enhancement of the public rights of way network. The general planning principles should endeavour to achieve safe and pleasant access to and from public transport, and local facilities to reduce dependency on cars. Beneficial if developers could be required to submit comprehensive Design Access Statements to address the protection and enhancement of footpaths, bridleways, byways and cycle routes, as applicable, within proposed developments of any type. Assurance could be offered to developers that their proposals will be more likely to be supported by the planning authority and the County Council's Public Rights of Way Team where they give regard to:

- a) enhancing usability and amenity value of existing footpaths, bridleways, byways and cycle routes;
- b) accommodating or formally diverting existing footpaths, bridleways, byways and cycle routes within green open space;
- c) avoiding obstruction or confinement of existing footpaths, bridleways, byways and cycle routes;
- d) improving access by creating links between new development and the local network.

Comment is not provided at this stage on each of the locations included as each case will be considered individually as part of the formal planning consultation process with reference to the principles above.

If it was considered helpful at this stage the Definitive Map Team would be able to provide mapping data showing public rights of way to the Planning team for inclusion within plans of each of the sites.

RDC Comment

As part of a Planning application there will be a requirement to comply with strategic planning policies and the submission of Transport Statements/Assessments and Travel Plans, in conjunction with Design and Access Statements. This will be to reduce reliance on cars and provide integrated and inclusive means of accessing services and facilities and recreation- including Green Infrastructure. As identified in the representation, this is best considered on an individual site basis. Where relevant, the existence of PROW at proposed sites is referenced in development principles. The Council has a copy of the definitive map which is used for information. It is considered that it is not necessary to include all PROW on the Local Plan Policies Map.

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General					

Comment
Landscape considerations in general are supported, and recognition that the sustainability appraisal and site selection methodology places on the visual setting of a settlement and the use of Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs) helps to protect the character and landscape setting in and at the edge of settlements. Cumulative considerations have been considered within section 7, but does not describe additional changes to the landscape and visual amenity caused by the proposed development in conjunction with other development such as when sites are grouped together. Nationally valued landscapes (AONB, Registered Parks and Gardens and including Areas of High Landscape Value) should be considered or explained in stage 3 screening process. Landscape sensitivity should be defined between high, medium and low, and utilise value and susceptibility to change to help explain landscape and visual sensitivity. Coalescence is not necessarily a matter of distance, where possible descriptive use of visual barriers such as landform, woodland and trees may be more robust than distance unless this is explained and defined. Define utilise, Special Qualities, landscape and setting
RDC Comment
<p>Noted. These factors have been considered in the application of the Site Selection Methodology and at the appropriate stage and in a way which is proportionate to the scale and distribution of development requirements. The SSM itself is not a detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.</p> <p>The use of VIUAs is not a landscape designation. The landscape and visual impact has been considered on a site by site basis, in principle, as there are no proposed allocations where they merge with other allocations to form larger areas. Cumulative site considerations were identified where sites were grouped. National landscape designations are considered within Stage 2, an earlier stage than Stage 3, denoting their statutory importance. Areas of High Landscape Value, a local landscape designation are also considered at Stage 2. Registered Parks and Gardens, as a designated heritage asset could be considered at Stage 1 and 2 depending on the site. Coalescence was mentioned where settlements could be viewed from each other, and then what features were present. Distance plays a part, but other factors can influence visual relationships.</p>

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General					
Comment					
welcome and support the allocation of appropriate sites to meet identified needs for both housing and economic growth. Welcome the buffer within the housing allocation as builds in flexibility. Identification of sites is broadly in line with strategic policies and is supported, ensure a sustainable pattern of growth and positive approach for the delivery of infrastructure and services.					
RDC Comment					
Noted. The operation of the buffer is part of the Local Plan Strategy. The District Council consider that the proposed allocations are in accordance with the strategic policies of the Local Plan Strategy, and this is evidenced through the sustainability appraisal process.					

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General		Yes			Yes
Comment					
Welcomes opportunity to engage with Ryedale District Council on the preparation of the Local Plan Sites Document as part of NYCC's Duty to Co-operate. We are encouraged to see the plan progress to Publication Stage.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General	Other				
Comment					
The NYCC Integrated Passenger Transport service supports 'The Sustainability Appraisal and Site Selection Methodology spatial approach' which concentrates allocation on Market Towns and Service Villages which already have some level of public transport.					
Access by public transport will need to be considered for individual sites through Transport Plans and studies.					
RDC Comment					
Noted. The requirement for Transport Assessments/Statements and Travel Plans is required as part of the Council's recently adopted Local Validation List.					

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General	Other				
Comment					
Support the recognition and inclusion of essential infrastructure within the Development Principles. Could be strengthened by providing more clarity regarding layout, design and connectivity and how infrastructure will be funded. This could be done by expanding the Development Principles, Supplementary Planning Documents as development briefs or master plans. Improve confidence in the delivery of the sites. Developer contributions will be required to secure necessary infrastructure. Without adequate funding the viability and delivery of sites may be compromised- leading to delay in provision. The CIL charging Schedule, and Regulation 123 list are already adopted, but pre-date the Local Plan Sites Document, and that the Reg.123 list should be reviewed prior to the Examination. The County Council would welcome this with regards to ensuring adequate provision is made for County Council					

infrastructure. Discussions have taken place regarding the development of an Infrastructure Deliverability Statement, to set out delivery and we are keen to continue this work.

RDC Comment

The LPA considers that the key/necessary development principles for the sites are included in the policies and will provide an appropriate basis for the compilation of detailed schemes.

The LPA sees no reason to review the Regulation 123 list prior to the examination. The list refers to the infrastructure requirements required to support planned growth and is compliant with the regulations as it stands.

The Council has conducted clear discussions with service providers to understand the implications of site choices and the impacts on infrastructure provision. The Regulation 123 List was written with a degree of flexibility to allow the document to respond where the need is greatest. The Council will work with NYCC on the completion of the Infrastructure Delivery Statement to ensure priorities for CIL expenditure are clear and reflect other sources of funding.

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Paragraph	2.23				
Comment					
NYCC health and adult services consider broadly reflects current provision and future requirements for extra care housing in Ryedale but would make the following points: Make reference to scheme at Pickering (not just that at Helmsley and Norton) Malton is a priority location for Extra Care Housing and we are seeking new provision at Malton through the One Public Estate work in relation to Ryedale House and adjacent sites- as such should make reference to One Public Estate Kirkbymoorside is identified as being a potential location for Extra Care provision. Requirements will be reviewed and on that basis, the reference to Kirkbymoorside is adequate.					
RDC Comment					
An update to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan reflects the current position. RDC will continue to work with NYCC to ensure requirements are provided for.					

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD1 - Existing Residential Commitments				

Comment
Kirkbymoorside – 225 + 61 LP dwellings - one approved outline planning application (225) is to provide extra education land for use by Kirkbymoorside CP School. Without this additional land it would be difficult to develop the existing restricted site in response to any new housing. Ryedale Secondary School has been recently expanded.
RDC Comment
Noted. The permission is subject to a Reserved Matters application. The update of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will reflect the need to ensure that land is retained for future education expansion at Primary level.

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD1 - Existing Residential Commitments				
Comment					
Malton Primary – existing permissions + 60 LP dwellings may need some small scale expansion of Malton CP School. NYCC are working with the diocese St Mary's RC Primary Malton which will add additional capacity to provide for the impacts of new housing in both Malton and Norton. NYCC are reviewing the position of Malton Secondary to determine the need for and degree of any future expansion.					
RDC Comment					
Noted. The existing permissions in Malton have been pre-CIL, and subject to educational contributions. As The District Council has a CIL charge in place, Education contributions would be covered by the CIL charge, if the resulting scheme generates such a requirement.					

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD10 - Housing Allocation- Land to the south of Amotherby Primary School, Amotherby: Development Principles				
Comment					
Amotherby – 40 LP dwellings – Amotherby CP School is operating under capacity and it is anticipated no expansion will be needed.					
RDC Comment					
Noted. The Council has updated its IDP to reflect this information.					

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD10 - Housing Allocation- Land to the south of Amotherby Primary School, Amotherby: Development Principles				
Comment					
Site 148 lies within/or partly within an area identified under a policy or (if applicable, several Policies) of the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for safeguarding. Therefore, in the event that the Joint Plan is adopted and the site is allocated in the Local Plan adopted by the District Council, the County Council should be consulted on the planning application associated with this development as it not considered currently to meet the exemption criteria in the Joint Plan.					
RDC Comment					
The Site Selection Methodology identified sites where a minerals safeguarding designation was in place. It also recognised that some sites, being adjacent to existing residential development would not be suitable to provide a mineral extraction resource. The Council has taken the emerging safeguarding policy into account in identifying land allocations in line with the Local Plan Strategy and in balancing a range of sustainability considerations. The plan process itself has taken these issues into account and on that basis, the text of the plan does not need to make explicit reference to this matter.					

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD11 - Housing Allocation - Land to the south of Aspen Way, Slingsby: Development Principles				
Comment					
Site 464 lies within/or partly within an area identified under a Policy or (if applicable, several Policies) of the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for safeguarding. Therefore, in the event that the Joint Plan is adopted and the site is allocated in the Local Plan adopted by the District Council, the County Council should be consulted on the planning application associated with this development as it not considered currently to meet the exemption criteria in the Joint Plan.					
RDC Comment					
The Site Selection Methodology identified sites where a minerals safeguarding designation was in place. It also recognised that some sites, being adjacent to existing residential development would not be suitable to provide a mineral extraction resource. The Council has taken the emerging safeguarding policy into account in identifying land allocations in line with the Local Plan Strategy and in balancing a range of sustainability considerations. The plan process itself has taken these issues into account and on that basis, the text of the plan does not need to make explicit reference to this matter.					

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD11 - Housing Allocation - Land to the south of Aspen Way, Slingsby: Development Principles				
Comment					
Slingsby – 36 LP dwellings – School will be operating at capacity and difficult to expand, however significant numbers of children attending the school come from out-catchment so expansion may not be required					
RDC Comment					
Noted. The existing permissions in Slingsby have been pre-CIL, nor were of a scale which warranted an educational contribution. As The District Council has a CIL charge in place, Education contributions would be covered by the CIL charge.					

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD12 - New Employment Land Allocations				
Comment					
It appears that the 'Broad Location for Future Employment' to the north east of Malton would, if developed, be on land to the north of the A64 and east of the A169, in which case it would also lie outside any area identified within the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for safeguarding.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD12 - New Employment Land Allocations				
Comment					
Site 21 lies within an area identified under a minerals safeguarding policy or (if applicable, several Policies) and the development proposed may fit within the					

exemption criteria identified in the Joint Plan (if adopted).
RDC Comment
Noted.

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD12 - New Employment Land Allocations				
Comment					
Support principle of identification of future employment growth, but seek additional clarification of detailed site boundaries and principles of development to ensure effective alignment with the adopted Malton Food Enterprise Zone Local Development Order and Design Code, and to ensure compatibility of use and design that supports effective place-making.					
RDC Comment					
The Council has not established the boundaries due to only requiring a small residual requirement of employment land. The broad location is identified to steer future employment land needs if required during the plan period. The land would be provided to meet a range of employment land uses and is not necessarily aligned to the FEZ LDO.					

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD12 - New Employment Land Allocations				
Comment					
Sites 588, 650 and 657 lie outside any area identified within the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for safeguarding and hence it is not considered that any safeguarding issues are likely to arise.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate

Policy	SD12 - New Employment Land Allocations				
Comment					
Site 608 lies within/or partly within an area identified under a Policy or (if applicable, several Policies) of the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for safeguarding. Therefore, in the event that the Joint Plan is adopted and the site is allocated in the Local Plan adopted by the District Council, the County Council should be consulted on the planning application associated with this development as it not considered currently to meet the exemption criteria in the Joint Plan.					
RDC Comment					

The Site Selection Methodology identified sites where a minerals safeguarding designation was in place. It also recognised that some sites, being adjacent to existing residential development would not be suitable to provide a mineral extraction resource. The Council has taken the emerging safeguarding policy into account in identifying land allocations in line with the Local Plan Strategy and in balancing a range of sustainability considerations. The plan process itself has taken these issues into account and on that basis, the text of the plan does not need to make explicit reference to this matter.

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD13 - Expansion Land for Existing Employers				
Comment					
Site 259 lies outside any area identified within the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for safeguarding and hence it is not considered that any safeguarding issues are likely to arise.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD13 - Expansion Land for Existing Employers				
Comment					
Site 371 lies within an area identified under a minerals safeguarding policy or (if applicable, several Policies) and the development proposed may fit within the exemption criteria identified in the Joint Plan (if adopted).					
RDC Comment					

Noted

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD13 - Expansion Land for Existing Employers				
Comment					
Site 489 lies within/or partly within an area identified under a Policy or (if applicable, several Policies) of the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for safeguarding. Therefore, in the event that the Joint Plan is adopted and the site is allocated in the Local Plan adopted by the District Council, the County Council should be consulted on the planning application associated with this development as it not considered currently to meet the exemption criteria in the Joint Plan.					
RDC Comment					
The Site Selection Methodology identified sites where a minerals safeguarding designation was in place. It also recognised that some sites, being adjacent to existing residential development would not be suitable to provide a mineral extraction resource. The Council has taken the emerging safeguarding policy into account in identifying land allocations in line with the Local Plan Strategy and in balancing a range of sustainability considerations. The plan process itself has taken these issues into account and on that basis, the text of the plan does not need to make explicit reference to this matter.					

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD14 - Retail Commitments				
Comment					
Sites 250, 442 and Dewhirst site lie within an area identified under a minerals safeguarding policy or (if applicable, several Policies) and the development proposed may fit within the exemption criteria identified in the Joint Plan (if adopted).					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations				
Comment					

Given the progress with the Joint Plan it is considered that there are emerging policies that are relevant to the consideration of some of the proposed Ryedale allocation sites as they proceed through the Local Plan process. In particular these include: Policy S01 Safeguarding mineral resources; Policy S02 Developments proposed within Minerals Safeguarding Areas; and Policy S06 Consideration of applications in Consultation Areas, as well also the text regarding safeguarding exemption criteria. However, there are currently representations with regard to these Policies that are at present unresolved. With regard to the exemption criteria set out in paragraph 8.47 of the Joint Plan, the 12th bullet point refers to 'applications for development on land which is already allocated in an

adopted plan where the plan took account of minerals and waste safeguarding requirements'. There is a revision to this bullet proposed, but doesn't change the essence of the Policy. If the District Council can add to the development requirements of a proposed site allocation text regarding safeguarding then that could lead to a position that a future planning application for the development of that allocation falls within the exemption criteria as it 'took account of ... safeguarding requirements'.

RDC Comment

The Site Selection Methodology identified sites where a minerals safeguarding designation was in place. It also recognised that some sites, being adjacent to existing residential development would not be suitable to provide a mineral extraction resource. The Council has taken the emerging safeguarding policy into account in identifying land allocations in line with the Local Plan Strategy and in balancing a range of sustainability considerations. The plan process itself has taken these issues into account and on that basis, the text of the plan does not need to make explicit reference to this matter.

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles				
Comment					
Site 649 lies within/or partly within an area identified under a Policy or (if applicable, several Policies) of the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for safeguarding. Therefore, in the event that the Joint Plan is adopted and the site is allocated in the Local Plan adopted by the District Council, the County Council should be consulted on the planning application associated with this development as it not considered currently to meet the exemption criteria in the Joint Plan.					
RDC Comment					
The Site Selection Methodology identified sites where a minerals safeguarding designation was in place. It also recognised that some sites, being adjacent to existing residential development would not be suitable to provide a mineral extraction resource. The Council has taken the emerging safeguarding policy into account in identifying land allocations in line with the Local Plan Strategy and in balancing a range of sustainability considerations. The plan process itself has taken these issues into account and on that basis, the text of the plan does not need to make explicit reference to this matter.					

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles				
Comment					
Support the recognition and inclusion of essential infrastructure within the Development Principles. Could be strengthened by providing more clarity regarding layout, design and connectivity and how infrastructure will be funded. Particularly for the more significant sites such as SD3. This could be done by expanding the Development Principles, Supplementary Planning Documents as development briefs or master plans. Improve confidence in the delivery of the sites. Developer contributions will be required to secure necessary infrastructure. Without adequate funding the viability and delivery of sites may be compromised- leading to delay in provision. The CIL charging Schedule, and Regulation 123 list are already adopted, but pre-date the Local Plan Sites Document, and that the Reg.123 list should be reviewed prior to the Examination. The County Council would welcome this with regards to ensuring adequate provision is made for County Council infrastructure. Discussions have taken place regarding the development of an Infrastructure Deliverability Statement, to set out delivery and we are keen to continue this work.					
RDC Comment					
The LPA considers that the key/necessary development principles for the sites are included in the policies and will provide an appropriate basis for the compilation of detailed schemes.					
The LPA sees no reason to review the Regulation 123 list prior to the examination. The list refers to the infrastructure requirements required to support planned growth and is compliant with the regulations as it stands. The list is clear about those requirements which will be funded through CIL and the site specific Section 106 and developers are aware of this.					
The Council has conducted clear discussions with service providers to understand the implications of site choices and the impacts on infrastructure provision. The Regulation 123 List was written with a degree of flexibility to allow the document to respond where the need is greatest. The Council will work with NYCC on the completion of the Infrastructure Delivery Statement to ensure priorities for CIL expenditure are clear and reflect other sources of funding. The major allocation at Norton has been progressed on the basis that the link road is a necessary on-site scheme to be provided by the developers and this is acknowledged in their supporting material. Land for a school will be provided by the developer (to be offset in the CIL contribution) and CIL payments will be used to fund a new school. The development is not of a size to justify the school via Section 106 contribution.					

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles				
Comment					

Norton Primary – 600 LP dwellings – the existing split-site provision and capacity of Norton CP School would be exceeded. Potential new school site with Norton Lodge planning application. Secondary provision in Norton may also need expansion in the long-term.
RDC Comment
Noted. The existing permissions in Norton have been pre-CIL, and subject to educational contributions. Normally, as The District Council has a CIL charge in place, Education contributions would be covered by the CIL charge. The District Council have been in discussions with the County Council and are aware that a new school will be required in Norton and NYCC are aware that this will be at the proposed allocation site.

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD4 - Housing Allocation - Land to the west of Old Maltongate (Ryedale House), Malton: Development Principles				
Comment					
Site 450 lies within an area identified under a minerals safeguarding policy or (if applicable, several Policies) and the development proposed may fit within the exemption criteria identified in the Joint Plan (if adopted).					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD4 - Housing Allocation - Land to the west of Old Maltongate (Ryedale House), Malton: Development Principles				
Comment					
Malton Primary – existing permissions + 60 LP dwellings may need some small scale expansion of Malton CP School. NYCC are working with the diocese St Mary's RC Primary Malton which will add additional capacity to provide for the impacts of new housing in both Malton and Norton. NYCC are reviewing the position of Malton Secondary to determine the need for and degree of any future expansion.					
RDC Comment					

Noted. The existing permissions in Malton have been pre-CIL, and subject to educational contributions. As The District Council has a CIL charge in place, Education contributions would be covered by the CIL charge, if the resulting scheme generates such a requirement.

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles				
Comment					
Pickering Primary – 360 LP dwellings – both the existing community Schools, Pickering Infants and Pickering Junior, would need some expansion. Any significant uplift in the allocation figure would need a review of the need for an additional education site. For Pickering secondary; Lady Lumley's has surplus capacity so no expansion would be needed.					
RDC Comment					
Noted. The existing permissions in Pickering have been pre-CIL, and subject to educational contributions. As The District Council has a CIL charge in place, Education contributions would be covered by the CIL charge.					

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles				
Comment					
Site 347 lies within/or partly within an area identified under a Policy or (if applicable, several Policies) of the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for safeguarding. Therefore, in the event that the Joint Plan is adopted and the site is allocated in the Local Plan adopted by the District Council, the County Council should be consulted on the planning application associated with this development as it not considered currently to meet the exemption criteria in the Joint Plan.					
RDC Comment					
The Site Selection Methodology identified sites where a minerals safeguarding designation was in place. It also recognised that some sites, being adjacent to existing residential development would not be suitable to provide a mineral extraction resource. The Council has taken the emerging safeguarding policy into account in identifying land allocations in line with the Local Plan Strategy and in balancing a range of sustainability considerations. The plan process itself has taken these issues into account and on that basis, the text of the plan does not need to make explicit reference to this matter.					

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD6 - Housing Allocation - Land to the West of Malton Road, Pickering: Development Principles				
Comment					
Pickering Primary – 360 LP dwellings – both the existing community Schools, Pickering Infants and Pickering Junior, would need some expansion. Any significant uplift in the allocation figure would need a review of the need for an additional education site. For Pickering secondary; Lady Lumley's has surplus capacity so no expansion would be needed.					
RDC Comment					
Noted. The existing permissions in Pickering have been pre-CIL, and subject to educational contributions. As the District Council has a CIL charge in place, Education contributions would be covered by the CIL charge.					

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD6 - Housing Allocation - Land to the West of Malton Road, Pickering: Development Principles				
Comment					
Site 200 lies within/or partly within an area identified under a Policy or (if applicable, several Policies) of the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for safeguarding. Therefore, in the event that the Joint Plan is adopted and the site is allocated in the Local Plan adopted by the District Council, the County Council should be consulted on the planning application associated with this development as it not considered currently to meet the exemption criteria in the Joint Plan.					
RDC Comment					
The Site Selection Methodology identified sites where a minerals safeguarding designation was in place. It also recognised that some sites, being adjacent to existing residential development would not be suitable to provide a mineral extraction resource. The Council has taken the emerging safeguarding policy into account in identifying land allocations in line with the Local Plan Strategy and in balancing a range of sustainability considerations. The plan process itself has taken these issues into account and on that basis, the text of the plan does not need to make explicit reference to this matter.					

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD7 - Housing Allocation - Land to the south of Swineherd Lane, Kirkbymoorside: Development Principles				

Comment
Site 156 lies outside any area identified within the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for safeguarding and hence it is not considered that any safeguarding issues are likely to arise.
RDC Comment
Noted.

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD8 - Housing Allocation - Land to the north of Keld Head Close, Kirkbymoorside: Development Principles				
Comment					
Site 206 lies within/or partly within an area identified under a Policy or (if applicable, several Policies) of the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for safeguarding. Therefore, in the event that the Joint Plan is adopted and the site is allocated in the Local Plan adopted by the District Council, the County Council should be consulted on the planning application associated with this development as it not considered currently to meet the exemption criteria in the Joint Plan.					
RDC Comment					
There is no site 206 identified on the policies map, there is a site 201 which is SD8. The Site Selection Methodology identified sites where a minerals safeguarding designation was in place. It also recognised that some sites, being adjacent to existing residential development would not be suitable to provide a mineral extraction resource. The Council has taken the emerging safeguarding policy into account in identifying land allocations in line with the Local Plan Strategy and in balancing a range of sustainability considerations. The plan process itself has taken these issues into account and on that basis, the text of the plan does not need to make explicit reference to this matter.					

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD9 - Housing Allocation - Brickworks Site, to north of Swineherd Lane, Kirkbymoorside: Development Principles				
Comment					
Site 265 lies within/or partly within an area identified under a Policy or (if applicable, several Policies) of the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for safeguarding. Therefore, in the event that the Joint Plan is adopted and the site is allocated in the Local Plan adopted by the District Council, the County					

Council should be consulted on the planning application associated with this development as it not considered currently to meet the exemption criteria in the Joint Plan.

RDC Comment

The Site Selection Methodology identified sites where a minerals safeguarding designation was in place. It also recognised that some sites, being adjacent to existing residential development would not be suitable to provide a mineral extraction resource. The Council has taken the emerging safeguarding policy into account in identifying land allocations in line with the Local Plan Strategy and in balancing a range of sustainability considerations. The plan process itself has taken these issues into account and on that basis, the text of the plan does not need to make explicit reference to this matter.

1060 North Yorkshire County Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy Map	General Policies Map Matters				
Comment					
Policy Map does not show SINC (Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation) which are an important environmental constraint. Does not show Lady Spring Wood SINC or the non-SSSI section of the River Derwent, Kirkbymoorside Map shows Manor Vale shaded in yellow. Although the map does not identify what this signifies. A housing allocation is shown overlapping a SINC.					
RDC Comment					
The Policies Maps do have include SINC sites - they are a pale yellow hashed area, which in the case of Lady Spring Woods is not clear against the VIUA designation. This will be addressed once the maps are fully interactive. The Map key should identify both Local Geological Sites and SINC sites and this will required an amendment. The Kirkbymoorside map does not show a housing site overlapping the edge of a SINC (Manor Vale Wood), but a Scheduled Monument.					

1061 Norton on Derwent Town Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD12 - New Employment Land Allocations				
Comment					
SD12 - New Employment land allocations - York Road Industrial Estate, land at Norton Grove and the Agri-Business Park, Eden House Road are broadly supported by the Council					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1061 Norton on Derwent Town Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD14 - Retail Commitments				
Comment					
SD14- Retail Commitments- Malton Livestock Market site and former Dewhirst Factory site are both supported by the Council					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1061 Norton on Derwent Town Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles	Yes			
Comment					
SD3- supportive of this site and its development principles- provided that a new link road from Beverley Road to Hugden Way and the land allocation for a new primary school are included and not compromised in any way.					
RDC Comment					
Noted. These key infrastructure requirements are integral to the delivery of the site.					

1061 Norton on Derwent Town Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD4 - Housing Allocation - Land to the west of Old Maltongate (Ryedale House), Malton: Development Principles				
Comment					
No comment.					
RDC Comment					

Noted.

1062 obo A L Kirk

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				
Comment					
<p>Land at Back Lane VIUA designation SD16. There are no statutory or non-statutory designated sites and no known species of ecological importance on the site. There are no listed structures within or immediately adjacent to the site and whilst it is located adjacent to Ampleforth Conservation Area, it is not located within the Conservation Area itself. There are several Listed Buildings located within Ampleforth itself, the closest of which is located approximately 170m to the north west (The Manor House, Grade II Listed).</p>					
<p>The Proposed Local Plan Sites DPD outlines that sites are identified as VIUA's for one or more of the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><input type="checkbox"/> a site makes a significant contribution to the character or setting of the settlement;<input type="checkbox"/> a site provides an attractive setting for buildings within a settlement and/or;<input type="checkbox"/> a site makes an important contribution to the historical form and layout of a settlement.					
<p>The Proposed Local Plan Sites DPD confirms that the site selection process used to assess the sites put forward for development by landowners has considered the merits of sites in terms of their contribution to the form, character and setting of settlements. The Proposed Local Plan Sites DPD confirms that landscape quality in itself is not a reason for the designation of a VIUA.</p>					
<p>Further justification is requested to explain the proposed allocation of land south of Back Lane as a VIUA. There is currently no evidence to support the proposed allocation therefore the proposed VIUA is not considered to be justified. It is not considered that the emerging Local Plan Sites DPD demonstrates up-to-date or robust evidence to support the allocation of a VIUA at land to the south of Back Lane, Ampleforth. There are several other sites allocated as VIUA's within Ampleforth which appear to align more closely with the above reasons for such an allocation. The site is located outside of the Conservation Area. This proposed allocation is not considered to be a robust approach or one that is consistent with National Policy that requires plans to be based on up to date and relevant evidence. It is considered, therefore, to ensure the plan is sound, a comprehensive criteria-based assessment and methodology for the designation of land as VIUA should be undertaken.</p>					
RDC Comment					
<p>The proposed VIUA is in response to the Ampleforth Conservation Area Appraisal, undertaken by Ryedale District Council and the North York Moors National Park. This site is identified as being an area of land which is in the setting of the Conservation Area and which contributes to the character and appearance of the designated heritage asset. The Conservation Area appraisal was consulted on and is an adopted SPD. The reason for the proposed designation is set out on page 33 of the VIUA background paper.</p>					

1062 obo A L Kirk

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Omissions	No			
Comment					
Site 160 is not included within the proposed allocations. The Local Plan Strategy does not define a total number of dwellings for Ampleforth or any of the other Service Villages. The Local Plan Strategy seeks to ensure that the extent to which suitable sites exist, will influence the distribution of housing across such Service Villages. It is within this context that Site 160 should be viewed favourably for a residential allocation within Ampleforth. Consider that the total number of dwellings planned for the Service Villages should indeed be viewed as a minimum to provide flexibility. There are a number of valid planning reasons to promote growth in this location, which include:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The site represents a 0.99ha site with no technical constraints that would hinder the delivery of housing in this location. <input type="checkbox"/> The site is advantageously located, with good accessibility to the main strategic transport routes within the District also offering a choice of sustainable transport choices such as bus, pedestrian and cycle routes. <input type="checkbox"/> The site has potential to sustainably accommodate a moderate number of houses to contribute to the housing requirement within Ryedale. <input type="checkbox"/> The Site Assessment Methodology confirms that Site 160 is considered to be a suitable site for a residential allocation and we therefore consider this site should be included within the proposed Local Plan Sites DPD as a residential allocation. <input type="checkbox"/> The site is immediately available for development and can come forward within the period of 0-5 years. <input type="checkbox"/> There are no known technical constraints that could preclude the site coming forward for development. 					
RDC Comment					
Site 160 was identified through the site assessment process as a Group 4 site, but was not taken forward as an allocation due to the delivery of the scheme of over 30 houses in Ampleforth within the Plan Period. The Council has modestly exceeded the Local Plan Strategy's requirement for housing at the Service Village Tier, with proposed allocations at Slingsby and Amotherby, to ensure plan flexibility and ensuring that as equitably as possible development is distributed across the tier. The site performed well through the site assessment process as it has limited sensitivities and constraints. However, since the original site assessment was undertaken, and the majority of site 288 has been built out, the access situation has changed. The access identified as being through 'the Laurels' has been discounted by the Highway Authority. The access would need to be provided from the site 288. The layout of the completed scheme precludes direct access, and so access would be through the undeveloped part of 288, and the landowner of 288 has not engaged with the Council to confirm as to whether this is possible. On that basis, as the access is legally and physically unclear, the site would now be identified as a Group 2 site.					

1062 obo A L Kirk

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Omissions				
Comment					

The Background Paper states; the site (Site 632) is very visually prominent from long distance view across to the village from the eastern part of Yearsley Moor, close to Gilling East, about 2.5 km to the south east of Ampleforth. The historic linear form of the village is an important element of its character. Development of the site would extend the village in a way which would lead to the coalescence of Ampleforth village with buildings associated with the Ampleforth College site. In this respect, it is considered that by virtue of its location and scale the development of the site would compromise the landscape setting of the village, within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The Background Paper confirms that the Site is considered to be a Group 2 site. Further justification is required to support the above assumptions. It's not considered that the development of Site 632 would result in coalescence with the collage area, there are additional properties between the site and the college therefore the above assumptions and reasons for discounting the site do not appear to be robust. Notwithstanding the above, if the Council consider it inappropriate to develop the site in its entirety, it may be possible to develop a smaller proportion of the site to mirror the development pattern on the northern side of East Lane without any adverse impacts on the relationship between the village and the college area. The reasons for discounting Site 632 for development do not appear to be robust. Further evidence is required to support the above assumptions. The applicant would encourage the Council to reconsider their position on the above site and consider at least a small proportion of the site for residential development, to mirror the development pattern on land to the north of East Lane.

RDC Comment

Site has been considered based on the submitted extent. The identification of site 632 as a group 2 site is based on more than just an issue of coalescence, although the Council maintains that the development of this site would link through to a series of properties (irrespective of their ownership) which then leads to the Abbey/school complex and would lead to the merging of two separate entities, significantly changing the form and character of Ampleforth. There are also issues concerning the access to the site, and the standard of the road. The Council is also not identifying an allocation at Ampleforth due to the delivery of the scheme on Station Road, and the need to comply with the requirements of the Local Plan Strategy.

1063 obo Barber and Booth

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy Map	SD2 - Omissions	No		No	No

Comment

Site 417 should be included within Development Limits. Don't agree with the Council's assessment of the site/ application of the site selection methodology. The Development Limits are illogical, perverse, contrary to policy and therefore unsound.

The site is almost surrounded by development and has no intrinsic quality. It is in essence an infill site. The development limits are unsound as they specifically exclude a site that is almost entirely surrounded by development and has no environmental protection policy on it. There are no known ownership, planning or technical constraints to the site's development and the site can be delivered in a policy compliant manner. Flood risk associated with the site is no different to another previously approved scheme in Norton.

The policies map is unsound as it ignores government policy and statements that support the need for more housing and the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The inclusion of undeveloped sites in the development limits would allow windfall sites to come forward at an appropriate time.

RDC Comment

The Local Planning Authority have demonstrated that the proposed allocations comply with the objectives of the adopted Strategic Development Plan (Local Plan Strategy) and the sustainability appraisal process of the site assessment process. This representation neither challenges the identified allocations nor commitments. The Development Limits are an adopted component of the Development Plan in the Local Plan Strategy, and their presence is integral to the operation of Policies SP1 and SP2 (RPLPS). On that basis, the Development Limits can only be changed now in response to the proposed allocations, and commitments as part of the Policies Map, which result in meeting the housing requirement as set out in the Local Plan Strategy. There were site-specific issues with site 417 regarding the fish ponds, and impact on the River Derwent SAC, coupled with pockets of high flood risk, coupled with the important Green Infrastructure Corridor provided by Mill Beck.

1064 obo Barratt and DWH

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD1 - Existing Residential Commitments				
Comment					
The Site at Middleton Road Pickering, (site ref 116) should be allocated for residential development. It will create a sustainable, high quality and accessible development which will bring significant social and economic benefits. The site can deliver a comprehensive development of market and affordable housing. It is in a suitable location and there are no technical or environmental constraints to preclude development. It is available and under the control of a national housebuilder and is considered to be achievable. Its allocation will contribute to the shortfall in homes on account of deliverability concerns associated with SD6 (Malton Road, Pickering) and two Gladman sites (at Kirkbymoorside and Sherburn).					
RDC Comment					
The Local Planning Authority consider that the proposed residential land allocations comply with the objectives of the adopted Local Plan Strategy and are supported by the sustainability appraisal process/ site assessment process. The combination of proposed sites at Pickering will provide for the housing requirements for the Town which are established in the Local Plan Strategy. The site at Middleton Road is less accessible to the Town Centre and is more sensitive in landscape terms.					
The landowner of SD6 remains clear of their commitment to delivering a plan-compliant scheme on the site, and have a planning consultancy engaged in the process. They have made clear representations and it is considered that just because a major housebuilder is not currently promoting the site does not mean that it is not deliverable. The site could be available to a wider range of builders / developers.					
The sites at Kirkbymoorside and Sherburn are relatively recently granted planning permissions, and the Council is not aware of any impediment to their delivery.					
The Plan builds in additional flexibility in terms of housing land supply and the Council do not believe that further sites need to be identified to meet housing requirements. It should be noted that Policy SP2 of the Local Plan Strategy provides a framework for the release of further sites should commitments fail to come forward and if this is required to ensure a deliverable five year land supply. As part of the annual update to the SHLAA, Gladman has confirmed that the sites which it has an interest in, remain deliverable.					

1064 obo Barratt and DWH

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Omissions	No			
Comment					
The Site at Middleton Road Pickering, (site ref 116) should be allocated for residential development. It will create a sustainable, high quality and accessible development which will bring significant social and economic benefits. The site can deliver a comprehensive development of market and affordable housing. It is in a suitable location and there are no technical or environmental constraints to preclude development. It is available and under the control of a national housebuilder and is considered to be achievable. Its allocation will contribute to the shortfall in homes on account of deliverability concerns associated with SD6 (Malton Road, Pickering) and two Gladman sites (at Kirkbymoorside and Sherburn).					
RDC Comment					
The Local Planning Authority consider that the proposed residential land allocations comply with the objectives of the adopted Local Plan Strategy and are supported by the sustainability appraisal process/ site assessment process. The combination of proposed sites at Pickering will provide for the housing requirements for the Town which are established in the Local Plan Strategy. The site at Middleton Road is less accessible to the Town Centre and is more sensitive in landscape terms.					
The landowner of SD6 remains clear of their commitment to delivering a plan-compliant scheme on the site, and have a planning consultancy engaged in the process. They have made clear representations and it is considered that just because a major housebuilder is not currently promoting the site does not mean that it is not deliverable. The site could be available to a wider range of builders / developers.					
The sites at Kirkbymoorside and Sherburn are relatively recently granted planning permissions, and the Council is not aware of any impediment to their delivery.					
The Plan builds in additional flexibility in terms of housing land supply and the Council do not believe that further sites need to be identified to meet housing requirements. It should be noted that Policy SP2 of the Local Plan Strategy provides a framework for the release of further sites should commitments fail to come forward and if this is required to ensure a deliverable five year land supply. As part of the annual update to the SHLAA, Gladman has confirmed that the sites which it has an interest in, remain deliverable.					

1064 obo Barratt and DWH

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD6 - Housing Allocation - Land to the West of Malton Road, Pickering: Development Principles				
Comment					
The Site at Middleton Road Pickering, (site ref 116) should be allocated for residential development. It will create a sustainable, high quality and accessible development which will bring significant social and economic benefits. The site can deliver a comprehensive development of market and affordable housing. It is in a suitable location and there are no technical or environmental constraints to preclude development. It is available and under the control of a national					

housebuilder and is considered to be achievable. It's allocation will contribute to the shortfall in homes on account of deliverability concerns associated with SD6 (Malton Road, Pickering) and two Gladman sites (at Kirkbymoorside and Sherburn).

RDC Comment

The Local Planning Authority consider that the proposed residential land allocations comply with the objectives of the adopted Local Plan Strategy and are supported by the sustainability appraisal process/ site assessment process. The combination of proposed sites at Pickering will provide for the housing requirements for the Town which are established in the Local Plan Strategy. The site at Middleton Road is less accessible to the Town Centre and is more sensitive in landscape terms.

The landowner of SD6 remains clear of their commitment to delivering a plan-compliant scheme on the site, and have a planning consultancy engaged in the process. They have made clear representations and it is considered that just because a major housebuilder is not currently promoting the site does not mean that it is not deliverable. The site could be available to a wider range of builders / developers.

The sites at Kirkbymoorside and Sherburn are relatively recently granted planning permissions, and the Council is not aware of any impediment to their delivery.

The Plan builds in additional flexibility in terms of housing land supply and the Council do not believe that further sites need to be identified to meet housing requirements. It should be noted that Policy SP2 of the Local Plan Strategy provides a framework for the release of further sites should commitments fail to come forward and if this is required to ensure a deliverable five year land supply. As part of the annual update to the SHLAA, Gladman has confirmed that the sites which it has an interest in, remain deliverable.

1065 obo Barratt Homes and Taylor Wimpey

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles				
Comment					
<p>We fully support the principle of the proposed allocation of the site by RDC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The allocation boundary needs to be expanded in order to provide a more sympathetically designed development which places the new primary school within the proposed link road boundary, and also to enable the delivery of additional public open space and landscaping on the site's southern boundary.• The development proposals will deliver circa 600 homes, a new primary school, a new link road, public open space, green networks and enhanced boundary landscaping.• The proposed development can enhance the south-eastern area of Norton through a sensitive extension to the existing urban area.• The development will enhance identified areas of landscape and habitat value in perpetuity.• The proposed number of homes to be delivered at this site are required to meet Malton/Norton's and the District's housing needs.					

- The development provides the opportunity to facilitate the delivery of a significant number of environmental benefits.
- No other potential site option located within Malton/Norton can deliver the socio-economic, community or highways benefits that the site can deliver. The development proposals are situated in a suitable and highly sustainable location in respect of existing settlement form and there are no technical or environmental (built and natural) constraints that would preclude the development of the site.
- The site is available now as it is under the control of two national house builders who are actively seeking to secure planning permission for the residential development of the site.
- The site can also be considered achievable as our clients can deliver new homes on the site within the next 5 years.

Creating a sustainable community of 600 homes, meeting market and affordable housing needs.

- The proposals will deliver a new link road connecting Beverley Road and Hugden Way. As shown on the enclosed Indicative Masterplan and Site Location Plan. The junctions, alignment and standard of the new link road has been agreed with NYCC.
- At this point we believe that the requested implementation of a MOVA system at the junction with Scarborough Road and Westfield Way is pre-emptive in advance of the submission of the planning application. This specific scheme may well form part of the proposals in due course, but it has not been discussed with NYCC at this point and our highways consultants have not specifically identified that it is needed. In fact, our highways consultants are currently predicting that the Scarborough Road and Westfield Way junction will operate with significant reserve capacity in the future, meaning we are not expecting that mitigation will be required at this location. In any event, this is a matter that we will work with NYCC on over the course of the determination of the impending planning application.
- The development proposals include 2Ha of land for a new two form entry primary school.
- Site and boundary landscaping has been integrated into the proposals to include landscape areas for play and fitness. Including new additional boundary landscape planting along the site's northern and southern boundaries.
- The scheme has been designed to deliver well defined hierarchy of streets and spaces.
- Pedestrian and cycle only routes have been designed throughout the scheme and will circumnavigate the proposed areas of public open space throughout the site and alongside the proposed link road. Connecting the site to existing surrounding areas, the town centre and the countryside to the south of the site. All existing PROW and Bridleways through the site are to be retained. A direct connection will be provided to the new proposed primary school site from the north.
- Vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access will be provided from two access points along Beverley Road via the new link road and a separate access for the development proposals.
- The development proposals will include significant areas of green infrastructure. By undertaking a landscape led masterplan, development parcels have naturally been developed. Existing landscape features, including hedges and trees are retained within the site and can be further enhanced through additional planting within the built form. Public open space is distributed evenly throughout the site allowing easy access for all future residents of the development. The focus of the public open space provision will be on natural areas of play, with the potential for a NEAP and playing pitch to be provided within the area of public open space proposed within the north-western corner of the site, to connect to existing areas of open space. Other facilities such as

trim trails will also be considered.

- The development will deliver sustainable drainage systems which are integrated into the design with regards to Surface water drainage and Foul water drainage. The proposed SuDs features within the development will also be designed to deliver biodiversity benefits.
- The capability for electric vehicle charging through the provision of a 13-amp electrical socket will be discussed with the Council. It is also a matter that could be resolved by an appropriate worded planning condition. For this reason, we request that the criteria be removed from the proposed policy.
- A lighting scheme to minimise glare, reduce energy usage, and protect amenity will be submitted to discharge any future appropriately worded planning condition. For this reason, we request that the criteria be removed from the proposed policy.

Further to the undertaking of additional discussions with officers of RDC and NYCC, the development proposals will deliver each of RDC's site specific development principles for the Norton Lodge site.

RDC Comment

Note for support for the proposed allocation. The Development Principles outline particular site-specific matters for which its is important that delivery of these matters is articulated in the Development Plan to give them full weight. NYCC and the modelling work undertaken for the Council have identified that utilising efficient junction capacity is important for overall vehicular movements and reducing congestion. The Air Quality Impact Assessment identifies the importance of ensuring new residences have the capability to charge vehicles, and the council is keen to ensure that this is established as part of the Development Plan rather than as a condition. The precise means of lighting the schemes will be discussed as part of any resulting planning application, but the Council wants to ensure that the Development Plan sets out a clear position regarding lighting.

1066 obo Bede Homes Ltd

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Omissions				
Comment					
The majority of the housing need for Malton / Norton is proposed to be delivered on a greenfield site on the edge of Norton. The Ryedale House site comprises brownfield land but currently lies outside the settlement limits.					
Despite the former Woolgrowers site comprising brownfield land within the settlement limits of Malton / Norton and in close proximity to Malton town centre, this site has not been identified as a proposed housing allocation as the Council consider that concerns relating to flood risk, access and contamination cannot be mitigated.					
No objections to the above allocations, but consider that the identified site constraints can be mitigated such that the site can deliver housing within the proposed plan period and should therefore be duly allocated for residential development. Submits that Westwood have undertaken a sequential assessment which concludes the Woolgrowers site is the only site within the appropriate size parameters and geographical area which meets the flood risk sequential criteria of availability and deliverability. Suggests a series of mitigation measures. Access and highways is confirmed that for a scheme of 50 units access can be achieved from Park Lane. An ecological appraisal identifies some areas of high value for nesting birds, and would be retained. Contamination is expected, but no evidence that the site cannot be remediated, and as such not considered to constrain development. Include Land at the					

former Woolgrowers Site, Park Road, Malton (4.5ha) circa 50 dwellings
RDC Comment
No site submission information was received after 2009. Site is subject of long-standing awareness. It is a brownfield site, within Development Limits, and with the geographic capability to forge sustainable links to Malton and Norton Town Centres, subject to the provision of a crossing of the railway. However, the individual site 121 was not considered to be deliverable or developable: complex contamination issues with the site, and the uncertain means of access and high flood risk. The site is almost entirely within Flood Zone 3, and also is within a Rapid Inundation Zone. There are other sites in a lower level of flood risk which are available, developable and are also sustainably located. Therefore the site fails the Sequential Test, as alternatives are present, and is unable to move onto the Exception Test. Matters regarding access are noted, but would need to be assessed within the context of strategic junction capacity considerations. The ecological appraisal has not considered the proximity of the site to the River Derwent SAC. The Council is aware that the site can be remediated, but is concerned that the costs of such remediation would affect viability, the representations do not confirm the viability position.

1067 obo Church Commissioners for England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General					
Comment					
Changes to the NPPF which will be brought forward next year and the further emphasis of boosting housing delivery forward by the Government in its Housing White Paper. emphasises that more small and medium sized sites should be made available to allow rural communities to grow. This is clearly at odds with the current approach in the Local Plan.					
RDC Comment					
A result of the white paper, prior to Publication we examined the contribution of small and medium sites (which are being allocated see SD7, SD8, SD9, SD10, SD11 which are between 8-40 units) and investigated sub-0.5ha sites. Many of these site which had been submitted were not deliverable. The Local Plan Strategy provides a range of scenarios for small scale- locally derived needs to be met.					

1067 obo Church Commissioners for England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General	Other	No			
Comment					
The Local Plan Strategy document therefore seemingly allows some (limited) growth with Other Villages under certain circumstances. This would then contribute towards the plan requirement of 3,000 (net) new homes over the plan period (2012 – 2027)					
The Local Plan Sites Document and Policies Map uses this approach. It calculates the residual requirement to be 545 dwellings (taking into account					

completions and commitments since the start of the plan period). It then allocates this requirement (plus a buffer) over 9 sites which predominantly focus on Malton and Norton (Principal Town), Pickering and Kirkbymoorside (Local Service Centres) as well as the Local Service Villages of Amotherby and Slingsby. Whilst the Local Plan Sites Document does provide settlement boundaries to the smaller villages within the District, it does not allocate land for housing within these settlements. Consider that Local Plan Sites Document should be scrapped and a new Local Plan prepared.

RDC Comment

The Local Plan Strategy seeks to provide for locally-driven housing demand in the smaller settlements, and focus the majority of housing on the larger settlements. The Development Limits are retained, and contained with the adopted Local Plan Strategy. The Local Plan Strategy is a post NPPF adopted Plan, which gave a clear steer as to where and to what extent residential development would be appropriate. Whilst the lag time between the two development plan documents is longer than the Council would have anticipated, planning permissions and delivery of the housing strategy, including affordable housing has been taking place- as evidence by the robust, in excess five-year land supply. Need is being met. The recently prepared SHMA has reinforced this.

1067 obo Church Commissioners for England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD15 - Flamingo Land and the National Agri-Food Innovation Campus				
Comment					
Consider the rolling forward of existing Development Limits for the NAFIC site is unsound. Should identify neighbouring land (not within the Green belt) to allow for future expansion.					
RDC Comment					
The purpose of SD15 is to allow the reconfiguration of the existing site in principle, as the LEP identified that there was no need for expansion. There is policies SP6 an SP9 which would allow the principle of such expansion, if there was a need to expand. Such extensions to the site would be considered through the usual planning application process, examining the nature, scale and impact of the proposed use. No land has been submitted for an extension to the NAFIC site.					

1067 obo Church Commissioners for England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Omissions				
Comment					
Proposes Claxton as an example where the Development Limits should be changed- and a parcel of land is indicated on a map. Identifies the site as being available, suitable and achievable.					

RDC Comment
This site is in Claxton, not one of the villages which are identified as Service Villages, and therefore not capable in principle of allocations being made, in accordance with the Local Plan Strategy. In respect of the site submitted, this has only been submitted at Publication Stage.

1067 obo Church Commissioners for England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations	No			
Comment					
Local Plan Sites Document should allow alterations to Development Limits within Villages to accommodate growth.					
RDC Comment					
The Development Limits are part of the adopted Development Plan and operate with SP1 and SP2 as a policy tool to implement the spatial strategy and ensure that housing allocations are delivered in the larger, more sustainable locations. With Exception Sites and Enabling Development scenarios being capable of being brought forward. If the Local Planning Authority proposed to allow alterations to Development Limits as a principle at the Other Villages, this would totally undermine the spatial approach as set out in the adopted Local Plan Strategy.					

1067 obo Church Commissioners for England

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations				
Comment					
Local Plan Sites Document should identify sites beyond 2027, based this on up to date housing requirements and needs of rural areas within the district. This would indicate appropriate housing development in sustainable rural locations to allow for the continued viability of these settlements. This is something echoed within the aforementioned Housing White Paper (which suggests identifying small and medium sites for such purposes) and paragraph 55 of the NPPF.					
RDC Comment					
The Local Plan Sites Document, in order to be legally compliant, needs to be in conformity with the Local Plan Strategy, on which it is based. To extend the life of the Local Plan Sites Document on that basis would be unsound. The Spatial Strategy and resulting Settlement Hierarchy is post NPPF, and pairing of villages took place to identify Service Villages where allocations could be identified. The allocations reflects this. The Council has a SHMA of 2016 which identified Local Plan Strategy housing requirement of 200 homes was still appropriate and there is still the capability to bring forward housing to meet the needs of rural areas such as Exception Site Housing and Enabling Development, and dwellings subject to the Local Needs Occupancy.					

1068 obo Commercial Development Projects and Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD12 - New Employment Land Allocations				
Comment					
Not sound, not legally compliant. Particular reference to site 578 and 678 (579). Was identified as a preferred site in 2015 consultation, submitted representations which confirmed the sites were suitable as they were deliverable and developable. Note that a broad location has been identified but would help if the site was properly defined as per that in our 2015 representations that would remove any uncertainty/ ambiguity regarding the extent. Certainty will be a key issue for any interested occupier, and similarly will also be required if further investment in infrastructure on that site is to proceed. This out to be a relatively simple revision prior to the submission of the DPD.					
RDC Comment					
(678 does not exist) Council refer to 579. The LPA has set out the specific reasons why the site is not identified as a specifically defined extent. This is due to site specific issues such as archaeology, power lines, and the surface water management. It is also due to the land take of those site extents being well in excess of the plan requirements, and the low take up of sites at York Road, and the slow progress at Eden House Road. The Local Plan Sites Document identifies the locality as the longer-term area for expansion. This is sufficient for the remainder of this Plan Period.					

1068 obo Commercial Development Projects and Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				
Comment					
Not sound not legally compliant. The inclusion of site 324 as a VIUA is contrary to our evidence- the development of Peasey Hills, with retention of the Flatts is sufficient to provide open space between Malton and Old Malton. Our advice concerning archaeology is that this land, due to its distance from Old Malton cannot be considered as a substantive reason from a heritage perspective for the creation of a VIUA in this location. Any former connection between the site and St. Mary's Church is no longer perceptible. There is no justification for the proposed designation of the Peasey Hills Site as a new or extended VIUA. Reconsider the VIUA designation, and identify the site for housing, as part of the Malton Option.					
RDC Comment					
The proposed VIUA is not unsound or in breach of any legal requirement.					
The land is proposed as VIUA as it is considered that in its undeveloped state, it forms part of the setting of St Mary's Priory and the Old Malton Conservation Area. The Council has previously under estimated the role of this site in this respect and following the 2015 and 2016 consultations, reconsidered the site. Historic England and the Council's Conservation Officer have concerns that the Flatts itself was insufficient to preserve both the					

setting of the Old Malton Conservation Area, and the setting of St. Mary's Priory which is a Grade I Listed Building. The Council consider that the contribution of the land to the setting is about its contribution to significance, including, for example visibility and status as in this case. It is not necessarily about a physical direct connection of the land to the church in terms of current land ownership.

1068 obo Commercial Development Projects and Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Omissions	No		No	
Comment					
Not sound not legally compliant. Particular reference to site 324 (Land South of Westgate Lane and north of Green Lane, Malton). Was identified as a preferred site in 2015 consultation, submitted representations which confirmed the sites were suitable as they were deliverable and developable. Now not included. The site was accompanied by a considerable body of supporting information which confirmed the site's suitability. Reconsider the VIUA designation, and identify the site for housing, as part of the Malton Option.					
RDC Comment					
It was identified as an option choice. The choice of other sites over this site is not a soundness issue. The decision to chose other sites is made from a suite of information to inform site choices. It includes the SSM, Background Papers, and technical assessments to evidence that approach.					

1068 obo Commercial Development Projects and Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles				
Comment					
Not sound not legally compliant. The LPA has placed significant weight on a number of untested assertions: no evidence that the link road is deliverable and developable. No viability evidence concerning affordable housing provision, with the link road and land for a new primary school; thirdly it is understood that the Malton Option was also acceptable in transport and highway terms. Differentiation on landscape terms due to misplaced sensitivity. Reconsider the VIUA designation, and identify the site for housing, as part of the Malton Option.					
RDC Comment					
The Local Planning authority received headline viability information, which was externally evaluated which confirmed that with all infrastructure requirements a level of affordable housing which was still acceptable, based on the strategic importance of the link road and the land for a school. The Norton Lodge site heritage setting considerations is much less sensitive than that of the Peasey Hills site. Both sites have low landscape sensitivity.					

1069 obo CPRE North Yorkshire

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General		Yes		Yes	
Comment					
CPRENY is supportive of the fact that RDC has produced the Sites Document in conformity with the Local Plan Strategy. The Plan provides land to meet minimum housing requirements and a supply buffer and does not over allocate land. CPRENY is confident that the allocations and commitments will be delivered appropriately as set out through the design principles contained in SD3-SD11.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1070 obo D Beal

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD6 - Housing Allocation - Land to the West of Malton Road, Pickering: Development Principles				
Comment					
We are unaware of any evidence, planning policy or case law which states or even implies that to be deliverable a developer has to be involved. The Landowner has taken the decision with regard to Site 200 to self-fund the planning allocation and application process. The reason for doing that is to retain more control of the process, both in regard to the quality of the proposals (which is important to our client being a local landowner) and in terms of the timing of the development coming forward. It is our experience that where developers have under control via an option agreement, this can take a significant amount of time to commence development post consent, including time to agree price and serve option notices, which can take 6-24 months.					
RDC Comment					
Noted. The Council is confident that the site is in a location which would be attractive to a range of housebuilders, including some of the more local, smaller builders.					

1070 obo D Beal

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD6 - Housing Allocation - Land to the West of Malton Road, Pickering: Development Principles	Yes		Yes	Yes
Comment					
The Master Plan although draft and prepared ahead of the Local Plan Sites Document, shows general conformity with all the key Development Principles.					

We would anticipate there being enough flexibility within the Site to address the more minor elements such as a suitable lighting scheme and capability of electric vehicle charging points at detailed planning stage. An Access Feasibility Report demonstrates that access from Malton Road without compromise to the operation of the existing junctions, is achievable. Accept that a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan will still be required, as well as the provision of electric vehicle charging through a 13 amp electrical socket for each property with a dedicated car parking space within its curtilage. The site is in a Sustainable location and there is the opportunity to connect to and enhance the existing pedestrian and cycle only routes in and through the development to the site access. That principle will be embraced at the time of application. Part of the site (western edge) is within Flood Zone 2, and so there is recognition that this area of the site submission fails the Sequential Test, and as shown in the submitted Master Plan has been excluded from the developable area. It has been identified that consideration will need to be given to the treatment of surface water through the implementation of SuDS in line with the North Yorkshire County Council SuDS Design Guidance.

RDC Comment

Noted. Compliance with the Development Principles would be required, as if adopted they would form part of the Development Plan.

1071 obo D Dale-Sunley

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Omissions	No		Yes	Yes
Comment					
Propose the allocation of a large site to the south of Kirkbymoorside (RDC refs 524,644,213,210,385,159,509) to meet housing need and the associated buffer. In its entirety the site is in a central location, is well related to the existing built form of the Town and is close to services and facilities. Development of the site would not lead to coalescence with Keldholme and the site is not a VIUA or in the AHLV. It is an appropriate, suitable and sustainable location. There are no legal, policy or physical constraints to its development.					
The Council's housing figure is a minimum figure and it is important that the Council addresses the requirements of the Zone of Tolerance when allocating land. If the Council fails to plan properly to meet objectively assessed needs it will fail the tests of soundness in failing to be consistent with the Local Plan Strategy and the plan will not be effective. The Council is not planning positively to accommodate the flexible buffer and Zone of Tolerance.					
On the edge of the more sustainable settlements, land should be identified/safeguarded to be used if needed. This would ensure that the long term expansion of the towns continues to be plan-led.					
RDC Comment					
The Council considers that the proposed allocations, and the identified commitments are capable of delivering the plan requirements, and the evidence has been produced to demonstrate this. The land to the north of the A170 at Kirkbymoorside is identified within the Local Plan Strategy as being the area of focus for housing (Policy SP2), and the strategic principles for the Town. Conversely the land to south is expected to "consolidate existing redevelopment opportunities without redefining the traditional built form of the town.". The development of these sites would be contrary to the adopted Development Plan.					

1071 obo D Dale-Sunley

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Omissions				
Comment					
The Council is not planning positively to accommodate the flexible buffer and Zone of Tolerance. Site 203 at Outgang Road in Pickering should be allocated for residential or employment purposes. The site is adjacent to the built form of Pickering and there are no technical constraints which would prevent its development. It is a suitable location for development and can be viably developed. There is also an existing commitment on the site for a B1/B2 unit (planning application ref: 17/00398/FUL).					
The Council's site assessment does not take account of surrounding development or the existing permission. If allocated for housing, the effects of the existing industrial estate can be mitigated.					
On the edge of the more sustainable settlements, land should be identified or safeguarded to be used if needed. This would ensure that the long term expansion of the Towns continues to be plan-led.					
RDC Comment					
The Council's approach is positive and aligns with commitments in the Local Plan Strategy. An additional supply is identified in the plan to provide flexibility. The role of the Zone of Tolerance has been misunderstood. Its purpose is to provide positive /responsive management of housing delivery: by allowing an annual 25% uplift in completions to not affect the following 5 year land supply position. Its operation is demonstrated in the SHLAA Part 1 annual update.					
Site 203 is in close proximity to the Industrial Estate, and now a B2 use (which is not appropriate to occur in a residential area) is adjacent. The Council has taken into account the surrounding development, and this is evidenced in the Site Selection Methodology Tables. The permission for the B1/B2 units covers an area of land which is not contiguous to the established Development Limits. The site is not considered to be an appropriate site for housing and other sites provide more appropriate sites to meet housing requirements. It is noted that the respondent has not sought to demonstrate why the sites proposed in the plan are considered to be unsound.					

1071 obo D Dale-Sunley

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy Map	Harome				
Comment					
The Development Limits at Harome should be amended to include site 37 for local needs housing. The site is deliverable with no legal, policy or physical constraints which would prevent development. The land is currently the subject of a planning application (17/01299/OUT).					
The Development Limits are drawn too tightly and do not allow for small-scale growth which is commensurate with the size of the settlement in accordance with the District's strategy. There is high demand for local needs properties in Harome and it is important that the Council supports some rural development.					

RDC Comment
Alteration of the Development Limits other than for proposed allocations or commitments outside of the Service Villages and Market Towns would be contrary to the provisions of SP1 and SP2, and would as a principle be employing a different spatial strategy to that set out in the Local Plan Strategy. The Local Plan Strategy still provides scenarios for small-scale incremental growth for local needs, such as Exception Sites, and the needs of the land-based economy. The Local Plan Sites Document is in conformity with the Local Plan Strategy.

1071 obo D Dale-Sunley

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy Map	Pickering				
Comment					
The Development Limits at Pickering should be amended to include our clients land (Planning application ref: 17/00398/FUL) and to align with development on the ground and where consent has been obtained.					
RDC Comment					
The District Council consider that the Development Limits as proposed are appropriate.					

1072 obo D Hume

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD10 - Housing Allocation- Land to the south of Amotherby Primary School, Amotherby: Development Principles	No			
Comment					
Object to the proposed allocation of Site 148 at Amotherby and its preference over Site 365. Concerned over inaccuracies in the Site Selection methodology and in the supporting information - (Amotherby Background Paper). There is no clarity around the deliverability of site 148. The site is not in a single ownership and there are known problems with running sand and non quantified ground conditions. (The Parish Council's concerns with the proposed allocation of site 148 are repeated in the response)					
RDC Comment					
The Council has previously responded to the perceived inaccuracies as part of the response to the Sites Consultation in 2015 regarding sites 365, 341, 8 and 148. The Council is aware that there is developer interest, and that whilst the land is multiple ownership all of the landowners are in agreement for the site's development, and a planning consultant has provided information about the potential delivery of the site. Whilst they have not made a representation as part of the Publication, they have provided confirmation subsequently. The ground conditions would be considered through a geotechnical survey which					

can be submitted with the planning application, noting the proximity of residential development already to the immediate east of the site.

1072 obo D Hume

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Omissions				
Comment					
Site 365 at Amotherby should be proposed as an allocation above alternatives. It has the support of the Parish Council and local residents. The site meets the Local Plan Strategy requirements for 'limited small scale sites in or adjacent to current development limits'. The development of the site will not create parking issues in the village and will result in minimal impact on the street scene, countryside and AONB in contrast to the preferred proposed site. The site selection methodology includes a number of inaccuracies about the site. There have been two planning applications for the development of the site and supporting technical information is available. The Parish Council and site (365) owner wish to challenge the grouping of the site as a Group 2 site. The source protection zone is irrelevant and Nosie is no greater than that experienced by current residents. The advantages and lesser impact of site 365 outweigh those of site148.					
RDC Comment					
The Local Planning Authority is well aware of the submission of documents about the site to both the planning application process and the Development Plan production process, and that documentation is on the website. Neither application has been approved (one returned, one refused). Site 635 has been principally ruled out due to the risks to a private water supply bore hole which serves a food manufacturing enterprise, the Environment Agency has been clear about the very high potential for contamination of the aquifer, it is not an irrelevance. Nor is the impacts of noise which must be based on current standards of amenity for residents, and the inability to achieve this was a reason for refusal on the second planning application. The representor has not substantiated the impacts of the proposed allocation (site SD11) on the AONB, the wider countryside or the street scene. Within the Development Principles, it is proposed that alongside the housing there is to be a play area (which is not currently available) and a kiss and drop facility for the school is to be provided as a solution to the issues with traffic at the school starting and finishing. The Site Selection Methodology has identified the proximity of the AONB as a sensitivity and suggested mitigation measures as part of that, which would also be required in terms of noise impacts (which 635 was unable to overcome).					

1072 obo D Hume

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations				
Comment					
Despite the planned supply of housing at the Service Villages being exceeded, a supply of housing from small infill sites of lower impact , like site 365, should be maintained. The site individually or in conjunction with other sites, will help to maintain a healthy housing supply.					

RDC Comment					
Infill sites (which meet the definition set out in SP2) can still come forward within the provisions of the adopted Development Plan. Site 635 is not an infill site as it is outside Development Limits. Site 635 has been ruled out due to the risks to a private water supply bore hole which serves a food manufacturing enterprise, the Environment Agency has been clear about the very high potential for contamination of the aquifer. The response is confused, in so far as it acknowledges that there is some over provision in the tier, but then suggests sites like 635 should come forward, when it is not within Development Limits, and is not an infill site. Such proposals would be contrary to the overall spatial approach which seeks to ascribe some of the housing supply to the Service Village Tier.					

1073 obo David Wilson Homes

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations	Yes			
Comment					
Support the allocation of the Whitby Road site. Whilst the site is the subject of a planning application, DWH consider it prudent to continue to promote the site as an allocation.					
The site represents a deliverable residential development site in a sustainable and accessible location. It will deliver substantial economic and social benefits (including CIL; indirect and direct spending in the local economy; open space and affordable housing) and it will make an important contribution to Ryedale's housing requirements. The development of the site would comply with the Local Plan Strategy and the NPPF. The site is deliverable. It is suitable for housing and there are no technical constraints which would preclude its development. The site is available and there are no legal or ownership constraints to its development. The development of the site is achievable and 35 dph are anticipated.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1073 obo David Wilson Homes

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles				
Comment					
Support the allocation of the Whitby Road site. Whilst the site is the subject of a planning application, DWH consider it prudent to continue to promote the site as an allocation.					
The site represents a deliverable residential development site in a sustainable and accessible location. It will deliver substantial economic and social					

benefits (including CIL; indirect and direct spending in the local economy; open space and affordable housing) and it will make an important contribution to Ryedale's housing requirements. The development of the site would comply with the Local Plan Strategy and the NPPF. The site is deliverable. It is suitable for housing and there are no technical constraints which would preclude its development. The site is available and there are no legal or ownership constraints to its development. The development of the site is achievable and 35 dph are anticipated.

RDC Comment

Noted.

1074 obo E Humble

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations	Yes		Yes	Yes
Comment					
Support the allocation of site 201 in Kirkbymoorside and the principles set out in the plan.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1074 obo E Humble

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD8 - Housing Allocation - Land to the north of Keld Head Close, Kirkbymoorside: Development Principles				
Comment					
Support the allocation of site 201 in Kirkbymoorside and the principles set out in the plan.					
RDC Comment					

1075 obo Fitzwilliam Malton Estate

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations				

Comment
Supporting paragraphs (1.2,1.3 and 2.2) emphasise the need to allocate sites to meet needs. However the document or supporting evidence do not set out information which is required to demonstrate that delivery can and will take place. In the absence of this certainty the requirements that the Draft Plan itself sets out cannot be guaranteed. Evidence is required to demonstrate that delivery can be achieved.
RDC Comment
The Local Planning Authority has, in the case of SD3, received headline viability information around the costs of the site's delivery, which the developers considered they would be plan-compliant, and this was independently appraised. The Independent Appraisal concluded that given the costs of the road, affordable housing provision may not quite meet plan- requirements, but the road is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms combined with the land for the school (as a new school would be required in Norton) and will deliver wider benefits for general traffic circulation. Other developers have confirmed in their representations that they can deliver a plan-compliant development in light of the CIL Charge, and they do not have the same infrastructure requirements. No viability evidence was provided concerning the FME sites as part of the Development Plan production.

1075 obo Fitzwilliam Malton Estate

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations				
Comment					
The proposed allocations (notably the site subject of SD 3) are not sound (as set out in separate submissions) and alternative should be included. Additional sites need to be referenced and tested to allow full comparative assessment and to ensure that the requirements of the Local Plan Strategy can be delivered in the plan period.					
RDC Comment					
The process for testing sites and referencing them is evidenced in all the Sustainability Appraisal, Site Selection Methodologies, background papers, and technical evidence through the transport modelling work and the air quality impact assessment, it is not the role of the plan to explain the chosen allocations, but that of the supporting documents. The 2015 Sites Consultation outlined the site options and choices which the Council were considering, and as a result of that consultation, in conjunction with the above-referenced material it made informed judgements on the suitability of sites to meet the plan requirements, and based on the evidence provided to the Council regarding alternative sites, this has confirmed that SD3 and the other proposed allocations are the most appropriate sites to deliver the plan requirements.					

1075 obo Fitzwilliam Malton Estate

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles				

Comment
The viability of the site has not been soundly demonstrated and relies on assertions. Evidence needs to be produced which can be tested to demonstrate that delivery can be achieved incorporating the full requirements of the plan (para 2.13).
RDC Comment
The Local Planning Authority has, in the case of SD3, received headline viability information around the costs of the site's delivery, which the developers considered they would be plan-compliant, and this was independently appraised. The Independent Appraisal concluded that given the costs of the road, affordable housing provision may not quite meet plan- requirements, but the road is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms combined with the land for the school (as a new school would be required in Norton) and will deliver wider benefits for general traffic circulation. Other developers have confirmed in their representations that they can deliver a plan-compliant development in light of the CIL Charge, and they do not have the same infrastructure requirements. No viability evidence was provided concerning the FME sites as part of the Development Plan production.

1075 obo Fitzwilliam Malton Estate

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy Map	Malton/Norton (Central Area)	No		Yes	Yes
Comment					
Policies in relation to retail development are considered to reflect available evidence, the nature of the retail market and Framework policies which emphasise the need to maintain and enhance established town centres as most accessible locations for the provision of retail and other services to meet local needs.					
The commitments are based on historic permissions granted on this basis or in the context of particular site circumstances and with appropriate restrictions on the permissions.					
RDC Comment					
Noted. The permissions are within the Plan Period.					

1076 obo Flamingo Land

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD15 - Flamingo Land and the National Agri-Food Innovation Campus				
Comment					
There are areas on the fringes of the park which have been identified by the business to facilitate its expansion and SD15 should be amended to reflect this.					

Policy SP8 of the Local Plan Strategy aims to support the business plan and operational requirements of existing tourist and visitor attractions. The ability of the owners to implement their future business plans would be restricted by the development limits as currently drawn.

Flamingo land is generally supportive of the approach that has been taken in relation to development within the park boundary. We consider that additional wording should be included within SD15 which extends this approach to areas of the park that lie beyond the development limits to:

- support the reconfiguration of the holiday village to make qualitative improvements

- support the expansion of the zoo to the east

(suggested wording attached)

RDC Comment

The Local Planning Authority would need to understand the impact of the proposed works, and so the extending of the Development Limits in principle would not represent a justified and evidenced approach (acknowledging the existing development as a factual change)

1076 obo Flamingo Land

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy Map	Kirby Misperton - Flamingoland	No			
Comment					
Flamingo land is generally supportive of the approach that has been taken in relation to development within the Park boundary. However, the Development Limits on the western edge of the park should be amended to take in the land which is the subject of the Certificate of Lawful Use or Development (03/01192/CLEUD).					
RDC Comment					
Noted. The Local Planning Authority have no objections to the inclusion of the established use within the Development Limits, as a factual alteration.					

1077 obo Karro Food Group

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles				
Comment					
Given the allocation also seeks to deliver a link road which will connect to Hugden Way, it is essential the design of the road and the associated highways assessment takes into account and accommodates truck yard movements associated with the Karro site and a safe pedestrian crossing from the existing car park to the main factory site. It is also noted that the extent of the allocation encroaches onto land that lies within the existing employment allocation					

(SP6). From reviewing the illustrative masterplan it appears this relates to part of the link road and we will be seeking further clarification from the council in respect of this particular matter.

RDC Comment

The link road is an integral element of the delivery of the housing allocation, and is a strategic solution to improving traffic circulation around the towns.

1077 obo Karro Food Group

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles				
Comment					

Note fourth bullet point which seeks a substantive landscape, visual and noise attenuation buffer between the housing development and the Malton Bacon Factory. Whilst this bullet point does seek to address potential conflict between the Karro site and the proposed residential dwellings by providing a buffer area, it is maintained this is not enough to give comfort to the Karro Food Group site that the buffer would not prejudice or compromise the ability of the company to grow in the future. An illustrative masterplan has been submitted which shows a new car parking area for Karro Food Group with 780 spaces proposed and an adjacent area of public open space. However, Karro Food Group is not planning to take up this new car parking area, and this area will need to be redesigned, potentially to incorporate an acoustic bund, acoustic fencing and landscaping, as technical consultants determine appropriate. The proximity of a public open space area to Karro's operation is also questioned. The Site Selection Methodology Assessment for the site (Q. 29) advises the site submitter has prepared a noise assessment which has informed the buffer shown on the indicative masterplan for the site. It should be a requirement of the allocation that the noise attenuation buffer is informed by an up to date noise assessment, carried out on a mid-week, full production activity day.

Amendments to Policy SD3 Development Principles to make the plan sound:

1 – A new road linking Beverley Road to Hugden Way which accommodates existing goods vehicles associated with the Karro Food Group site and safe pedestrian movements between the existing Karro Food Group car park and the main factory site.

4 – A substantive landscape, visual and noise attenuation buffers between the housing development and the Karro Food Group site and be subject to discussions with Karro Food Group in order that the nature of their operations can be fully understood. A noise assessment should inform the noise attenuation buffer. A new Development Principle: An odour report should form part of any planning application submission and should identify measures to ensure the design and layout of the scheme addresses odour associated with the Karro Food Group site.

A New Development Principle: Any future planning applications, including reserved matters, must include a Statement of Community Involvement and in particular make reference to consultation with key stakeholders, including Karro Food Group.

RDC Comment

1077 obo Karro Food Group

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles				
Comment					
<p>Karro Food Group who operate from Hugden Way in Malton. It is the largest employer in Malton and operates 24 hours from the site 7 days a week. Operations in meat production, and through its geographic size, generates a certain level of noise, light, smells and substantial vehicle movements around the clock. The land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton is proposed to be allocated under Policy SD2, which sets out the detailed proposals for the development of the site (SD3), identifies land for 600 dwellings adjacent to my client's site. Concerns regarding sensitivity of new occupants to operations. These representations do not seek to object to the principle of residential development of this site but it must be ensured the development principles for the site support the operation of the Karro Food Group site in its current manner and do not prejudice or compromise the ability of the company to grow in the future. To ensure the plan is sound we consider further detail should be set out within the development principles for the site which are identified in associated Policy SD3 to ensure any future residential development will not result in conflict with Karro's existing and future operations. Of critical importance in this regard are the appropriate siting of dwellings, a buffer between the proposed dwellings and the site, along with noise and light attenuation in the site design and landscaping, and in the design and fabric of the dwellings most likely to be affected. We can confirm that discussions are in progress with the proposed developers of the proposed allocation. We will continue to work with them prior to the submission of a planning application and throughout the determination period.</p>					
RDC Comment					
<p>The impact of industrial operations is a material planning consideration both to ensure an acceptable level of residential amenity for prospective and existing residents, and the continued operation of established businesses. The identification of the site was undertaken in the knowledge that the layout of the proposed development, and noise attenuation measures would need to result in no adverse impacts for prospective residents.</p>					

1078 obo Langton Estate

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				
Comment					
<p>Object to this inclusion of the former allotment area within the VIUA designation and request that it is removed.</p> <p>The Background Paper identifies this site as 'field between Milestone Cottage and Whittam Cottage' and states that the space continues to contribute to designation criteria 3 and 4 in particular. Respectively, these suggested areas should contribute to the form and character of the settlement and provide a vista/viewpoint into the surrounding countryside. It is not considered that the site meets these criteria. Whilst the other areas of VIUA in Langton form public areas of the village green and grassed verges, this site is the only enclosed, private space designated as VIUA. It is contained behind a walled frontage with little views possible into or beyond the site. A small area is used by the tenants of Wray Cottage and has a domestic appearance, used as a garden area with washing, areas of planting and outdoor seating. There are no views or vistas through the site into the surrounding countryside. We are therefore of the</p>					

view that it no longer contributes sufficiently to the character of the village to justify inclusion as a VIUA. A small scale, sensitive, residential development would be an appropriate use of the site, contributing to the District's housing supply and providing local needs housing within a sustainable location.
RDC Comment

1078 obo Langton Estate

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations	No			
Comment					
Fails to acknowledge the Development Potential of smaller villages, such as Langton, fails to propose development limits that are consistent with what on the ground and reflects development potential. No allocation of any land in smaller villages such as Langton is not positively prepared, and is inconsistent with the para 55 of the NPPF. Such an approach is not justified as sites are available. Policy SP2 advises that infill development is acceptable in the other villages. We therefore object to draft Policy SD2, which does not allocate any sites for residential development in the smaller villages.					
RDC Comment					
The proposed expansion of the Development Limits, as suggested, would amount to incremental allocations contrary to the adopted Spatial Approach and Settlement Hierarchy in the Adopted Local Plan Strategy. The settlement Hierarchy was adopted post NPPF, and was identified as being consistent with Paragraph 55 of the NPPF. The plan provides opportunities to meet local needs and enabling development, with small scale infill for local needs. These sites identified have been submitted at Publication Stage. Policy SP2 works in conjunction with SP1, in order for infill (prescribed definition) to be identified as being within other villages because it is within Development Limits and not 'wider open countryside'. Therefore the absence of allocations in the other villages is in accordance with Policies SP1 and SP2.					

1078 obo Langton Estate

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy Map	Langton				
Comment					
Proposed the following changes in the Development Limits for Langton:					
1. Incorporation of Langton Hall and adjacent buildings within the Development Limits of Langton to reflect the historic boundaries of the village.					

2. Amendment of the development limit to include the joiner's yard to the north of Main Street. The joiner's yard is an existing brownfield site in the centre of the village. Whilst the joiner's shop exists and continues to operate, the full area of the site is not required and could be revitalised with a small scale, mixed business or residential use. Development of the site should be included as an allocation in Policy SD2. 4. Amendment of development limits to the north of the village and reuse of existing agricultural site.

On the northern edge of the village is an area with a sugar beet pad and agricultural building. These buildings are no longer critical to the Estate's agricultural operations and a sensitive redevelopment of the site would make a better use of the site. 5. Amendment of development limits to include land to the west of Green Farm. Green Farm is currently a tenanted farm at the western end of the village. Land adjacent to the farm is available for small scale residential development. Access to the highway exists.

RDC Comment

These sites identified have been submitted at Publication Stage. Development Limits are a policy approach to define the acceptability in principle for certain forms of development, and do not either refer to the built extent of a settlement nor the Conservation Area, which is a statutory designation recognising the historic and architectural character of places. The proposed expansion of the Development Limits would amount to substantial allocations contrary to the adopted Spatial Approach and Settlement Hierarchy in the Local Plan Strategy. Such an approach would be contrary to the adopted Settlement Hierarchy of SP1 and SP2, which does not identify allocations for residential development below the Service Village Tier.

1079 obo Linden Homes

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Omissions	No			
Comment					
In summary, we consider that the housing requirement for Malton/Norton for the Plan period can be most appropriately and sustainably delivered via the allocation of Site 649 and Site 194, which we consider to be a more sustainable and deliverable option than Site 450 and one which would also provide a greater buffer to the supply of housing should the significant infrastructure requirements associated with Site 649 result in the delivery of residential development on that site not coming forward at the rates anticipated. Consider that the exclusion of site 194 renders the plan unsound					
Not being justified: We consider there to be insufficient justification to support the allocation of Site 450 (Ryedale House) over Site 194.					
Not being effective: We note the net residual requirement for the delivery of 246no. dwellings in Malton/Norton across the Plan period but we have concerns over the rates at which new residential development can potentially be delivered on Sites 450 and 649 (Norton Lodge) and consider provision should therefore be made for alternative/additional allocations by way of a buffer should these two sites fail to deliver to the anticipated rates for those reasons.					
Not being consistent with national policy: We consider Site 194 represents a more sustainable and deliverable option than Site 450 and that the housing requirement for Malton/Norton should be increased to ensure the delivery of an adequate supply, given the deliverability rates for residential development on Site 649 could be constrained by the need to deliver significant infrastructure as part of that development					

RDC Comment

No representations on the development capability of this site have been submitted since the site was originally submitted- the site could not be considered deliverable. Identified as a potential group 3 site, but not identified as an option choice in 2015 due to lack of information, and the concerns with sites on western Norton resulting in greater pressure on existing junction capacity. Maps were of the site submissions. The Council is confident that with the commitments and proposed allocations that across the district the 200 homes per annum as a minimum can be delivered. For clarification, SD4 is not adjacent to the Scheduled Monument, known as 'Derventio'. There is another property, also known as Ryedale House, which is directly to the north of the Scheduled Site.

1079 obo Linden Homes

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles				
Comment					
Deliverability Issues relating to Site 649 (Norton Lodge)					
We consider Site 649 has potentially significant deliverability issues, which could prevent residential development being delivered at the anticipated rates for the following reasons:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sheer scale of Site 649 is such that it is required to deliver significant infrastructure to mitigate its impact, including a new link, which will potentially constrain the timescales for delivering new residential dwellings on site. Site 649 is located in close proximity to an industrial estate and Malton Bacon Factory, which constrains the Site in terms of its layout/potential yield and requirement for noise mitigation. Site 649 has been shown to have a high potential for survival of prehistoric ad Romano-British remains. The course of a Roman road also passes through the area, as does a prehistoric triple dyke boundary feature known from crop marks. Iron Age square barrow burials and other ditched enclosures have also been plotted from aerial photographs. The site is therefore potentially heavily constrained by existing heritage assets that could feasibly dictate the layout/potential yield of the site and/or delay the delivery of residential development below the anticipated rates. 					
In summary, we consider that the housing requirement for Malton/Norton for the Plan period can be most appropriately and sustainably delivered via the allocation of Site 649 and Site 194, which we consider to be a more sustainable and deliverable option than Site 450 and one which would also provide a greater buffer to the supply of housing should the significant infrastructure requirements associated with Site 649 result in the delivery of residential development on that site not coming forward at the rates anticipated.					
RDC Comment					
The site's size is a key benefit, as the site will ensure the delivery of two major elements of infrastructure for the towns: the link road, and the land for a primary school, which the Local Education Authority have identified as being necessary, wherever the majority of the allocation remains to be delivered (Norton). The Norton Lodge site is subject to two major, national housebuilders, and they have identified that the delivery of housing will be necessary in tandem with the infrastructure to deliver the scheme as a whole, and they will both delivering housing on the site. The site has been subject to					

archaeological evaluation which has not identified archaeological remains of such significance that would preclude the development or unduly dictate the layout. The proximity of Karro Foods site is important consideration, and the noise mitigation is recognised as being essential to ensure the two uses can operate without impairment.

1079 obo Linden Homes

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD4 - Housing Allocation - Land to the west of Old Maltongate (Ryedale House), Malton: Development Principles				
Comment					
<p>Constraints and Deliverability Issues relating to Site 450 (Ryedale House)</p> <p>We consider Site 194 represents a more appropriate and deliverable option to Site 450 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site 450 is stated to have potential to accommodate approximately only 60 dwellings, which does not provide for an appropriate buffer should delivery of residential dwellings on Site 649 stall due to its significant infrastructure requirements (see below). • The frontage to Site 450 is constrained by the presence of a number of mature trees, which are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order(s). • Land to the south-east of Site 450 is open and subject to a Visually Important Undeveloped Area, which constrains the site in terms of its potential impact on the adjoining landscape. • The aforementioned open land adjoining Site 450 is also part of the Scheduled Monument to the Derventio Site, which constrains the site in terms of its potential impact on designated heritage assets. • Pockets of Site 450 are known to have problems with surface water flooding. • Significant existing parking over the last few decades on Site 450 is likely to result in potential contamination issues that will need to be remediated. • Site 450 currently comprises the occupied HQ of Ryedale District Council and, whilst it is claimed that the Council has resolved in principle to the release of the site for development, there are no assurances as to the mechanisms or logistics for this, which clearly places a potential constraint on the actual delivery of development on the site. 					
RDC Comment					
<p>There are a number of extant permissions which are under construction, and subject to Reserved Matters at present. The allocation SD3 is not expected to stall due to the infrastructure requirements, in so far as the house-building will facilitate the delivery of the infrastructure. The presence of the VIUA across the road from the site, the presence of the trees subject to TPO, and some surface water flooding matters (Site is Flood Zone 1) are material considerations as sensitivities, that will influence the form and siting of any resulting building, but are not constraints to the site's development in principle. The Development Principles respond to these sensitivities. It is also a brownfield site, and the Council has taken account of the demolition of existing buildings and hardstanding. SD4 is not adjacent to the Scheduled Monument, known as 'Derventio'. There is another property, also known as Ryedale</p>					

House, which is directly to the north of the Scheduled Site. The Council has agreed to release the site in principle.

1080 obo Local Residents

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations	No			
Comment					
Concerns over the allocation of land at Whitby Road, Pickering and the degree of dependence on large site allocations such as this represents a risk to the fulfilment of the housing strategy.					
RDC Comment					
The proposed allocation, at c 200 dwellings, would be a large site, but it is not a strategic site, as it is one of a number of sites identified as either completions, commitments and allocations which make up the total housing land supply to deliver the Local Plan Strategy's housing requirement, with a robust land supply buffer. The Council has a suite of evidence which demonstrates that there are no constraints on the site in principle, which would render the site undevelopable or undeliverable.					

1080 obo Local Residents

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations				
Comment					
Concerned/object to the allocation of the Whitby Road site at Pickering. The application of the Site Selection Methodology has not been shown to be sufficiently rigorous to justify this scale of allocation at this site. It is yet to be demonstrated that the site is capable of being delivered at the scale proposed whilst complying with the Local Plan Strategy and development principles. There are fundamental issues which should be explored before the allocation is confirmed. These include risk of flooding, highway safety and congestion and the development principles are less than adequate for an allocation of this significance.					
RDC Comment					
The Development Principles are site-specific matters which are to then supplemented by the submission of the standard requirements such as Transport Assessments and Travel Plans. The Site Selection Methodology has been compiled with evidence derived from specialist organisations, including the Highway Authority, the Environment Agency, Yorkshire Water. The evidence base does not go into the level of detail required for a planning application, but provides proportionate detail to establish the principle, and to outline any matters which will need specific consideration- and to demonstrate that there are no constraints which would render the site undevelopable or undeliverable.					

1080 obo Local Residents

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles				
Comment					
Without prejudice to the question of the suitability of SD5 for development, the development principles listed should be reinforced, made explicit, extended in scope and incorporated into a planning brief which should have SPD status. (To include reference to drainage, landscaping/tree protection, housing mix and, to give effect to SP17 (Air Quality) and SP18 (Renewable and Low Carbon Energy).					
RDC Comment					
An SPD is not part of the Development Plan, and would have less weight that the Development Principles as proposed in the Local Plan Sites Document, this would also need to be related to a Policy/Allocation in the adopted Local Plan Sites Document. The role of the Development Principles is not to supersede the detailed consideration of the application in respect of the matters discussed above, and matters of detail Furthermore, to presuppose such a level of detail provides no flexibility and resilience to the plan-should, for example, a different developer come forward. There is the adopted Development Plan- which is referred to in the representation- which provides a strategic steer to consider those matters which are not defined in the Development Principles.					

1081 obo M Campion

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)	No			
Comment					
Support the proposed designation of land east of Welham Road and north of Whitewall as a VIUA. The designation is fully compliant with nationally and locally applied planning policy. The criteria used to justify and support the designation is considered to provide a generally robust methodology for assessment and inclusion of land south of Norton meets a number of criteria identified by the Council. It reflects the need to protect and provide setting for listed buildings at Whitewall and protects the landscape that has an intrinsic and historic relationship with the horseracing industry.					
RDC Comment					
Noted and welcomed.					

1081 obo M Campion

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				

Comment	The application of criteria relating to the protection of the character of settlements and the relationship of the urban edge with the Area of High Landscape Value would justify expansion of the boundaries of the VIUA currently proposed (Welham Road, Norton) to both east and west.
RDC Comment	The role of the VIUA designation and the Area of High Landscape Value are different policies with a different purpose. The Latter is concerned with the identification of large areas of land of particular landscape quality and sensitivity and to ensure that this is considered in any proposals which come forward. VIUA's are not designated on the basis of landscape qualities or sensitivities but rather the extent to which land which is within or around a settlement contributes to the form, character and setting of settlements and the setting of historic assets.

1081 obo M Campion

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				
Comment	(Proposed VIUA at Welham Road, Norton). There is scope to review the assessment of the value of retaining the area of land in visual terms. A more comprehensive LVIA would reinforce the already robust case for supporting the designation and would support the case made here that the area of the designation should be extended further.				
RDC Comment	It is considered that in terms of the purposes of the designation, the extent of the proposed VIUA is appropriate.				
1082 obo M Green					

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Omissions				
Comment	I regret that Site 539 (7) in Allerston has been excluded from the Development Limits map. It would have allowed a neglected brownfield site in a visually important location to be improved. Please therefore accept this as a formal objection to the Council's proposals. I understand why the Council's search for sites to meet its housing needs is concentrating on larger sites and is restricted to Market Towns and Service Villages. Should amend existing Development Limits in the 2002 Ryedale Local Plan if needed. It is important that required amendments are made as they will continue to be used in the smaller 'other' villages. I therefore object on this point, on behalf of Mr Martin Green.				
As you know from previous correspondence I consider that there is an ambiguity between Inset Map 7 and 2.2 of the supporting text and this should be					

clarified. The other argument I have made is that the existing mid-20C agricultural buildings on site are an eyesore. They continue to deteriorate. Removal of them would be a benefit to the Conservation Area, as would be their replacement with appropriate development.

RDC Comment

The proposed allocations identified are in accordance with the Spatial Strategy as set out in the Local Plan Strategy, the adopted Development Plan. Allerston is not identified as a Service Village. To amend the Development Limits at such settlements would be contrary to the adopted Development Plan.

1083 obo Maw Family

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Paragraphs	2.16				
Comment					
We reserve the right and opportunity to comment further in the light of evolving circumstances also associated with the progression of the committed housing site owned by Gladman Developments and how actual delivery of that site may progress (or not). This is an evolving context and the plan should appropriately reflect the need for flexibility and the positive benefits derived from development on our clients' land in delivering key objectives of the local authority.					
RDC Comment					
The identification of Westfields, a site which is 75% of the Plan requirement to Kirkbymoorside is an extant permission and is subject to a reserved matters application. The plan builds in a plan-led additional supply of housing land to ensure flexibility. Policy SP2 of the Local Plan Strategy provides a framework for the release of further sites in the event that commitments/ allocations fail to come forward. There is no requirement to allocate further land in advance of a review/roll forward of the plan.					

1083 obo Maw Family

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Paragraphs	3.8				
Comment					
SD13 not sound. Contend that Site 259 remains an available, deliverable and achievable development site to meet arising housing needs while also providing the means to maintain economic opportunities in the area – either through facilitating relocation or redevelopment of the adjoining Sylatech site. Our clients land is proposed for allocation for expansion purposes and could be pursued on a mixed-use basis given previous comments submitted as part of the plan process, the underlying objective and past collaborative approach. Letter 23 November 2016 - Concerning Expansion Land for Existing Employers - conclusion premature to delete this designation, and that it should remain in place. Letters October 2016 and June 2017 - Set out delivery of housing on sites 259 and 454, and this would be phased to bring site 454 last. Allowing the Sylatech production to remain in operation through landscaping and boundary treatments. The development of site 259 with or without 454 will facilitate the delivery of site 650 at Pickering.					

RDC Comment
It is not clear from the representation what the soundness issue is. The Local Planning Authority has retained the employment land expansion land, which is reflective of the letter sent by ELG for the retention of the designation. Sylatech has confirmed that they no longer have plans to relocate to Pickering and will remain at Kirkbymoorside. Sylatech have had a close relationship with the Maw family representative and the Local Planning Authority can only assume that in resolving to stay at Kirkbymoorside, that the company would be confident in the knowledge that expansion land would be available if required.

1083 obo Maw Family

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD13 - Expansion Land for Existing Employers				
Comment					
SD13 not sound. Contend that Site 259 remains an available, deliverable and achievable development site to meet arising housing needs while also providing the means to maintain economic opportunities in the area – either through facilitating relocation or redevelopment of the adjoining Sylatech site. Our clients land is proposed for allocation for expansion purposes and could be pursued on a mixed-use basis given previous comments submitted as part of the plan process, the underlying objective and past collaborative approach. Letter 23 November 2016 - Concerning Expansion Land for Existing Employers - conclusion premature to delete this designation, and that it should remain in place. Letters October 2016 and June 2017 - Set out delivery of housing on sites 259 and 454, and this would be phased to bring site 454 last. Allowing the Sylatech production to remain in operation through landscaping and boundary treatments. The development of site 259 with or without 454 will facilitate the delivery of site 650 at Pickering.					
RDC Comment					
It is not clear from the representation what the soundness issue is. The Local Planning Authority has retained the employment land expansion land, which is reflective of the letter sent by ELG for the retention of the designation. Sylatech has confirmed that they no longer have plans to relocate to Pickering and will remain at Kirkbymoorside. Sylatech have had a close relationship with the Maw family representative and the Local Planning Authority can only assume that in resolving to stay at Kirkbymoorside, that the company would be confident in the knowledge that expansion land would be available if required.					

1083 obo Maw Family

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Omissions	No			
Comment					
Contend that Site 259 remains an available, deliverable and achievable development site to meet arising housing needs while also providing the means to maintain economic opportunities in the area – either through facilitating relocation or redevelopment of the adjoining Sylatech site to site 650 in Pickering. Our clients land is proposed for allocation for expansion purposes and could be pursued on a mixed-use basis given previous comments submitted as part of the plan process, the underlying objective and past collaborative approach. The need to ensure a ‘willing landowner’ is key in this regard and should be					

duly appreciated. We reserve the right and opportunity to comment further in the light of evolving circumstances also associated with the progression of the committed housing site owned by Gladman Developments and how actual delivery of that site may progress.

RDC Comment

The Local Plan Strategy looks to avoid the allocation of residential development to the south of the A170 as a spatial principle. The use of the site would be contrary to this. The Council has considered the extent to which the residential use of the site would help to facilitate the move of the adjacent factory to Pickering. It is understood that this is no longer an aspiration of Sylatech who have now confirmed that they will remain and expand at the Kirkbymoorside site and that this is something that all parties are aware of.

The identification of the expansion land at Kirkbymoorside has been a longstanding allocation in the development plan and there has no indication that the land would not continue to be available for this purpose if required. As the previous representations have shown, the site has oscillated between being a site promoted for residential development and as land for employment expansion. Since Sylatech have confirmed that they are not relocating, the identification of part of site 259 for employment expansion is sound.

The Council is confident that the proposed sites, together with commitments are appropriate and deliverable and that they will meet Kirkbymoorside's planned housing requirement in a way which is consistent with the principles of the Local Plan Strategy. A reserved matters application has been submitted by Gladman and the landowners have confirmed that it remains their intention to develop the site.

1083 obo Maw Family

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations				
Comment					
We reserve the right and opportunity to comment further in the light of evolving circumstances also associated with the progression of the committed housing site owned by Gladman Developments and how actual delivery of that site may progress (or not). This is an evolving context and the plan should appropriately reflect the need for flexibility and the positive benefits derived from development on our clients' land in delivering key objectives of the local authority.					
RDC Comment					
The identification of Westfields, a site which is 75% of the Plan requirement to Kirkbymoorside is an extant permission and is subject to a reserved matters application.					

1083 obo Maw Family

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy Map	Kirkbymoorside				

Comment
Contend that Site 259 remains an available, deliverable and achievable development site to meet arising housing needs while also providing the means to maintain economic opportunities in the area – either through facilitating relocation or redevelopment of the adjoining Sylatech site to site 650 in Pickering. Our clients land is proposed for allocation for expansion purposes and could be pursued on a mixed-use basis given previous comments submitted as part of the plan process, the underlying objective and past collaborative approach. The need to ensure a ‘willing landowner’ is key in this regard and should be duly appreciated. We reserve the right and opportunity to comment further in the light of evolving circumstances also associated with the progression of the committed housing site owned by Gladman Developments and how actual delivery of that site may progress.
RDC Comment
The Local Plan Strategy looks to avoid the allocation of residential development to the south of the A170 as a spatial principle. The use of the site would be contrary to this. The Council has considered the extent to which the residential use of the site would help to facilitate the move of the adjacent factory to Pickering. It is understood that this is no longer an aspiration of Sylatech who have now confirmed that they will remain and expand at the Kirkbymoorside site and that this is something that all parties are aware of.
The identification of the expansion land at Kirkbymoorside has been a longstanding allocation in the development plan and there has no indication that the land would not continue to be available for this purpose if required. As the previous representations have shown, the site has oscillated between being a site promoted for residential development and as land for employment expansion. Since Sylatech have confirmed that they are not relocating, the identification of part of site 259 for employment expansion is sound.
The Council is confident that the proposed sites, together with commitments are appropriate and deliverable and that they will meet Kirkbymoorside's planned housing requirement in a way which is consistent with the principles of the Local Plan Strategy. A reserved matters application has been submitted by Gladman and the landowners have confirmed that it remains their intention to develop the site.

1084 obo Mr B Newcombe

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Omissions	No			
Comment					
I regret that Site 125 in Rillington has been excluded from the Development Limits map. It would have allowed a neglected site to be used and so improved. Please therefore accept this as a formal objection to the Council's proposals.					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have studied the 2017 Full Site Selection Methodology papers for Rillington. In comparison to the 2015 version I note that it has been accepted that neither the trees on site or the nearby footpath would necessarily preclude development. • Disagree the site no longer has the use class of a domestic property. I do not agree as this use has not been abandoned. • The comments from C Methan on page 34 would appear to have been misapplied to Site 125. (I would welcome your comments on this). 					
Q7. "... This is a small, but prominent site which is heavily treed . . ." and "... There is an existing timber building, which the site submitter proposes to					

replace with a new dwelling. It is unlikely to cause wider landscape impacts by virtue of its size, but an adverse localised impact would be present."

This seems somewhat of an exaggeration – a replacement dwelling of similar size (a bungalow?) would have no significant impact in this respect.

Q11, 'C'. Disagree with this – suggest 'neutral impact' would be more appropriate; proposal would have minimal adverse impact on . . . etc.

Q13. "intrusive development in streetscene" - how? Surely, if anything, the trees referred to would help minimise any visual intrusion, helping to cloak the development? Being on the periphery of the village, it would help to define the boundary. Also, there have indeed been significant archaeological discoveries in and around the Wolds area but we cannot recall anything of that nature in the immediate vicinity of Rillington. However, we accept that this is a requirement that, as with all sites, must be legally addressed.

Q13, 'D'. We would respectfully suggest that 'Development would not adversely affect etc.' would be more appropriate.

Q16 'E'. 'Site capable of incorporating low carbon, etc.' We would be quite happy to follow this route, voltaic panels, etc.

Q46. This seems to contradict the assessment for Q3. ". . . and conflicts anticipated with playing pitch access". One small dwelling access teed off the adequately wide playing field access road; it's not really likely to cause any conflicts.

Q48. The report is correct in stating that the site is adjacent to the PROW. Cannot see how there would be any need to transect the PROW. Proposal would not therefore affect the PROW.

Q52, 'M'. We would respectfully suggest, given the responses we have made above, that 'Site has no adverse impact, etc.' or at the very least, 'Site does not have significant adverse impact, etc.' would be more appropriate here.

RDC Comment

This site falls below the site assessment threshold of 0.15ha at the Service Villages. This threshold was, as part of the Site Selection Methodology, consulted upon extensively and approved by Members. The site selection process automatically discounted sites below the site size threshold. The lawful use is a legal matter.

1085 obo National Grid

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General	No comment				
Comment					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1086 obo National Grid

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General	No comment				
Comment					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1087 obo Not identified Land owner sites 512 590 589

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General	SD2 - Omissions				
Comment					
Write to confirm that phase two of Mickle Hill Development is unlikely to go ahead but the owners of the adjoining land as marked on the attached plan with access through Mickle Hill are prepared to put this up for development as it is within walking distance of the town centre.					
RDC Comment					
This land has not be identified for development, but is identified as part of the Mickle Hill Visually Important Undeveloped Area.					

1088 obo Scaling and Falkingham

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Omissions	No	Effective		
Comment					
Site 666 (Land south of Swineherd Lane, Kirkbymoorside) should be allocated for residential development in preference to the allocation of site 201 and 265. Site 666 can be delivered in conjunction with the proposed allocation to the south of Swineherd Lane (Site 156).					
Sites 156 and 666 would be in accordance with SP1 of the Local Plan Strategy and are well located to the town. They are deliverable and will provide significant social and economic benefits without significant detriment to the environmental quality of the area.					
The delivery of the Gladman site at Kirkbymoorside might be questionable. Therefore it is essential that the net requirement of 61 is considered as a minimum only. The comprehensive development of sites 156 and 666 could deliver a sustainable development of circa 70-75 dwellings.					
RDC Comment					

Site 666 does extend beyond the sports field, making it, as in incursion into the AHLV and Strip Field system, more visually prominent than site 156 alone. Site 156 is a Group 2 site, acknowledging that the ability to read the field boundaries will be affected, with the addition of site 666 the field boundary between the sites would be rendered 'illegible'. Site 156 was chosen because of the good connectivity to the Town Centre. The Gladman site is subject to a Reserved Matters Application.

1088 obo Scaling and Falkingham

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Omissions	No	Justified		
Comment					
Site 666 (Land south of Swineherd Lane, Kirkbymoorside) should be allocated for residential development in preference to the allocation of site 201 and 265. Site 666 can be delivered in conjunction with the proposed allocation to the south of Swineherd Lane (Site 156).					
Sites 156 and 666 would be in accordance with SP1 of the Local Plan Strategy and are well located to the town. They are deliverable and will provide significant social and economic benefits without significant detriment to the environmental quality of the area.					
The delivery of the Gladman site at Kirkbymoorside might be questionable. Therefore it is essential that the net requirement of 61 is considered as a minimum only. The comprehensive development of sites 156 and 666 could deliver a sustainable development of circa 70-75 dwellings.					
RDC Comment					
Site 666 does extend beyond the sports field, making it, as in incursion into the AHLV and Strip Field system, more visually prominent than site 156 alone. Site 156 is a Group 2 site, acknowledging that the ability to read the field boundaries will be affected, with the addition of site 666 the field boundary between the sites would be rendered 'illegible'. Site 156 was chosen because of the good connectivity to the Town Centre. The Gladman site is subject to a Reserved Matters Application.					

1088 obo Scaling and Falkingham

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations	No	Effective		
Comment					
The development of site 156 along with site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more appropriate and comprehensive alternative to the allocation of sites 201 and 265.					
Sites 201 and 265 are not considered to be as deliverable as site 666 particularly given the infrastructure works required to facilitate the development of site 201 and remediation and limited potential yield associated with site 265.					

The development of site 156 and our clients site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more sustainable option than sites 201 and 265 particularly given the peripheral locations of the two other sites away from the Town Centre.
RDC Comment
Site 265 is subject of a planning application, and is only 70 metres further east than site 666, it is a Brownfield site. Site 201 is closest of the option choices to the north and is still within walking distance of the town. Site 201 is a modest greenfield site, with residential development adjacent to it. Site 156, a Group 2 site based on the strip field system, was also included due to its good connectivity to the town centre. It is no more requiring of infrastructure works than site 666, and is on a flatter area of land. The Proposed allocations provide opportunities for a range of house-builders.

1088 obo Scaling and Falkingham

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations	No	Justified		
Comment					
The development of site 156 along with site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more appropriate and comprehensive alternative to the allocation of sites 201 and 265.					
Sites 201 and 265 are not considered to be as deliverable as site 666 particularly given the infrastructure works required to facilitate the development of site 201 and remediation and limited potential yield associated with site 265.					
The development of site 156 and our clients site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more sustainable option than sites 201 and 265 particularly given the peripheral locations of the two other sites away from the Town Centre.					
RDC Comment					
Site 265 is subject of a planning application, and is only 70 metres further east than site 666, it is a Brownfield site. Site 201 is closest of the option choices to the north and is still within walking distance of the town. Site 201 is a modest greenfield site, with residential development adjacent to it. Site 156, a Group 2 site based on the strip field system, was also included due to its good connectivity to the town centre. It is no more requiring of infrastructure works than site 666, and is on a flatter area of land. The Proposed allocations provide opportunities for a range of house-builders.					

1088 obo Scaling and Falkingham

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations	Yes	Justified		
Comment					
Advocate the inclusion of site 156 in the plan.					

RDC Comment
Noted.

1088 obo Scaling and Falkingham

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations	No	National Policy		
Comment					
The development of site 156 along with site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more appropriate and comprehensive alternative to the allocation of sites 201 and 265.					
Sites 201 and 265 are not considered to be as deliverable as site 666 particularly given the infrastructure works required to facilitate the development of site 201 and remediation and limited potential yield associated with site 265.					
The development of site 156 and our clients site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more sustainable option than sites 201 and 265 particularly given the peripheral locations of the two other sites away from the Town Centre.					
RDC Comment					
Site 265 is subject of a planning application, and is only 70 metres further east than site 666, it is a Brownfield site. Site 201 is closest of the option choices to the north and is still within walking distance of the town. Site 201 is a modest greenfield site, with residential development adjacent to it. Site 156, a Group 2 site based on the strip field system, was also included due to its good connectivity to the town centre. It is no more requiring of infrastructure works than site 666, and is on a flatter area of land. The Proposed allocations provide opportunities for a range of house-builders.					

1088 obo Scaling and Falkingham

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD7 - Housing Allocation - Land to the south of Swineherd Lane, Kirkbymoorside: Development Principles	Yes	Justified		
Comment					
Advocate the inclusion of site 156 in the plan.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1088 obo Scaling and Falkingham

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD8 - Housing Allocation - Land to the north of Keld Head Close, Kirkbymoorside: Development Principles	No	Justified		
Comment					
<p>The development of site 156 along with site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more appropriate and comprehensive alternative to the allocation of sites 201 and 265.</p> <p>Sites 201 and 265 are not considered to be as deliverable as site 666 particularly given the infrastructure works required to facilitate the development of site 201 and remediation and limited potential yield associated with site 265.</p> <p>The development of site 156 and our clients site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more sustainable option than sites 201 and 265 particularly given the peripheral locations of the two other sites away from the Town Centre.</p>					
RDC Comment					
<p>Site 265 is subject of a planning application, and is only 70 metres further east than site 666, it is a Brownfield Site. Site 201 is closest of the option choices to the north, and it is because of the lack of connectivity, site 156, a Group 2 site based on the strip field system, was also included. Site 201 is a modest greenfield site, with residential development adjacent to it. It is no more requiring of infrastructure works than site 666, and is on a flatter area of land.</p>					

1088 obo Scaling and Falkingham

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD8 - Housing Allocation - Land to the north of Keld Head Close, Kirkbymoorside: Development Principles	No	National Policy		
Comment					
<p>The development of site 156 along with site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more appropriate and comprehensive alternative to the allocation of sites 201 and 265.</p> <p>Sites 201 and 265 are not considered to be as deliverable as site 666 particularly given the infrastructure works required to facilitate the development of site 201 and remediation and limited potential yield associated with site 265.</p> <p>The development of site 156 and our clients site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more sustainable option than sites 201 and 265 particularly given the peripheral locations of the two other sites away from the Town Centre.</p>					
RDC Comment					

Site 265 is subject of a planning application, and is only 70 metres further east than site 666, it is a Brownfield Site. Site 201 is closest of the option choices to the north, and it is because of the lack of connectivity, site 156, a Group 2 site based on the strip field system, was also included. Site 201 is a modest greenfield site, with residential development adjacent to it. It is no more requiring of infrastructure works than site 666, and is on a flatter area of land.

1088 obo Scaling and Falkingham

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD8 - Housing Allocation - Land to the north of Keld Head Close, Kirkbymoorside: Development Principles	No	Effective		
Comment					
The development of site 156 along with site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more appropriate and comprehensive alternative to the allocation of sites 201 and 265.					
Sites 201 and 265 are not considered to be as deliverable as site 666 particularly given the infrastructure works required to facilitate the development of site 201 and remediation and limited potential yield associated with site 265.					
The development of site 156 and our clients site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more sustainable option than sites 201 and 265 particularly given the peripheral locations of the two other sites away from the Town Centre.					
RDC Comment					
Site 265 is subject of a planning application, and is only 70 metres further east than site 666, it is a Brownfield Site. Site 201 is closest of the option choices to the north, and it is because of the lack of connectivity, site 156, a Group 2 site based on the strip field system, was also included. Site 201 is a modest greenfield site, with residential development adjacent to it. It is no more requiring of infrastructure works than site 666, and is on a flatter area of land.					

1088 obo Scaling and Falkingham

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD9 - Housing Allocation - Brickworks Site, to north of Swineherd Lane, Kirkbymoorside: Development Principles	No	National Policy		
Comment					
The development of site 156 along with site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more appropriate and comprehensive alternative to the allocation of sites 201 and 265.					
Sites 201 and 265 are not considered to be as deliverable as site 666 particularly given the infrastructure works required to facilitate the development of site 201 and remediation and limited potential yield associated with site 265.					

The development of site 156 and our clients site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more sustainable option than sites 201 and 265 particularly given the peripheral locations of the two other sites away from the Town Centre.
RDC Comment
Site 265 is subject of a planning application, and is only 70 metres further east than site 666. It is brownfield site. Site 201 is closest of the option choices to the north, and it is because of the lack of connectivity, site 156, a Group 2 site based on the strip field system, was also included. Site 201 is a modest greenfield site, with residential development adjacent to it. It is no more requiring of infrastructure works than site 666, and is on a flatter area of land.

1088 obo Scaling and Falkingham

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD9 - Housing Allocation - Brickworks Site, to north of Swineherd Lane, Kirkbymoorside: Development Principles	No	Justified		
Comment					
The development of site 156 along with site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more appropriate and comprehensive alternative to the allocation of sites 201 and 265.					
Sites 201 and 265 are not considered to be as deliverable as site 666 particularly given the infrastructure works required to facilitate the development of site 201 and remediation and limited potential yield associated with site 265.					
The development of site 156 and our clients site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more sustainable option than sites 201 and 265 particularly given the peripheral locations of the two other sites away from the Town Centre.					
RDC Comment					
Site 265 is subject of a planning application, and is only 70 metres further east than site 666. It is brownfield site. Site 201 is closest of the option choices to the north, and it is because of the lack of connectivity, site 156, a Group 2 site based on the strip field system, was also included. Site 201 is a modest greenfield site, with residential development adjacent to it. It is no more requiring of infrastructure works than site 666, and is on a flatter area of land.					

1088 obo Scaling and Falkingham

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD9 - Housing Allocation - Brickworks Site, to north of Swineherd Lane, Kirkbymoorside: Development Principles	No	Effective		
Comment					

The development of site 156 along with site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more appropriate and comprehensive alternative to the allocation of sites 201 and 265.

Sites 201 and 265 are not considered to be as deliverable as site 666 particularly given the infrastructure works required to facilitate the development of site 201 and remediation and limited potential yield associated with site 265.

The development of site 156 and our clients site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more sustainable option than sites 201 and 265 particularly given the peripheral locations of the two other sites away from the Town Centre.

RDC Comment

Site 265 is subject of a planning application, and is only 70 metres further east than site 666. It is brownfield site. Site 201 is closest of the option choices to the north, and it is because of the lack of connectivity, site 156, a Group 2 site based on the strip field system, was also included. Site 201 is a modest greenfield site, with residential development adjacent to it. It is no more requiring of infrastructure works than site 666, and is on a flatter area of land.

1089 obo Taylor Wimpey (N Yorks)

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD1 - Existing Residential Commitments				
Comment					
SD1- sound. Support Policy D1 which confirms that 'residential development sites shown on the Policies Map as existing residential commitments will continue to the support in principle, for residential development which is consistent with a site's existing permission. Currently developing Land north of Broughton Road, the scheme includes a total of 345 dwellings, with the final phase to commence spring 2018.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1090 obo The Brewis Family/Halifax Estate

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Paragraph	2.11	No		No	Yes
Comment					
Support of the comprehensive development of 134 hectares of land at Scarborough Road, Norton ("the site") on which circa 105 hectares of land is promoted for a mixed-use allocation in the Ryedale Local Plan Sites Document ("LPSD"). The site (660) lies to the North and South of Scarborough Road and to the west adjoins the defined settlement boundary of Norton. To the east the boundary is formed by the A64 which contains the settlement in this direction but provides accessible transport links with suitable and recently improved highway access. The site also adjoins the area identified in the LPSD					

with potential (sites 651 and 649) and the case was made that this could provide a robust urban extension site to the east of the settlement of sufficient size to plan comprehensively for mixed uses including housing, employment, associated infrastructure, community facilities and open space. This remains the case. Paragraph 2.11 - Objection - The lack of assessment of individual sites within this comprehensive development area for employment or residential uses; sites were also submitted in smaller components.

RDC Comment

The representation is not clear in its objective. Paragraph 2.11 explains that a range of sites had been submitted and from those the Local Planning Authority chose the most suitable sites- to deliver the requirements of the Local Plan Strategy, through the use of the Site Selection Methodology. This did not include the identification of Strategic Sites, in fact it consciously discounted such an approach within the Local Plan Strategy. A site of 105 ha is a strategic site. Other, smaller configurations of the site submissions were considered on their merits, and this was based on the use identified in the site submission made by the landowner (which was for employment land- not for residential in the case of 184). The sites of 655 (residential/mixed use) and 184 were also not submitted by the landowner in smaller sites configuration, it was the Local Planning Authority who identified/broke the sites down into components in order to consider the sites is sufficient detail due to their substantial size. The Local Planning Authority has identified the sites it considers meets the objectives of the Local Plan Strategy, and in doing so has duly considered these sites- as demonstrated through the Sustainability Appraisal and Site Selection Methodology.

1090 obo The Brewis Family/Halifax Estate

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Paragraph	2.20	No		No	Yes
Comment					
Paragraph 2.20 - General comment - The treatment of the “buffer” within the overall housing requirement and the requirement to focus this buffer in line with the spatial requirements of SP2; Paragraph 2.2 of the LPSD-PV confirms that “Policy SP2 aims to direct the housing land required to meet housing requirements to these settlements which are expected to accommodate planned growth in the settlement hierarchy.” Policy SP2 confirms that most new development is to be directed towards the largest town of Malton/Norton with some 50% of the housing requirements to be directed to the principal Town.					
This is a figure of (approximately) 1500 dwellings over the Plan period to 2027. Policy also allows for an additional 20% (600 dwellings) as part of a further supply buffer and a Zone of Tolerance supply of an additional 25% (750 dwellings), and paragraph 2.4 confirms “this additional supply is identified at those settlements in the settlement hierarchy where the Plan directs housing growth.” This effectively gives a buffer range of 600 – 750 dwellings in addition to the global 3,000 figure. However, it is stated at paragraph 2.20 that “in allocating sites to provide for the supply buffer in addition to the residual planned housing requirement, the resulting proportional distribution does not follow precisely, the distribution established in SP2, although it continues to reflect the Plan’s strategic settlement hierarchy.” On a general point, it is important that the overall housing requirement and buffer is geographically focused in accordance with Policy SP2. Greater clarification is therefore required on this point.					
RDC Comment					
There is a misunderstanding in the operation of the zone of tolerance. The 20% land supply buffer was to be proportionally split across the settlement					

Hierarchy, but since there has been a range of planning permissions granted, the buffer is not strictly proportional. In delivering the allocations and the 20% buffer, due to the delivery of sites and identified commitments, the outstanding buffer is focused on the Principal Town. The Zone of Tolerance is a positive management of completions whereby up to 25% uplift from the 200 plan figure is not added into the following 5 year land supply position.

1090 obo The Brewis Family/Halifax Estate

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD12 - Omissions	No		No	Yes
Comment					
Policy SD12 - Objection - The focus of employment land on the NAFIC at the expense of other suitable locations in Malton / Norton and lack of inclusion of sites in Policy SD12. The Council's approach to the location of development is set out in Policy SP1 of the Local Plan Strategy (adopted in 2013). This policy sets out the focus for development being Malton and Norton, subject to various criteria. The site is promoted as the focus for employment investment in Malton / Norton allied to the Agri-Business Park / Food Enterprise Zone. This approach is not supported given:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Policy SD12 does not accord with the requirements of the NPPF in that the site does not match the strategy for local and inward investment and does not meet anticipated needs over the plan period; <input type="checkbox"/> The identification of this site as the site to meet outstanding requirements is not soundly based; <input type="checkbox"/> The identification of land to the north of the A64 / east of the A169 (for B1, B2 and B8 uses) does not accord with the policy approach of Policy SP1; <input type="checkbox"/> The land to meet additional unidentified requirements is not located in a sustainable location; <input type="checkbox"/> There is no evidence to suggest that this expansion land will be required or be attractive to the market if associated solely with the Agri-Business Park / FEZ; <input type="checkbox"/> The site is allocated for B1, B2 and B8 which could be readily accommodated elsewhere; and <input type="checkbox"/> Alternative sites (such as sites 655 and 184 in combination) have not been considered as required by the NPPF. 					
RDC Comment					
The NAFIC site is not considered in SD12, but SD15. SD12 reflects the number of outstanding commitments and residual land supply, and the broad location identifies the strategic future direction for employment land (which is by its nature provided as B1, B2 and B8 uses), and is therefore not aligned to the agri business park or the FEZ. It is considered that it is suitable and appropriate approach given the existing commitments. 655 was considered for housing and/or employment land as it was mixed - and site 184 for employment land (as submitted by the site submitter) in various configurations had a number of constraints, which the identified broad location (SD12) does not have.					

1090 obo The Brewis Family/Halifax Estate

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
--------------	---------------------	----------	-----------------	------------------	-------------------

Policy	SD2 - Omissions	No		No	Yes
Comment					
Policy SD2 - Objection - The non-identification of sites 655 and 184 as potential employment or housing sites to meet need within the plan period (either as a comprehensive redevelopment or on a phased basis) within SD2; Policy SD2 - Objection – Lack of recognition of the immediate development credentials of site 184D and 655B (part thereof);					
RDC Comment					

This is a confused representation. SD2 is concerned with housing land, not employment land which is under SD12. The Council is keen to ensure that the land use position is clear regarding the proposed allocations. To identify a mixed approach would leave uncertainties in the land supply. Had the Council being considering a strategic site, such as the a larger area of land as submitted under 655 this would specifically identify such uses as part of the comprehensive development of the site. Re. 184 D and 655b these components of larger sites would still have form and character issues with their development, and the Council has identified the sites it considers best meet the residual requirements .

1091 obo Vellco Tyres

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD13 - Expansion Land for Existing Employers	No			
Comment					
An amendment to the development limits and allocation of land to the east of the existing employment site for the expansion of the operation would accord with SP6 and would allow for a continuation of existing operations in Weaverthorpe to the benefit of the local economy and in the interests of sustainable development. Although the site is in an Area of High Landscape Value, the site is of little landscape value. Development of the site would round off the village envelope.					
RDC Comment					
The role of SD13 is a continuation on from the original policy in the 2002 Local Plan, and was undertaken on the basis that the companies involved had made investment decisions on the land and that the land was important to their long term business plans. This is why the policy specifically refers to that company and so cannot be applied to other companies, and is not included within the Development Limits. Policy SP6 in the Local Plan Strategy, is concerned with the location and supply of economic development, and is the policy framework for considering other businesses proposals for expansion. Any proposal made under SD13 would still have comply with the rest of the provisions of the Development Plan.					

1091 obo Vellco Tyres

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy Map	Weaverthorpe				
Comment					
An amendment to the development limits and allocation of land to the east of the existing employment site for the expansion of the operation would accord with SP6 and would allow for a continuation of existing operations in Weaverthorpe to the benefit of the local economy and in the interests of sustainable development. Although the site is in an Area of High Landscape Value, the site is of little landscape value. Development of the site would round off the village envelope.					
RDC Comment					
The role of SD13 is a continuation on from the original policy in the 2002 Local Plan, and was undertaken on the basis that the companies involved had made investment decisions on the land and that the land was important to their long term business plans. This is why the policy specifically refers to that company and so cannot be applied to other companies, and the land is not within Development Limits. Policy SP6 in the Local Plan Strategy, is concerned with the location and supply of economic development, and is the policy framework for considering other businesses proposals for expansion. To amend the policy map regarding the development limits would not be justified. Any proposal made under SD13 would still have comply with the rest of the provisions of the Development Plan.					

1092 obo W&W Estates

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD1 - Existing Residential Commitments				
Comment					
Concerned over the deliverability of the Westfield/Gladman site. Reserved matters have been submitted by Gladman themselves. There is a lack of developer appetite for the site and there is a risk that the site will never come forward or that it will not all come forward within the plan period. Also concerned that the Gladman Site at Sherburn is not deliverable. When combined, these two sites equate to circa 300 homes that have been included in housing delivery calculations.					
If they don't come forward, their housing delivery capacity should be re-located to other deliverable and sustainable development sites including the larger proposed site option at Swineherd Lane which could deliver 80 of these 300 homes in the next five years. If the (committed) sites are not deliverable, the socio-economic benefits associated with the delivery of 300 homes will be lost, including the provision of up to 105 affordable homes.					
RDC Comment					
The plan allocates land for 1,097 dwellings in addition to committed sites and completions (not including the residential land allocations at Helmsley). It makes provision for circa 3,902 new homes over the plan period which is 30 % above the housing requirement of 3,000 homes over the plan period. The plan builds in sufficient flexibility in its land supply and includes a policy framework (Policy SP2 of the Local Plan Strategy) to support the release of further sites if this is required in the event that commitments or allocations fail to come forward.					

1092 obo W&W Estates

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Omissions				
Comment					
<p>There is a planning case for a larger site proposal than the proposed allocation SD7 to include a further parcel of land to the east. Together, the sites would measure 2.67ha and both are well located to services and facilities in the Town. Taking into account of the Local Plan Strategy, there are no planning policies which would preclude the development of the site. It would represent a logical extension to the town and there are no unsurmountable issues in terms of design or technical matters. The site is deliverable and would form a logical extension to the Town. The socio-economic benefits of developing the land would double if the larger site was allocated. A larger site would only represent an additional 35 dwellings (1% of the Districts housing needs). This would not be detrimental to the spatial strategy and could be allocated in addition to other proposed allocations. Allocation of a larger site would also provide further flexibility should other sites not prove deliverable.</p>					
RDC Comment					
<p>The Council would resist the expansion of the proposed allocation to include Site 666. It would represent unnecessary further incursion into the historic strip fields and would have an unnecessary adverse landscape impact.</p> <p>Additional housing land supply flexibility is built into the plan and a policy framework (Policy SP2 of the Local Plan Strategy) exists to support the release of suitable sites in the event that current commitments or allocations fail.</p>					

1092 obo W&W Estates

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations				
Comment					
<p>Support the proposed allocation of land south of Swineherd Lane for residential development. The site can deliver a comprehensive development of market and affordable housing and other socio-economic benefits in a sustainable and suitable location. There are no technical or environmental constraints that would preclude the development of the site. The site is deliverable (suitable, available and achievable) and is a logical extension to the Town. Development proposals for the site will deliver each of the development principles for the site.</p>					
RDC Comment					
<p>Noted. The Council has proposed the allocation of the site for a number of reasons. It is well located to the Town Centre and the size of the site (and others proposed at Kirkbymoorside) provide a combination/range of sites of different sizes at the Town. The development of the site will result in a limited incursion into historic strip fields and the Area of High Landscape Value and VIUA but this is balanced against accessibility of the site, its relationship to</p>					

existing development and the spatial principles for growing the town which are included in the Local Plan Strategy and is mitigated by the limited extent of the proposed allocation.

1092 obo W&W Estates

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations				
Comment					
A larger development option at land south of Swineherd Lane should be considered preferable to both of the proposed land allocations SD8 and SD9 or allocated in addition to them given that it can be considered a more sustainable and deliverable site than both of the proposed allocations. A comprehensive development in one single location will bring greater socio-economic benefits and will reduce the impact on the character of the Town and the wider landscape setting. There is direct developer interest in this option. It is not known whether there is developer interest in sites SD8 and SD9 which could be a delay to delivery or a reflection of a lack of developer interest.					
RDC Comment					
The Council would resist a larger development option in this location. The Council is confident that the other proposed sites in Kirkbymoorside are deliverable/ developable.					

1092 obo W&W Estates

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD7 - Housing Allocation - Land to the south of Swineherd Lane, Kirkbymoorside: Development Principles	No			
Comment					
Support the proposed allocation of land south of Swineherd Lane for residential development. The site can deliver a comprehensive development of market and affordable housing and other socio-economic benefits in a sustainable and suitable location. There are no technical or environmental constraints that would preclude the development of the site. The site is deliverable (suitable, available and achievable) and is a logical extension to the Town. Development proposals for the site will deliver each of the development principles for the site.					
RDC Comment					
Noted. The Council has proposed the allocation of the site for a number of reasons. It is well located to the Town Centre and the size of the site (and others proposed at Kirkbymoorside) provide a combination/range of sites of different sizes at the Town. The development of the site will result in a limited incursion into historic strip fields and the Area of High Landscape Value and VIUA but this is balanced against accessibility of the site, its relationship to existing development and the spatial principles for growing the town which are included in the Local Plan Strategy and is mitigated by the limited extent of					

the proposed allocation.

1092 obo W&W Estates

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD9 - Housing Allocation - Brickworks Site, to north of Swineherd Lane, Kirkbymoorside: Development Principles				
Comment					
A larger development option at land south of Swineherd Lane should be considered preferable to both of the proposed land allocations SD8 and SD9 or allocated in addition to them given that it can be considered a more sustainable and deliverable site than both of the proposed allocations. A comprehensive development in one single location will bring greater socio-economic benefits and will reduce the impact on the character of the Town and the wider landscape setting. There is direct developer interest in this option. It is not known whether there is developer interest in sites SD8 and SD9 which could be a delay to delivery or a reflection of a lack of developer interest.					
RDC Comment					
The deliverability of other sites in Kirkbymoorside is not in question. The Local Planning Authority has set out in the evidence base to support the plan the reasons why it has not chosen to include site 666. Site 156, a Group 2 site based on the strip field system, was included because of the accessibility of the site combined with a limited incursion into the Area of High Landscape Value and VIUA. The extended site (including 666) would represent a significant visual incursion into the Area of High Landscape Value, and would be further eroding the strip field system. Site 265 is subject of a planning application, and is only 70 metres further east than site 666, it is a Brownfield site. Site 201 is closest of the option choices to the north, and although elevated is within walking distance of the town centre. Site 201 is a modest greenfield site, with residential development adjacent to it. It is no more requiring of infrastructure works than site 666, and is on a flatter area of land.					

1093 obo Watts (North Cotes Farm)

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				
Comment					
Land at Welham Road (plan provided) should not be identified as a VIUA. The land does not qualify for this designation as it does not meet the criteria that the Council use to justify the land's inclusion as a VIUA. This change is required so that the plan is positively prepared and can best meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements. The proposed VIUA would restrict possible development in a sustainable location and is therefore not effective. The proposed VIUA does not accord with the NPPF which seeks to protect valued landscapes and is contrary to para 113 of the NPPF which advises the use of criteria based policies rather than a blanket approach.					

RDC Comment

The VIUA designation is not a landscape- designation, but a means to identify areas of land in and around settlements which contribute to their form and character. There has been a lack of understanding on the basis on which the land is designated as a VIUA, which uses a criteria based approach to identify what elements are important in the area of land to warrant the designation. It should be noted that the principle of VIUAs was continued through the adoption of the Local Plan Strategy, which is a post-NPPF plan. It is considered that is as important for Plans to identify areas which should remain undeveloped as well as identifying suitable development sites if plans are to ensure development is sustainable. The VIUA designation is a local policy approach designed to ensure development is sustainable in Ryedale. The designation is not blanket in its approach and looks at discrete parcels of land. The Council has consciously chosen to not extend the land to the south west and east, despite requests, because these areas of land did not meet the criteria of the VIUA.

The land is proposed as a VIUA on the basis that in its undeveloped state it is considered to contribute to the setting and form of Malton and Norton and to the setting of the designated heritage assets at Whitewall.

The land is not required to meet development or infrastructure requirements.

1093 obo Watts (North Cotes Farm)

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Omissions	No		Yes	Yes
Comment					
Sites 648 and 647 at Welham Road should be allocated for housing. The 7.34ha of land is well located to the existing built up area. Development of this site will not materially harm the supply of productive agricultural land and the site is not an SSSI; SAC or Scheduled Monument. Vehicular and pedestrian access can be provided and the scheme can be designed to safeguard the setting of Listed Buildings in the vicinity. The land is available and deliverable.					
RDC Comment					
The representations have not explained why the Council's proposed allocations are unsound. The Council have a comprehensive body of evidence which explains the decisions made on site choices and why sites 648 and 647 would not represent the most sustainable sites for housing delivery when compared to the identified allocations. To meet residual requirements two sites are proposed at the Principal Town. The proposed site at Norton provides the opportunity for significant highway and school improvements to be delivered which cannot be secured through alternative sites. The site is also in a location which would encourage the use of the Brambling Fields junction as an alternative to the central road network.					

1094 obo Wharfedale Homes

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Omissions				

Comment

Allocate Beckett Close, Nawton site 252:

The site performed well through the Council's assessment process.

- There are a number of local services and facilities available within close proximity of the site, in particular Ryedale School, and the sustainable benefits that arise by virtue of proximity to such services;
- There are no known technical issues that would preclude the development of the site;
- The site would not have an adverse impact of the character of the Village or the wider landscape setting due to its location in the context of the Village's settlement form.
- Deliverability concerns associated with RDC Housing Allocations Ref.SD10 & Ref.SD11.
- Deliverability concerns associated with the two existing Gladman Development site interests in Kirkbymoorside and Sherburn.
- Deliverability concerns associated with two of the proposed housing allocations in Helmsley.

Furthermore, it is our clear view that a settlement of the size of Beadlam and Nawton, with the range of facilities it contains, has the capacity to accommodate this housing allocation over the remaining plan period and is of a scale that enables the viable deliver of benefits to the local area, which would importantly include affordable housing.

Allocation of the Beckett Close, Nawton site would represent approximately 1% of the District's identified housing needs, a scale which would not be detrimental to the spatial strategy of the District and thus the site could be allocated without the need to reduce the size or number of other proposed allocations across the District. Its allocation would also ensure further flexibility within the plan should other potential sites not prove deliverable in the plan period.

Initial survey work undertaken by our client in respect of the site's development have not identified any issues that would adversely impact on the site's deliverability. Subject to the site being identified as a draft housing allocation, our client would seek to be in a position to submit a planning application for development by summer 2018.

RDC Comment

The favourable performance of site 252 through the site assessment process is noted. Despite being a group 4 Site, the Council is committed to ensuring that for the Service Village Tier, allocations reflect the need to as equitably as possible distribute the housing requirement, subject to suitable sites and existing commitments. This results in a very modest 'over provision' of 58 units across the service village tier. Nawton has experienced a level of development (in excess of 30 dwellings) which is commensurate with its status in the Local Plan Strategy as a Service Village. This has been provided through the release of land ion advance of the Sites Document and to support affordable housing delivery and housing land supply.

The Council consider that the presence of a developer is not necessary to identify a site as deliverable. The Helmsley Plan was adopted in 2015 as a separate Development Plan Document. Planning permission is currently being sought for on one of the sites and it is anticipated that if approved , an application to develop the second site will follow. The Gladman Sites have planning permission.

The Plan builds in additional flexibility in terms of housing land supply and the Council do not believe that further sites need to be identified to meet housing

requirements for the plan period. It should be noted that Policy SP2 of the Local Plan Strategy provides a framework for the release of further sites should commitments fail to come forward and if this is required to ensure a deliverable five year land supply. As part of the annual update to the SHLAA, Gladman has confirmed that the sites which it has an interest in, remain deliverable.

1095 P and E Robinson

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)	Yes			
Comment					
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites for the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1096 P Littlewood Chair of Heatherside (Pickering) Residents Association

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles	No			
Comment					
Concerned about the allocation of land at Whitby Road. The Council need to justify the conclusion that SD5 is suitable for development. Many of the site assessment scores appear to be optimistic and/or based on little more than a wing and a prayer.					
The sheer size of the site means that it fails to meet local plan objectives of not relying on strategic sites. The yield has been over estimated and is too dense for development on the edge of a market town. No plans have been published to show how infrastructure would be developed to cope.					
Fails to meet government strategy to promote the use of brownfield sites and development of smaller sites by smaller developers.					
RDC Comment					
The proposed allocation is a large site at over 200 dwellings, as defined by the Local Plan Strategy, but not a strategic site in planning policy terms, such a site is that which is essential to deliver the spatial approach of the strategy. The Local Plan Strategy identified that greenfield land releases would be necessary to meet the housing requirement of the plan. The Local Plan Strategy provides a range of scenarios where smaller sites can obtain permission, provided that they comply with the other policies within the Local Plan Strategy. The site assessment process uses a range of information some of which is headline, and is to help inform the principle of the site's development. Matters of specific detail would be considered through the planning application					

process.

1097 Persimmon Homes

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate	
Paragraphs	2.12					
Comment		<p>Paragraphs 2.12 and 2.15 Not sound and not legally compliant. The policies in a site allocations plan must be consistent with the adopted development plan, unless policy in the sites allocations plan is intended to supersede another policy. Reasoned justification of the policies contained within a development plan document. The Publication Plan states, at paragraph 2.12, that: 'the ability of sites to address the objectives of the Ryedale Plan has also informed the selection of sites' and this is continued at paragraph 2.15 (page 9), which adds: "The combination of sites identified at Pickering reflect objectives of the Ryedale Plan, to minimise the impact of development on historic medieval field patterns which are a characteristic feature of Ryedale's northern Market Towns (and Pickering in particular) and a significant heritage asset'. It continues: 'The sites at Whitby Road and Malton Road will ensure that further residential development can be accommodated at the Town without impacting upon the medieval strip field system. Both sites provide existing access to the existing road network'.</p> <p>It is contended that the plan is not legally compliant. The first is that the policies in the Publication Plan are not consistent with the RP-LPS which form the adopted development plan. The second is that a reasoned justification has not been provided for the policies in the Publication Plan. The selection of the two sites for residential allocations at Pickering does not conform to the principles outlined for the selection of sites which were set in the RP-LPS. Only one of these principles is referred to in the reasoned justification. However, for Pickering, a series of key principles for the allocation of sites were set at Policy SP1 (General Location of Development and Settlement Hierarchy) and in the supporting text (the reasoned justification) for this policy. Policy SP1 states that in allocating sites in the locations identified (which includes Pickering which is recognised as a Local Service Centre) development will be guided to brownfield land first (though the plan acknowledges that there is insufficient supply of brownfield land to meet the need for housing), and that development will be guided to the areas with lowest flood risk. The policy goes onto state that in the site selection process regard will be had to the ability of sites to deliver against the objectives, policies and standards set in the RP-LPS; and, Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) requirements. Sites will also need to be compatible with neighbouring land uses; avoid adverse impacts of interests of acknowledged importance; be accommodated without detriment to the character of the settlements and its setting; and, satisfactorily address highway capacity and safety. Following this policy, the supporting text includes a section titled 'Guiding Development at the Towns' and this sets six principles for growth in Pickering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><input type="checkbox"/> Retaining the compact and accessible Market Town feel;<input type="checkbox"/> Preservation of surrounding historic strip field patterns;<input type="checkbox"/> Safeguarding of views towards and across the town and into the Moors ;<input type="checkbox"/> Ensure development is sensitive and responsive to the historic character and form of the town				

and its setting in the wider landscape;

- Avoid coalescence with Middleton; and,
- Controlling pressure for incremental urbanisation of the approach into Pickering along the Malton Road.

The justification provided in the Publication Plan at paragraph 2.15 refers to only one of these six principles and omits the remaining five principles. The justification is therefore not sufficiently reasoned in the selection of the proposed sites because it does not refer to all of the relevant considerations necessary to make a reasoned judgment formed logically. The Publication Plan is not consistent with the adopted development plan as it is required to be because Policy SD2 (Residential Land Allocations) selects sites (referenced previously as Site 200 and Site 347

RDC Comment

The Sites document is in conformity with policies of the Local Plan Strategy. There is no inconsistency between the Local Plan Strategy and the Sites Document. The policies of the LPS have been used to inform the site selection process in a consistent way. The Site Selection Methodology was consulted on to ensure that it provided an appropriate framework for the selection of sites. The SSM is a key part of the sustainability appraisal. It brings together the strategic policies of the LPS, its vision, aims, objectives and local sustainability issues to inform fine grained site selection. The Sustainability Appraisal Scoping report provides the context from which the SA ,SSM and Plan Policies have been developed.

The District Council, through the application of the SSM, has identified the sites which it considers best meet the residual housing requirements. Inevitably , this is involves a balancing of sustainability issues/objectives to ensure the most appropriate combination of sites. The sites proposed can be accommodated in the highway network and using existing school facilities, and would not involve the loss of important medieval strip field systems. The site at Malton Road is very well located to the centre of Pickering and key services and provides the opportunity to improve the appearance of that edge/ entrance of the town.

1097 Persimmon Homes

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Paragraphs	2.15				
Comment					
Paragraphs 2.12 and 2.15 Not sound and not legally compliant. The policies in a site allocations plan must be consistent with the adopted development plan, unless policy in the sites allocations plan is intended to supersede another policy. Reasoned justification of the policies contained within a development plan document. The Publication Plan states, at paragraph 2.12, that: 'the ability of sites to address the objectives of the Ryedale Plan has also informed the selection of sites' and this is continued at paragraph 2.15 (page 9), which adds: "The combination of sites identified at Pickering reflect objectives of the Ryedale Plan, to minimise the impact of development on historic medieval field patterns which are a characteristic feature of Ryedale's northern Market Towns (and Pickering in particular) and a significant heritage asset'. It continues: 'The sites at Whitby Road and Malton Road will ensure that further residential development can be accommodated at the Town without impacting upon the medieval strip field system. Both sites provide existing access to the existing road network'.					

It is contended that the plan is not legally compliant. The first is that the policies in the Publication Plan are not consistent with the RP-LPS which form the adopted development plan. The second is that a reasoned justification has not been provided for the policies in the Publication Plan. The selection of the two sites for residential allocations at Pickering does not conform to the principles outlined for the selection of sites which were set in the RP-LPS. Only one of these principles is referred to in the reasoned justification. However, for Pickering, a series of key principles for the allocation of sites were set at Policy SP1 (General Location of Development and Settlement Hierarchy) and in the supporting text (the reasoned justification) for this policy. Policy SP1 states that in allocating sites in the locations identified (which includes Pickering which is recognised as a Local Service Centre) development will be guided to brownfield land first (though the

plan acknowledges that there is insufficient supply of brownfield land to meet the need for housing), and that development will be guided to the areas with lowest flood risk. The policy goes onto state that in the site selection process regard will be had to the ability of sites to deliver against the objectives, policies and standards set in the RP-LPS; and, Community Infrastructure

Levy (CIL) requirements. Sites will also need to be compatible with neighbouring land uses; avoid adverse impacts of interests of acknowledged importance; be accommodated without detriment to the character of the settlements and its setting; and, satisfactorily address highway capacity and safety. Following this policy, the supporting text includes a section titled 'Guiding Development at the Towns'

and this sets six principles for growth in Pickering:

- Retaining the compact and accessible Market Town feel;
- Preservation of surrounding historic strip field patterns;
- Safeguarding of views towards and across the town and into the Moors ;
- Ensure development is sensitive and responsive to the historic character and form of the town and its setting in the wider landscape;
- Avoid coalescence with Middleton; and,
- Controlling pressure for incremental urbanisation of the approach into Pickering along the

Malton Road.

The justification provided in the Publication Plan at paragraph 2.15 refers to only one of these six principles and omits the remaining five principles. The justification is therefore not sufficiently reasoned in the selection of the proposed sites because it does not refer to all of the relevant considerations necessary to make a reasoned judgment formed logically. The Publication Plan is not consistent with the adopted development plan as it is required to be because Policy SD2 (Residential Land Allocations) selects sites (referenced previously as Site 200 and Site 347)

RDC Comment

The Sites document is in conformity with policies of the Local Plan Strategy. There is no inconsistency between the Local Plan Strategy and the Sites Document. The policies of the LPS have been used to inform the site selection process in a consistent way. The Site Selection Methodology was consulted on to ensure that it provided an appropriate framework for the selection of sites. The SSM is a key part of the sustainability appraisal. It brings together the strategic policies of the LPS, its vision, aims, objectives and local sustainability issues to inform fine grained site selection. The Sustainability Appraisal Scoping report provides the context from which the SA ,SSM and Plan Policies have been developed.

The District Council, through the application of the SSM, has identified the sites which it considers best meet the residual housing requirements. Inevitably , this involves a balancing of sustainability issues/objectives to ensure the most appropriate combination of sites. The sites proposed can be accommodated in the highway network and using existing school facilities, and would not involve the loss of important medieval strip field systems. The site at Malton Road is very well located to the centre of Pickering and key services and provides the opportunity to improve the appearance of that edge/ entrance of the town.

1097 Persimmon Homes

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Omissions	No		No	
Comment					
<p>The plan is therefore not sufficiently justified because it does not present the most appropriate allocations strategy to best meet the needs of the town of Pickering, and the plan therefore fails a test of soundness. The Council discounted an alternative site located south of Firthland Road and west of Greenlands Road (referenced Site 205/387). The site complies with the criteria that the Council have outlined for site releases in the town. It is in an area at low risk of flooding, the scale of the site is such that it will retain the compact and accessible market town feel, and the site does not affect views across the town and into the North York Moors National Park. The site is enveloped by existing development to the north, south and east and would not extend Pickering further west towards Middleton, therefore avoiding coalescence. The site is also not located in a position where it would result in the encroachment of the town along Malton Road. The last criterion regards the preservation of surrounding historic strip field patterns. The site features a strip field pattern though these have been altered over the years and therefore their significance has declined as a result of this. The strip field pattern in the location of this proposed development has not been identified for designation as a VIUA. Site 205/387 should be selected for allocation because it accords with the objectives and policies of the RP-LPS. The site will provide the opportunity to bring additional benefits to the town of Pickering. Land in the north west of the site has been reserved for a primary school to meet future educational needs in the town. Furthermore, the site is deliverable and will make a significant contribution to providing affordable homes, and a legal agreement is in place with a Registered Provider allowing them to acquire and manage affordable homes on the site. This demonstrates a clear commitment to delivery. The proposal will also over-provide publicly accessible open space and provide an area for ecological enhancement.</p>					
RDC Comment					
<p>The Council has chosen the sites which it considers best reflect the objectives and requirements of the Ryedale Plan Local Plan Strategy and which are considered to be the more sustainable combination of sites to meet needs. The LPS provides a framework for the selection of sites. The Council has always been clear that there have been more sites put forward for development in the locations supported by the LPS than will be needed and a choice needs to be made. The rationale for the proposed sites is set out in a suite of evidence, together with reasons why other sites have not been chosen at this time.</p>					
<p>Site 205/387 was consulted on as an option choice in 2015 . At that time, it was considered that land for a new primary school would be required in Pickering and that this could be secured from this site. It was primarily for that reason that the site was selected as an option , despite that fact that the land forms part of the historic medieval strip field system which the Council would look to avoid developing as part of the application of the Site Selection</p>					

Methodology. If the site is allocated along with the proposed site allocations at Pickering, the evidence demonstrates that this will have an adverse effect on the Vivis Lane junction and it will trigger a need for a new primary school. Whilst land for a school is being promoted by the developer, the Council and NYCC are not confident that there will be sufficient resources to fund the building of a new school. The priority for this is at the Principal Town.

1097 Persimmon Homes

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles				
Comment					
Site 347 is located to the north east of Pickering. This site affects a historic strip field pattern which is shown on the OS County Series map of Yorkshire from 1854 and on maps produced since this date. At this location, the patterns runs in an east-to-west direction, though the site affects part of a north-south running field at the north-eastern extent of the site. The development of this site therefore affects strip field patterns to the north of Pickering, which the regression of maps indicates has seen very little change. When considered against the criteria listed above it is clear that the site will affect historic strip field patterns, which run east to west through the site and, in part, a north to south running field. The site is located within an area identified as an 'Area of High Landscape Value' (AHLV), designated under Policy SP13 of the RP-LPS. This therefore conflicts with a further two objectives which seek to ensure that development is sensitive to the landscape setting of the town and the safeguarding of the setting and views of the North York Moors National Park. The RP-LPS notes that there are longstanding local landscape designations in the district including the AHLV covering the 'Fringe of the Moors'. This designation was made in recognition of the natural beauty and scenic qualities of the area. In designating sites through Policy SP13, the Council seeks to ensure the retention of areas with high landscape value and to reinforce local landscape quality and recognise the local value attached to these landscapes. The policy seeks also to protect the setting of the North York Moors National Park. The Fringe of the Moors is identified as a locally valued landscape. The fringe has a particular visual sensitivity given the topography of the moors and the resulting long distance skyline views within Ryedale and the area has a particular landscape character which is sensitive to change.					
RDC Comment					
The point is not factually accurate. Site SD5 does not form part of the Mediaeval Strip Field System. This is evidence of from the work undertaken by Historic England and NYCC (and other authorities) in 2013 in respect of the Historic Landscape Characterisation. The fields are enclosed land whilst some boundaries pre-date 1851, they are not identified as Mediaeval Historic Strip Fields. In respect of the Area of High Landscape Value, the designation does not preclude development (this was a point noted by the Local Plan Strategy Inspector) and the site has despite its elevation, makes a very limited contribution to the wider form and character of Pickering and its setting and the features of the AHLV. Regarding its relationship to the North York Moors, it should be noted that North York Moors National Park have no concerns about the site having any impact on the setting of the protected landscape. Additionally, Natural England have raised no concerns in this respect. The topography is undulating and enclosing, resulting in a site which is not capable of being read in the wider landscape, this has also been identified by Pickering Town Council.					

1097 Persimmon Homes

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD6 - Housing Allocation - Land to the West of Malton Road, Pickering: Development Principles				
Comment					
Site 200 is located directly to the east, and accessed from, Malton Road. The plan states that in allocating sites the Council will avoid the incremental urbanisation of Malton Road, yet this site is proposed for allocation which would urbanise this road in a southerly direction. This would affect views towards the town which currently benefits from relatively open aspects on this approach. Part of this site is located within Flood Zone 2 and 3.					
RDC Comment					
The Council disagree and consider the proposed allocation to be sound, and evidenced by the SSM and background papers. The part of the site which is in flood zones 2 and 3 is explicitly excluded from the developable area, and forms an important green infrastructure opportunity as it is already a well used area for walking and this area provides a buffer to mitigate the impact of the development on the setting of the Grade II Listed Vivis Mill. The current edge of Pickering to the north of site 200 is reflective of post war estate development, which does not complement Pickering's form and character. The site is very well located to the centre of the Town and key recreational facilities. The development of the site represents an opportunity to enhance the setting and entrance to Pickering and the proposed development principles have sought to make specific reference to this. The allocation would not be incremental development along Malton Road. The Plan is concerned with managing pressure for various enterprises and land uses which stretch along this key route and at some distance from the settlement.					

1098 R Bigg

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				
Comment					
I am writing to express my support for the proposed VIUA on this land. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade 2 Listed Buildings including historic racing stables, adjacent to the proposed VIUA and as such leads to the character of the heritage assets. The footpath and bridle way that run adjacent to the proposed VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents .					
The infrastructure including the roads and junctions will not take anymore people/vehicles, they are already at full capacity as it is. In my opinion there are far more suitable sites for building on. It is for these reasons that I support the proposed VIUA.					
RDC Comment					
Noted. Development capacity considerations are not part of the criteria for assessing sites for VIUA status, but are in terms of site suitability.					

1099 R Clayton

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)	Yes			
Comment					
Site No: 130 - Local Plan Sites Documents and Policies Maps					
I note that you confirm that the VIUA is proposed to be lifted in the publication documents and naturally I support this action. I write to confirm that in my opinion the Plan is sound.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1100 R J Fussell

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				
Comment					
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites for the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1101 R Simpson and J Holder

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				
Comment					
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites for the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.					
RDC Comment					

Noted.

1102 S Dick

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations	No			
Comment					
Object to the proposed development of site 347 (Whitby Road, Pickering) and have the following concerns: - there is a high risk of surface water flooding at the southern boundary of the site - highway safety and traffic congestion on the A169 causing pollution - loss of protected trees - reduction in light and privacy for neighbouring residents - layout and density is out of keeping with a historic market town and the density will result in traffic and parking problems - infrastructure of the town (.g. schools, doctors, dentists) cannot cope with additional people					
RDC Comment					
The proposed allocation identifies the principle of development, and key parameters concerning site specific matters. Allocations are made in response to the adopted Development Plan (Local Plan Strategy) and a required to deliver the housing requirement. The site was identified in the 2015 Sites Consultation as an Option Choice, and has performed well through the site assessment process. The response is made in relation to a submitted planning application on the site. The Highway Authority have advised that the access is acceptable in principle. Matters around density, residential amenity, surface water management, and the impacts on protected trees are important and will need to be satisfactorily addressed. The Council has discussed the proposals with infrastructure providers, and this has raised no objections in principle. The Council have had discussions with health care providers regarding the sites.					

1102 S Dick

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles				
Comment					
Object to the proposed development of site 347 (Whitby Road, Pickering) and have the following concerns: - there is a high risk of surface water flooding at the southern boundary of the site					

- highway safety and traffic congestion on the A169 causing pollution
- loss of protected trees
- reduction in light and privacy for neighbouring residents
- layout and density is out of keeping with a historic market town and the density will result in traffic and parking problems
- infrastructure of the town (e.g. schools, doctors, dentists) cannot cope with additional people

RDC Comment

The proposed allocation identifies the principle of development, and key parameters concerning site specific matters. Allocations are made in response to the adopted Development Plan (Local Plan Strategy) and a required to deliver the housing requirement. The site was identified in the 2015 Sites Consultation as an Option Choice, and has performed well through the site assessment process. The response is made in relation to a submitted planning application on the site. The Highway Authority have advised that the access is acceptable in principle. Matters around density, residential amenity, surface water management, and the impacts on protected trees are important and will need to be satisfactorily addressed. The Council has discussed the proposals with infrastructure providers, and this has raised no objections in principle. The Council have had discussions with health care providers regarding the sites.

1103 S H Jennings

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles				

Comment

My property abuts onto the southern boundary of the site. I appreciate the national need for new homes and in principle do not oppose the use of this land for housing. However I would like to object to the current application.

1. Density and size of development - after discounting a sizeable area of the site for other uses, in particular the proposed drainage basin, the semi-circular green area at the south (in a gully) and the underground storage tank. The housing planned for the remaining areas appears unduly dense, especially in the eastern sector. There appears to be relatively few green areas within the housing zones (verges, front gardens) when compared with other developments over recent decades in Pickering. The nearby Woodlands Park estate (by the same developer) shows the same level of density. As well as a lack of green areas and trees within the Woodlands estate, the density has resulted in substantial numbers of cars parked astride the pavement, or using the Community Park car park (not an option in the proposed development). There are also implications for surface water drainage and general quality of life for residents closely surrounded by housing, especially as the proposed development will be about two and a half times as big as Woodlands Park. Overall, the design would appear more suitable to an inner-city site than one on the edge of a market town.

The size of the development (239 homes) would seem to be at odds with the Local Plan. Section 3, p.18, 3.8 states: "An important element of this Strategy is that it looks to accommodate new development through a pattern of small and medium sized sites spread within and around each of the towns as

opposed to relying on the delivery of one or more 'strategic sites' capable of accommodating a significant proportion of Ryedale's development requirements in a limited number of locations." Under the council's definition, a large site consists of 100+ dwellings.

2. Access

The proposed single entrance/exit road leading directly onto the A169 would appear dangerous. Without additional traffic-calming measures, vehicles emerging from the estate, and those waiting in the middle of the road to turn into it, will have to cope with traffic from both directions that frequently exceeds the speed limit. Even more concerning is the prospect of pedestrians, including schoolchildren, having to cross the A169 at or near the same location to access all of the town's schools, shops and services.

3. Archaeology

I am concerned that the recent (Dec. 2017) trial trenching by MAP Archaeology Practice may have been inadequate. The exercise consisted of two field workers and a digger, and appeared, to those of us watching, to be completed very quickly. Unfortunately their report (doc. no. 1794755, 13/12/17) gives no details of the time that was spent on site. Two field workers, with one digger, over a couple of days for a site of over 8 hectares seems insufficiently thorough. They conclude: "The trial trenching revealed no significant archaeological features. Therefore, no archaeological mitigation is required" (p.3) Accepting the first sentence to be true, in the small proportion of the site that they explored, the second does not follow logically, as implied.

My main concern, however, is that the trial trenches did not cover two areas of potential importance.

(i) A sub-circular earthwork and crop mark enclosure. This has been recorded by English Heritage (Eng. Her. Pastscape website, Mon. no. 1370351).

This is visible from Google Maps, and lies NE of trial trench 12. I do not understand why this was not investigated by the field workers while they were so near it. It is due to be built over.

(ii) The hedge, and specifically the ridge on which it stands, which runs north from the southern boundary of the site (from behind 49 Corbie Way) into the centre of the site. This marks the western boundary of the series of historic strip fields running in a N - S alignment to the north-east of the town. (Although the field behind Marshall Drive has lost its inner hedges and has been "squared up" it is shown as a series of strip fields as recently as the 1930 O.S. map.) The ridge on which the hedge stands at its southern end appears to be a man-made feature, possibly a mediaeval boundary bank. Again, the nearest trial trench (trench 10) did not cover this feature, as it was cut approximately 50 - 100 m. to the north of the feature. I am very concerned that the site plan shows a road is to be cut through this bank. I attach photos of the feature, taken from the garden of 43 Corbie Way, looking east.

I emailed these photos to Heritage Services at NYCC, and they agreed in their reply that the feature should be investigated.

Section 7 of the Local Plan, 7.7, p.118 states: "Where it can, the Council will also look to protect wider features of local historic value which are not afforded statutory protection. Negotiating and advising on the siting of new development or adaptations to buildings will be an important way in which this can be achieved and the decisions made over new land allocations will need to ensure that the historic character of settlements and their settings are not undermined. Encouraging an awareness of the value of the District's historic landscapes will also be an important way in which they are protected and this is something that this Strategy seeks to support."

4. Ecology

I note in the Design and Access Statement (doc. 1781642, p.15): " sites (...) where the strip field systems are less intact (...) may be appropriate providing that the existing hedgerows and trees are incorporated into the design of the scheme."

On the site plans, the hedge referred to above is missing. Two large mature trees have also been removed. I would ask that planning permission only be granted on this condition being met. As well as preserving some of the rural nature of the site, this would enhance environmental sustainability and the quality of life of the residents.

RDC Comment

The support for the principle of development for housing is noted. The planning application is being considered on its merits. The use of Strategic sites is much larger sites which are integral to the delivery of the plan. This site would be identified as a large site, but not strategic. The access has been identified as being acceptable to the Highway Authority in principle.

1104 S Major and L Prince

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)				
Comment					
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites for the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1105 S Thackray

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General		No	Justified		
Comment					
If RDC promotes future development in the towns (Malton and Norton) based on the over optimistic findings of the Systra report and gets it wrong it will place the future health of children at significant risk of harm. The report states that air quality will fail to improve to meet the legal limit for NO2 at one receptor location (ref to para 10.1.16 of the Systra Report). Question the over optimism of the Systra Report.					

No account has been made in the report for the proposed increase in rail services. The increase in congestion and NO2 emissions that additional rail crossing barrier closures would cause would impact negatively and severely on air quality in the Malton AQMA and to such an extent that all future site allocations in Malton and Norton may prove untenable.
--

RDC Comment

No evidence has been provided to explain why the report is overly optimistic. The Air Quality Study did take into account the increase frequency of rail journeys between Scarborough and York and the timing of the crossings.

1106 Scarborough Borough Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General					Yes

Comment

I can confirm that no comments are proposed and support is given for taking forward this latest document that sets out allocations to meet, amongst other things, the housing numbers proposed in the adopted Core Strategy.

RDC Comment

Noted.

1107 Selby District Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General	No comment				

Comment

Thank you for circulating the Local Plan Sites Document and Policies Map. We have no specific Officer comments to make on this document, but look forward to continued dialogue with Ryedale District Council.

RDC Comment

Noted.

1108 Slingsby South Holme and Fryton PC

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate

General						
Comment						
No objections to the content of this document.						
RDC Comment						

1109 T M Barker and Son

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Omissions				
Comment					
Disappointed that my land has been taken of the land put forward for building schedule. I disagree with your view this development would be detrimental to landscape and visual image of area, it is the natural progression of the village should any houses need to be built in Beadlam in the future. In view of successive Government's building policies for more affordable houses to be available in rural areas I would ask that my site be retained or at the least included in any future village plan.					
RDC Comment					
It is not clear from the response which sites are being referred to, but our records show sites 147 and 267 were submitted by TM Barker and Son. Nawton and Beadlam are considered together for the purposes of designation as a Service Village, aside from the form and character and landscape sensitivities identified through the Site Selection Methodology, Nawton has seen 36 dwellings completed within the Plan Period.					

1110 The Coal Authority

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General	No comment				
Comment					
As you will be aware the majority of the coalfield area in Ryedale falls within the National Park and as such falls outside the remit of this plan. The small area of coal mining legacy within Ryedale does not coincide with any of the areas where development sites are proposed. On the basis of the above the Coal Authority has no specific comments to make on the consultation document.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1118 Weaverthorpe Parish Council

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)	No	Justified		
Comment					
The Parish Council would like two further areas to be included as VIUA's at Weaverthorpe. (Plan attached).					
RDC Comment					
Noted, these have been received too late to be considered within the Publication of the Plan.					

1111 Weaverthorpe PC

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy Map	Weaverthorpe	No			
Comment					
Request change to Policies Map to include two areas of land as VIUAs. The Weaverthorpe War Memorial site and land south of Wesley Cottage.(Marked on enclosed map). The Parish Council has agreed to register these areas of land as Common Land, along with other land already identified as VIUA.					
RDC Comment					
As these sites have not been previously identified, they have not been included in the Publication of the Local Plan Sites Document. The Local Planning Authority would not dispute the contribution of the these areas, particularly the War Memorial, to the form and character of the settlement.					

1112 Yorkshire Wildlife Trust

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
General					Yes
Comment					
The Trust does not have any further comments on the soundness of the sites document. The Trust would agree with the conclusions of the HRA on which sites may require Appropriate Assessments to consider Likely Significant Effects on the River Derwent SAC.					
RDC Comment					
Noted.					

1112 Yorkshire Wildlife Trust

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD12 - New Employment Land Allocations				
Comment					
<p>The Trust is however concerned that the policies in the full plan for no net loss of biodiversity and net gain of biodiversity as a result of development in Ryedale will mean that land may be required to mitigate or compensate for loss of habitat within development sites. There may be a need for an assessment of whether additional land will be required to ensure biodiversity is protected. For the larger sites a draft masterplan may be required to ensure that there will be sufficient open space or compensation habitat.</p>					
RDC Comment					
<p>The sites identified for allocation have limited biodiversity, most being cropped farmland. Were there any particular sensitivities, these will be addressed through the planning application process, as matters regarding conservation of habitats and species, in terms of establishing mitigation/compensatory habitats cannot be undertaken by condition. The larger sites have indicative masterplans, which have identified green infrastructure elements to enhance biodiversity. It is not expected that site's extents will be enlarged for habitat compensation/mitigation as they will be expected to ensure that these are integrated into the site.</p>					

1112 Yorkshire Wildlife Trust

Comment type	Comment description	Is sound	Soundness Tests	Legal Compliance	Duty to cooperate
Policy	SD2 - Residential Land Allocations				
Comment					
<p>The Trust is however concerned that the policies in the full plan for no net loss of biodiversity and net gain of biodiversity as a result of development in Ryedale will mean that land may be required to mitigate or compensate for loss of habitat within development sites. There may be a need for an assessment of whether additional land will be required to ensure biodiversity is protected. For the larger sites a draft masterplan may be required to ensure that there will be sufficient open space or compensation habitat.</p>					
RDC Comment					
<p>The sites identified for allocation have limited biodiversity, most being cropped farmland. Were there any particular sensitivities, these will be addressed through the planning application process, as matters regarding conservation of habitats and species, in terms of establishing mitigation/compensatory habitats cannot be undertaken by condition. The larger sites have indicative masterplans, which have identified green infrastructure elements to enhance biodiversity. It is not expected that site's extents will be enlarged for habitat compensation/mitigation as they will be expected to ensure that these are integrated into the site.</p>					

Report Grouped by Comment Type

General:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Derwent Practice Dr H Taylor				
Comment				
In the Plans for further new housing in Norton allowance has been made for a new surgery. I presume that this means that we will be able to bid for the money to expand our practice premises to accommodate the increase in the population. I would be grateful to if you could let me know the scale and process for this.				
RDC Comment				
Unclear whether this is a representation on the plan. The allocation at Norton does not in itself trigger the need for a new surgery. CIL is the mechanism to generate funds for infrastructure improvements. The spending of this is decided by Members of District Council, based on priorities identified by delivery organisations.				

General:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
East Riding of Yorkshire Council	Yes			Yes
Comment				
In respect of the content of the Publication Plan and Policies Map, East Riding of Yorkshire Council do not have any comments to make.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

General:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Environment Agency	Yes		Yes	Yes
Comment				
We are pleased to see that our previous comments have been addressed. As such, insofar as those matters within our remit are concerned, we consider the document to be legally compliant and sound. We also believe that it complies with the duty to co-operate				

RDC Comment
Noted.

General:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Forestry Commission				
Comment				
Not in a position to respond to Local Plan consultations. Information to assist in the assessment of sites provided.				
RDC Comment				
Noted. The strategic consideration regarding Ancient Trees is set out in the Local Plan Strategy, adopted post NPPF, in Policies SP14 and SP15 in particular, which are concerned with Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure. No sites proposed as allocations have Ancient Trees or protected trees which would need to be removed in order for development to occur. Where there are important trees, their retention, protection and promotion of their role in biodiversity, character and appearance of settlements, recreational/aesthetic value is considered through the site evidence base, and flows into the Development Principles, which are expected to be incorporated into proposals.				

General:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Helmsley Town Council				
Comment				
No comment.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

General:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
I Conlan				
Comment				

Human recreation of existing residents needs to be protected
RDC Comment
None of the allocations or commitments will result in a loss of recreational amenity- indeed through the proposals there will be enhanced opportunities for recreational activity.

General:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Local Access Forum	No		Yes	Yes
Comment				
The documents miss the opportunity for many of the large number of sites identified for development to incorporate walking and cycling as part of everyday methods of transport. The Public Right of Way network seems to be treated as separate facilities. It is hoped that when detailed schemes are put forward the principles of providing non-motorised paths will be incorporated in the specifications for sites.				
RDC Comment				
This is a matter which will be considered as part of the proposed allocation's future development. The Local Plan Strategy seeks to ensure that inclusive and interconnected non-vehicular access is provided as part of new developments in particular policies SP20, SP15. The role of LPSD is not to replicate all the considerations of the site's development, but site-specific ones- or ones which were not identified in the Local Plan Strategy. The Local Planning Authority has chosen to not have prescriptive master plans at this stage to ensure that the plan is responsive.				

General:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
F Ellis	No			
Comment				
Object to the proposed development of site 160 at Ampleforth. Access to the site from Station Road and egress is wholly unsuitable and this is recognised by the competent statutory consultee. At this stage I shall be making no further objections. Be advised that I am an appellant in an Upper Tier Tribunal Appeal. Before lodging substantial objections to the development of site 160, I intend to await the outcome of the appeal as the matters raised in the appeal are directly relevant to future development in Ampleforth.				
RDC Comment				
Site 160 is not identified for allocation. The Council has become aware of new information which would result in the sites performance change from a Group 4 site to a Group 2 site due to concerns regarding delivery of an access. No allocations are proposed at Ampleforth due to completions within the Plan				

Period.

General:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Natural England	Yes		Yes	
Comment				
Natural England notes that your authority has undertaken an Appropriate Assessment of the plans, in accordance with Regulation 61 of the Regulations. Natural England is a statutory consultee on the Appropriate Assessment stage of the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.				
Your appropriate assessment concludes that your authority is able to ascertain that the plans and proposals will not result in adverse effects on the integrity of any of the sites in question. Having considered the assessment, and the measures proposed to mitigate for all identified adverse effects that could potentially occur as a result of the proposal, Natural England advises that we concur with the assessment conclusions, providing that all mitigation measures are appropriately secured and delivered.				
RDC Comment				
Noted and welcomed. Mitigation measures will be secured.				

General:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North York Moors National Park				Yes
Comment				
This is to put on record that this Authority has not raised any cross boundary issues under the Duty to Co-operate regarding this plan and considers the requirement for Ryedale District Council to jointly work with its neighbouring planning authorities fulfilled insofar as it relates to the National Park Authority.				
As you know our two Authorities have a strong record of co-operation, not least through production of a joint Local Plan for Helmsley in 2015. My last record of a formal Duty to Co-operate meeting is 21 October 2016 with Rachel Balmer to discuss the Ryedale site allocations document.				
RDC Comment				
Noted and welcomed.				

General:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
-------------	--------	-----------------	------------------	-------------------

obo Church Commissioners for England				
Comment				
Changes to the NPPF which will be brought forward next year and the further emphasis of boosting housing delivery forward by the Government in its Housing White Paper emphasises that more small and medium sized sites should be made available to allow rural communities to grow. This is clearly at odds with the current approach in the Local Plan.				
RDC Comment				

A result of the white paper, prior to Publication we examined the contribution of small and medium sites (which are being allocated see SD7, SD8, SD9, SD10, SD11 which are between 8-40 units) and investigated sub-0.5ha sites. Many of these site which had been submitted were not deliverable. The Local Plan Strategy provides a range of scenarios for small scale- locally derived needs to be met.

General:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo CPRE North Yorkshire	Yes		Yes	
Comment				
CPRENY is supportive of the fact that RDC has produced the Sites Document in conformity with the Local Plan Strategy. The Plan provides land to meet minimum housing requirements and a supply buffer and does not over allocate land. CPRENY is confident that the allocations and commitments will be delivered appropriately as set out through the design principles contained in SD3-SD11.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

General:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Scarborough Borough Council				Yes
Comment				
I can confirm that no comments are proposed and support is given for taking forward this latest document that sets out allocations to meet, amongst other things, the housing numbers proposed in the adopted Core Strategy.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

General:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Slingsby South Holme and Fryton PC				
Comment				
No objections to the content of this document.				
RDC Comment				
Noted				

General:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust				Yes
Comment				
The Trust does not have any further comments on the soundness of the sites document. The Trust would agree with the conclusions of the HRA on which sites may require Appropriate Assessments to consider Likely Significant Effects on the River Derwent SAC.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

General:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Chris Robinson				
Comment				
As for the local plan:- If the road layouts at Broughton Road/Newbiggin, the roundabouts at Scagglethorpe end of bypass, the lack of proper junction at York Road end of bypass, the lack of any junction at Broughton Road onto bypass, the appalling lack of monitoring of parking on nearly every road in both towns, etc. etc. etc., are anything to go by then the plan will contain nothing more than the usual disgraceful waste of money with no benefits what so ever.				
RDC Comment				

The Local Plan Sites Document is supporting the delivery of the Local Plan Strategy which sets out a series of objectives which were formulated from extensive consultation and engagement as part of the production of the Local Plan Strategy. The Council has worked closely with both Highways England and The County Council Highway Authority, alongside a range of service delivery providers, to ensure that growth is realistically delivered, to meet identified needs, and in a manner which reflects a range of sustainability considerations.

General:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Nawton Parish Council				
Comment				
We object to site 252 and 173 being classed in group 4. This field is not an infill and would cause mayhem with the proposed 20+ houses each needing 2 cars in order to get to work. 40 cars coming through the adjoining estate would put children at risk who play in the streets and ride their bikes safely in that area. The bus service is inadequate and does not get people to work in time.				
RDC Comment				
Site 252/173 is not being taken forward as an allocation, due to previous developments at the settlement. The Local planning authority stands by the group 4 status of the site, infill status is not relevant for housing sites, and the Council is guided by the Highway Authority who have not objected to the proposed access.				

General:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council	Yes			Yes
Comment				
Welcomes opportunity to engage with Ryedale District Council on the preparation of the Local Plan Sites Document as part of NYCC's Duty to Co-operate. We are encouraged to see the plan progress to Publication Stage.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

General:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Ryedale District Council				

North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
welcome and support the allocation of appropriate sites to meet identified needs for both housing and economic growth. Welcome the buffer within the housing allocation as builds in flexibility. Identification of sites is broadly in line with strategic policies and is supported, ensure a sustainable pattern of growth and positive approach for the delivery of infrastructure and services.				
RDC Comment				
Noted. The operation of the buffer is part of the Local Plan Strategy. The District Council consider that the proposed allocations are in accordance with the strategic policies of the Local Plan Strategy, and this is evidenced through the sustainability appraisal process.				

General:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
Re. Archaeology: note that each site screened against the HER, and information provided on the likely impact on the significance of non-designated heritage assets or archaeological potential. NYCC happy to continue to work.				
RDC Comment				
Noted and welcomed.				

General:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
Landscape considerations in general are supported, and recognition that the sustainability appraisal and site selection methodology places on the visual setting of a settlement and the use of Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs) helps to protect the character and landscape setting in and at the edge of settlements. Cumulative considerations have been considered within section 7, but does not describe additional changes to the landscape and visual amenity caused by the proposed development in conjunction with other development such as when sites are grouped together. Nationally valued landscapes (AONB, Registered Parks and Gardens and including Areas of High Landscape Value) should be considered or explained in stage 3 screening process. Landscape sensitivity should be defined between high, medium and low, and utilise value and susceptibility to change to help explain landscape and visual sensitivity. Coalescence is not necessarily a matter of distance, where possible descriptive use of visual barriers such as landform, woodland and				

trees may be more robust than distance unless this is explained and defined. Define utilise, Special Qualities, landscape and setting
RDC Comment
<p>Noted. These factors have been considered in the application of the Site Selection Methodology and at the appropriate stage and in a way which is proportionate to the scale and distribution of development requirements. The SSM itself is not a detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.</p> <p>The use of VIUAs is not a landscape designation. The landscape and visual impact has been considered on a site by site basis, in principle, as there are no proposed allocations where they merge with other allocations to form larger areas. Cumulative site considerations were identified where sites were grouped. National landscape designations are considered within Stage 2, an earlier stage than Stage 3, denoting their statutory importance. Areas of High Landscape Value, a local landscape designation are also considered at Stage 2. Registered Parks and Gardens, as a designated heritage asset could be considered at Stage 1 and 2 depending on the site. Coalescence was mentioned where settlements could be viewed from each other, and then what features were present. Distance plays a part, but other factors can influence visual relationships.</p>
General:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Highways England	No	Justified		
Comment				
It is apparent that since the publication of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, there have been material changes in terms of the large number of development sites which are now constructed/committed/proposed and to the Brambling Fields junction. The document is therefore less relevant than at the time of initial publication, from the perspective of Highways England.				
RDC Comment				
The development sites, including committed sites are within the overall quantum of development and the spatial framework of the Local Plan Strategy. In this respect, the information in the IDP remains relevant.				

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Historic England	No	Justified		
Comment				
Sustainability Appraisal (Objective 5)				
Land allocations SD3, SD6, SD10 and SD11; at Thornton Road Pickering and north of the A64/A169 are likely to have a direct physical impact on non-designated archaeology some of which could potentially be of national importance. The reasons why it is considered to allocate a site which will result in the loss of nationally important archaeology will need to be justified in the plan. It is also essential that the plan sets out how prospective developers would be				

expected to address the archaeological resource.

Strongly advise that the Council's conservation staff and the County Heritage Unit are actively involved in the preparation of the plan and they are best placed to advise.

RDC Comment

The Council's conservation staff and the County Heritage Unit have been actively and continually involved in the preparation of the plan. The strategy for distributing development has been justified as part of the process of adopting the Local Plan Strategy and within the context of the significance of the Vale of Pickering. The Council has no objection to the inclusion of the proposed appendix to provide further information to developers and which will be used to support the application of Policy SP12 of the Local Plan Strategy.

General:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Councillor P Andrews	No	Justified		
Comment				
For Malton and Norton, the Plan will be unsound unless and until the roundabouts at Brambling Fields are rebuilt and an HGV restriction is made for the level crossing which remedies traffic congestion to the satisfaction of the local community.				
RDC Comment				
The Highway Authority (Highways England and North Yorkshire County Council) have not identified any operational deficiency in relation to the Brambling Fields Junction. The HGV Restriction is being brought in imminently by the County Council who have the legal capability to undertake the restriction.				

General:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
The Local Plan as the ideal opportunity for the local planning authority to raise awareness and make an important contribution towards the enhancement of the public rights of way network. The general planning principles should endeavour to achieve safe and pleasant access to and from public transport, and local facilities to reduce dependency on cars. Beneficial if developers could be required to submit comprehensive Design Access Statements to address the protection and enhancement of footpaths, bridleways, byways and cycle routes, as applicable, within proposed developments of any type. Assurance could be offered to developers that their proposals will be more likely to be supported by the planning authority and the County Council's Public Rights of Way Team where they give regard to:				

- a) enhancing usability and amenity value of existing footpaths, bridleways, byways and cycle routes;
- b) accommodating or formally diverting existing footpaths, bridleways, byways and cycle routes within green open space;
- c) avoiding obstruction or confinement of existing footpaths, bridleways, byways and cycle routes;
- d) improving access by creating links between new development and the local network.

Comment is not provided at this stage on each of the locations included as each case will be considered individually as part of the formal planning consultation process with reference to the principles above.

If it was considered helpful at this stage the Definitive Map Team would be able to provide mapping data showing public rights of way to the Planning team for inclusion within plans of each of the sites.

RDC Comment

As part of a Planning application there will be a requirement to comply with strategic planning policies and the submission of Transport Statements/Assessments and Travel Plans, in conjunction with Design and Access Statements. This will be to reduce reliance on cars and provide integrated and inclusive means of accessing services and facilities and recreation- including Green Infrastructure. As identified in the representation, this is best considered on an individual site basis. Where relevant, the existence of PROW at proposed sites is referenced in development principles. The Council has a copy of the definitive map which is used for information. It is considered that it is not necessary to include all PROW on the Local Plan Policies Map.

General:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
S Thackray	No	Justified		
Comment				
If RDC promotes future development in the towns (Malton and Norton) based on the over optimistic findings of the Systra report and gets it wrong it will place the future health of children at significant risk of harm. The report states that air quality will fail to improve to meet the legal limit for NO2 at one receptor location (ref to para 10.1.16 of the Systra Report). Question the over optimism of the Systra Report.				
No account has been made in the report for the proposed increase in rail services. The increase in congestion and NO2 emissions that additional rail crossing barrier closures would cause would impact negatively and severely on air quality in the Malton AQMA and to such an extent that all future site allocations in Malton and Norton may prove untenable.				

RDC Comment
No evidence has been provided to explain why the report is overly optimistic. The Air Quality Study did take into account the increase frequency of rail journeys between Scarborough and York and the timing of the crossings.

General:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				

Comment

The LHA has been working with the Local Planning Authority (LPA) on the development of its highway evidence in support of site allocations. The cumulative impact of various site allocation scenarios has been tested through transport consultants, Jacobs, who have used the Malton and Norton strategic transport model to assess the impact in Malton and Norton, and for Pickering carried out an assessment using individual junction transport models for two key junctions within the town. This assessed the capacity constraints on the highway network at the end of the Local Plan period 2027, with and without the various proposed Local Plan scenarios put forward by the LPA for assessment. The analysis assessed the impact on the local road network as a direct result of proposed allocated sites and identified a number of mitigation measures required to facilitate the cumulative impact of development.

The Sites Document details the Local Plan's allocations with development principles for the sites; the LHA would seek for further detail to be provided within these development principles such as the requirement to provide a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement and Travel Plan if required.

The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), 2012, lists a number of infrastructure requirements for highway improvements. This was based on the Malton and Norton Strategic Transport Assessment 2010 and discussions between authorities. The IDP lists internal junction improvements in Malton and Norton to accommodate the further development as being a critical infrastructure requirement and it is the LHA understanding that these include the required mitigation measures.

The LHA will continue to assist the LPA in addressing the issues raised above to enable robust transport evidence that the LHA can fully support to be established.

RDC Comment

The LHA have had long-standing engagement in the transport modelling work, and accepted its findings. The requirements for the submission of a Transport Assessment/statement and Travel Plan are required, as standard, as part of the District Councils Local List Validating Requirements, the Development Principles are the site specific requirements required on the proposed allocations and so generic supporting information requirements were not added (since they are automatically sought) in the interests of reducing duplication and repetition.

The Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been updated prior to submission to reflect proposed allocations. Specific measures have been identified in the Development Principles to deliver any necessary transport infrastructure generated by the development, in accordance with advice from the LHA and as part of the junction capacity modelling work, and air quality impact assessment.

Transport evidence has been produced in conjunction with NYCC and mitigation measures are as agreed by both organisations. The Council will continue

to work with NYCC as detailed schemes, accompanied by transport assessments provide on-going up to date evidence and will work with the County to identify further measures to address congestion at the Towns.

General:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Councillor P Andrews	No	Justified		
Comment				
There should be a policy in place at Malton and Norton restricting all new development to sites which have direct access to a four way intersection with the A64 to avoid having to drive through the Town Centres. A policy should be added to the plan to this effect.				
RDC Comment				
This a strategic spatial approach which is not part of the Strategic Development Plan. It may have adverse consequences regarding the ability to make reasoned site choices and allow holistic consideration of sites. The sites which are proposed as allocations can access a grade-separated junction with access to the A64. They are also within walking distance of the town centres (Malton and Norton) to have opportunities for integrated connectivity.				

General: No comment

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo National Grid				
Comment				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

General: No comment

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo National Grid				
Comment				

RDC Comment
Noted.

General: No comment

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Selby District Council				
Comment				
Thank you for circulating the Local Plan Sites Document and Policies Map. We have no specific Officer comments to make on this document, but look forward to continued dialogue with Ryedale District Council.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

General: No comment

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
The Coal Authority				
Comment				
As you will be aware the majority of the coalfield area in Ryedale falls within the National Park and as such falls outside the remit of this plan. The small area of coal mining legacy within Ryedale does not coincide with any of the areas where development sites are proposed. On the basis of the above the Coal Authority has no specific comments to make on the consultation document.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

General: Other

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
I Conlan				
Comment				
Urge the Council to provide a pedestrian/cycle bridge over the railway to encourage walking and make it more attractive than to drive. This may help				

reduce congestion at the level crossing. Insist on the implementation of the HGV ban at the level crossing before any further building in Malton and Norton.

RDC Comment

The complementary measures are being undertaken by the County Council in their capacity as the Highway Authority. The District Council has undertaken transport modelling work and Air Quality Impact Assessment to assess the impact of different scenarios of development on the highway network to ensure that junction capacity is optimised and that air quality is not adversely effected. The proposed allocations in conjunction with existing commitments can be acceptably accommodated and the link road which is necessary to accommodate the traffic from the proposed Norton site (SD3) will also have advantages for the wider movement of traffic. This is in conjunction with highway improvements that have been completed or which are underway or which will be delivered in the future. These include the full grade separation at Brambling Fields (additional slip road); changes to the Pasture Lane/Wheelgate junction; the change in priority at the level crossing between Church Street and Welham Road; an HCV restriction; the Hugden Way/Beverley Road link; signal optimisation where feasible, together with cycle and pedestrian improvements.

The Highway Authority has resolved not to take forward two of the 'complementary' measures which were originally thought to be necessary to encourage traffic to use the A64 Brambling Fields junction - The removal of the right hand turn lane at Castlegate and the one way restriction on Norton Road/Railway Street. It is understood that this is for air quality reasons.

General: Other

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Network Rail				
Comment				
Please note that the council has a statutory responsibility under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Procedure) Order 2015 (GPDO) to consult statutory rail undertakers where a proposal for development is likely to result in a material increase in the volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway or impact upon rail infrastructure. The GPDO also requires authorities to consult on all developments within 10m of the railway.				
Transport assessments which consider rail infrastructure must support all applications near railways. Developer contributions policy and supplementary guidance must ensure infrastructure risks are identified and mitigation secured.				
Network Rail would not seek contributions towards major enhancements.				
RDC Comment				
Noted. The planning applications made on the sites subject to allocation will be consulted upon in accordance with the GPDO, and assessed against our Local List validation criteria, and the Transport Assessments and Travel Plans will required.				

General: Other

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
-------------	--------	-----------------	------------------	-------------------

obo Church Commissioners for England	No			
Comment				
<p>The Local Plan Strategy document therefore seemingly allows some (limited) growth with Other Villages under certain circumstances. This would then contribute towards the plan requirement of 3,000 (net) new homes over the plan period (2012 – 2027)</p> <p>The Local Plan Sites Document and Policies Map uses this approach. It calculates the residual requirement to be 545 dwellings (taking into account completions and commitments since the start of the plan period). It then allocates this requirement (plus a buffer) over 9 sites which predominantly focus on Malton and Norton (Principal Town), Pickering and Kirkbymoorside (Local Service Centres) as well as the Local Service Villages of Amotherby and Slingsby. Whilst the Local Plan Sites Document does provide settlement boundaries to the smaller villages within the District, it does not allocate land for housing within these settlements. Consider that Local Plan Sites Document should be scrapped and a new Local Plan prepared.</p>				
RDC Comment				

General: Other

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
<p>Support the recognition and inclusion of essential infrastructure within the Development Principles. Could be strengthened by providing more clarity regarding layout, design and connectivity and how infrastructure will be funded. This could be done by expanding the Development Principles, Supplementary Planning Documents as development briefs or master plans. Improve confidence in the delivery of the sites. Developer contributions will be required to secure necessary infrastructure. Without adequate funding the viability and delivery of sites may be compromised- leading to delay in provision. The CIL charging Schedule, and Regulation 123 list are already adopted, but pre-date the Local Plan Sites Document, and that the Reg.123 list should be reviewed prior to the Examination. The County Council would welcome this with regards to ensuring adequate provision is made for County Council infrastructure. Discussions have taken place regarding the development of an Infrastructure Deliverability Statement, to set out delivery and we are keen to continue this work.</p>				
RDC Comment				
<p>The LPA considers that the key/necessary development principles for the sites are included in the policies and will provide an appropriate basis for the compilation of detailed schemes.</p>				

The LPA sees no reason to review the Regulation 123 list prior to the examination. The list refers to the infrastructure requirements required to support planned growth and is compliant with the regulations as it stands.

The Council has conducted clear discussions with service providers to understand the implications of site choices and the impacts on infrastructure provision. The Regulation 123 List was written with a degree of flexibility to allow the document to respond where the need is greatest. The Council will work with NYCC on the completion of the Infrastructure Delivery Statement to ensure priorities for CIL expenditure are clear and reflect other sources of funding.

General: Other

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
The NYCC Integrated Passenger Transport service supports 'The Sustainability Appraisal and Site Selection Methodology spatial approach' which concentrates allocation on Market Towns and Service Villages which already have some level of public transport.				
Access by public transport will need to be considered for individual sites through Transport Plans and studies.				
RDC Comment				
Noted. The requirement for Transport Assessments/Statements and Travel Plans is required as part of the Council's recently adopted Local Validation List.				

General: SD2 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Not identified Land owner sites 512 590 589				
Comment				
Write to confirm that phase two of Mickle Hill Development is unlikely to go ahead but the owners of the adjoining land as marked on the attached plan with access through Mickle Hill are prepared to put this up for development as it is within walking distance of the town centre.				
RDC Comment				
This land has not been identified for development, but is identified as part of the Mickle Hill Visually Important Undeveloped Area.				

General: SD2 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Ryedale District Council				

Nawton Parish Council				
Comment				
The villages need a new entrance/exit to Ryedale School and the provision of a road south of Beadlam (site481) and extra houses, even on half of it, would be more appropriate site benefitting all.				
RDC Comment				
Site 481, and a link road, was discussed as part of the site assessment work. This is a much larger site than the Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy were seeking to deliver at the Service Villages.				

Policy Map:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Howardian Hills AONB Manager	No	Effective		
Comment				
It is misleading to label all of the sites as Local Geological Sites. A short form of correct wording would be 'Local Sites (biological and geological) (SP14)'.				
RDC Comment				
This is an error on the map legend. The above nomenclature could be used. This would represent a factual correction to the map.				

Policy Map: General Policies Map Matters

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
Policy Map does not show SINC (Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation) which are an important environmental constraint. Does not show Lady Spring Wood SINC or the non-SSSI section of the River Derwent, Kirkbymoorside Map shows Manor Vale shaded in yellow. Although the map does not identify what this signifies. A housing allocation is shown overlapping a SINC.				
RDC Comment				
The Policies Maps do have include SINC sites - they are a pale yellow hashed area, which in the case of Lady Spring Woods is not clear against the VIUA designation. This will be addressed once the maps are fully interactive. The Map key should identify both Local Geological Sites and SINC sites and this will required an amendment. The Kirkbymoorside map does not show a housing site overlapping the edge of a SINC (Manor Vale Wood), but a Scheduled Monument.				

Policy Map: Harome

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo D Dale-Sunley				
Comment				
The Development Limits at Harome should be amended to include site 37 for local needs housing. The site is deliverable with no legal, policy or physical constraints which would prevent development. The land is currently the subject of a planning application (17/01299/OUT).				
The Development Limits are drawn too tightly and do not allow for small-scale growth which is commensurate with the size of the settlement in accordance with the District's strategy. There is high demand for local needs properties in Harome and it is important that the Council supports some rural development.				
RDC Comment				
Alteration of the Development Limits other than for proposed allocations or commitments outside of the Service Villages and Market Towns would be contrary to the provisions of SP1 and SP2, and would as a principle be employing a different spatial strategy to that set out in the Local Plan Strategy. The Local Plan Strategy still provides scenarios for small-scale incremental growth for local needs, such as Exception Sites, and the needs of the land-based economy. The Local Plan Sites Document is in conformity with the Local Plan Strategy.				

Policy Map: Kirby Misperton - Flamingoland

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Flamingo Land	No			
Comment				
Flamingo land is generally supportive of the approach that has been taken in relation to development within the Park boundary. However, the Development Limits on the western edge of the park should be amended to take in the land which is the subject of the Certificate of Lawful Use or Development (03/01192/CLEUD).				
RDC Comment				
Noted. The Local Planning Authority have no objections to the inclusion of the established use within the Development Limits, as a factual alteration.				

Policy Map: Kirkbymoorside

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Maw Family				

Comment
Contend that Site 259 remains an available, deliverable and achievable development site to meet arising housing needs while also providing the means to maintain economic opportunities in the area – either through facilitating relocation or redevelopment of the adjoining Sylatech site to site 650 in Pickering. Our clients land is proposed for allocation for expansion purposes and could be pursued on a mixed-use basis given previous comments submitted as part of the plan process, the underlying objective and past collaborative approach. The need to ensure a ‘willing landowner’ is key in this regard and should be duly appreciated. We reserve the right and opportunity to comment further in the light of evolving circumstances also associated with the progression of the committed housing site owned by Gladman Developments and how actual delivery of that site may progress.
RDC Comment
The Local Plan Strategy looks to avoid the allocation of residential development to the south of the A170 as a spatial principle. The use of the site would be contrary to this. The Council has considered the extent to which the residential use of the site would help to facilitate the move of the adjacent factory to Pickering. It is understood that this is no longer an aspiration of Sylatech who have now confirmed that they will remain and expand at the Kirkbymoorside site and that this is something that all parties are aware of.
The identification of the expansion land at Kirkbymoorside has been a longstanding allocation in the development plan and there has no indication that the land would not continue to be available for this purpose if required. As the previous representations have shown, the site has oscillated between being a site promoted for residential development and as land for employment expansion. Since Sylatech have confirmed that they are not relocating, the identification of part of site 259 for employment expansion is sound.
The Council is confident that the proposed sites, together with commitments are appropriate and deliverable and that they will meet Kirkbymoorside's planned housing requirement in a way which is consistent with the principles of the Local Plan Strategy. A reserved matters application has been submitted by Gladman and the landowners have confirmed that it remains their intention to develop the site.

Policy Map: Langton

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Langton Estate				
Comment				
Proposed the following changes in the Development Limits for Langton:				
<p>1. Incorporation of Langton Hall and adjacent buildings within the Development Limits of Langton to reflect the historic boundaries of the village.</p> <p>2. Amendment of the development limit to include the joiner's yard to the north of Main Street. The joiner's yard is an existing brownfield site in the centre of the village. Whilst the joiner's shop exists and continues to operate, the full area of the site is not required and could be revitalised with a small scale, mixed business or residential use. Development of the site should be included as an allocation in Policy SD2.</p> <p>4. Amendment of development limits to the north of the village and reuse of existing agricultural site.</p>				
On the northern edge of the village is an area with a sugar beet pad and agricultural building. These buildings are no longer critical to the Estate's				

agricultural operations and a sensitive redevelopment of the site would make a better use of the site. 5. Amendment of development limits to include land to the west of Green Farm. Green Farm is currently a tenanted farm at the western end of the village. Land adjacent to the farm is available for small scale residential development. Access to the highway exists.

RDC Comment

These sites identified have been submitted at Publication Stage. Development Limits are a policy approach to define the acceptability in principle for certain forms of development, and do not either refer to the built extent of a settlement nor the Conservation Area, which is a statutory designation recognising the historic and architectural character of places. The proposed expansion of the Development Limits would amount to substantial allocations contrary to the adopted Spatial Approach and Settlement Hierarchy in the Local Plan Strategy. Such an approach would be contrary to the adopted Settlement Hierarchy of SP1 and SP2, which does not identify allocations for residential development below the Service Village Tier.

Policy Map: Malton/Norton (Central Area)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Fitzwilliam Malton Estate	No		Yes	Yes
Comment				
Policies in relation to retail development are considered to reflect available evidence, the nature of the retail market and Framework policies which emphasise the need to maintain and enhance established town centres as most accessible locations for the provision of retail and other services to meet local needs.				
The commitments are based on historic permissions granted on this basis or in the context of particular site circumstances and with appropriate restrictions on the permissions.				
RDC Comment				
Noted. The permissions are within the Plan Period.				

Policy Map: Old Malton

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
L M shirley				
Comment				
Support SP16 and Old Malton Map, all VIUAs around Old Malton, including land north of Westgate Lane. St Marys Priory Church is the only surviving Gilbertine Church in use. The open nature of the land surrounding the priory and village enhance the beauty of the of the priory and the village, it is imperative that these spaces remain as they are for future generations to enjoy.				
RDC Comment				

Noted.

Policy Map: Oswaldkirk

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Howardian Hills AONB Manager	No	Effective		
Comment				
The map (Oswaldkirk) is missing the green shading (and inclusion on the key) that should show the whole of the white area that isn't 'Area Outside of the Ryedale Local Plan' is within the Howardian Hills AONB.				
RDC Comment				
Noted. This is a mapping error and correction would be a factual amendment.				

Policy Map: Pickering

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo D Dale-Sunley				
Comment				
The Development Limits at Pickering should be amended to include our clients land (Planning application ref: 17/00398/FUL) and to align with development on the ground and where consent has been obtained.				
RDC Comment				
The District Council consider that the Development Limits as proposed are appropriate.				

Policy Map: SD2 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Barber and Booth	No		No	No
Comment				
Site 417 should be included within Development Limits. Don't agree with the Council's assessment of the site/ application of the site selection methodology. The Development Limits are illogical, perverse, contrary to policy and therefore unsound.				
The site is almost surrounded by development and has no intrinsic quality. It is in essence an infill site. The development limits are unsound as they				

specifically exclude a site that is almost entirely surrounded by development and has no environmental protection policy on it. There are no known ownership, planning or technical constraints to the site's development and the site can be delivered in a policy compliant manner. Flood risk associated with the site is no different to another previously approved scheme in Norton.

The policies map is unsound as it ignores government policy and statements that support the need for more housing and the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The inclusion of undeveloped sites in the development limits would allow windfall sites to come forward at an appropriate time.

RDC Comment

The Local Planning Authority have demonstrated that the proposed allocations comply with the objectives of the adopted Strategic Development Plan (Local Plan Strategy) and the sustainability appraisal process of the site assessment process. This representation neither challenges the identified allocations nor commitments. The Development Limits are an adopted component of the Development Plan in the Local Plan Strategy, and their presence is integral to the operation of Policies SP1 and SP2 (RPLPS). On that basis, the Development Limits can only been changed now in response to the proposed allocations, and commitments as part of the Policies Map, which result in meeting the housing requirement as set out in the Local Plan Strategy. There were site-specific issues with site 417 regarding the fish ponds, and impact on the River Derwent SAC, coupled with pockets of high flood risk, coupled with the important Green Infrastructure Corridor provided by Mill Beck.

Policy Map: Slingsby

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Howardian Hills AONB Manager	No	Effective		
Comment				
The AONB boundary on the south side of the road is shown incorrectly at Slingsby. Copies of the Designation Map and the detailed boundary amendment required is provided.				
RDC Comment				
The GIS Layer provided by the AONB (via NYCC) was used. The error was not on the Council's part. The map will be updated in due course to reflect the correct boundary.				

Policy Map: Stonegrave

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Howardian Hills AONB Manager	No	Effective		
Comment				
The monument symbol is missing form the Scheduled Monument of Stonegrave Minster.				
RDC Comment				

This is mapping omission and can be identified and updated as a factual update

Policy Map: Weaverthorpe

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Vello Tyres				
Comment				
An amendment to the development limits and allocation of land to the east of the existing employment site for the expansion of the operation would accord with SP6 and would allow for a continuation of existing operations in Weaverthorpe to the benefit of the local economy and in the interests of sustainable development. Although the site is in an Area of High Landscape Value, the site is of little landscape value. Development of the site would round off the village envelope.				
RDC Comment				
The role of SD13 is a continuation on from the original policy in the 2002 Local Plan, and was undertaken on the basis that the companies involved had made investment decisions on the land and that the land was important to their long term business plans. This is why the policy specifically refers to that company and so cannot be applied to other companies, and the land is not within Development Limits. Policy SP6 in the Local Plan Strategy, is concerned with the location and supply of economic development, and is the policy framework for considering other businesses proposals for expansion. To amend the policy map regarding the development limits would not be justified. Any proposal made under SD13 would still have comply with the rest of the provisions of the Development Plan.				

Policy Map: Weaverthorpe

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Weaverthorpe PC	No			
Comment				
Request change to Policies Map to include two areas of land as VIUAs. The Weaverthorpe War Memorial site and land south of Wesley Cottage.(Marked on enclosed map). The Parish Council has agreed to register these areas of land as Common Land, along with other land already identified as VIUA.				
RDC Comment				
As these sites have not been previously identified, they have not been included in the Publication of the Local Plan Sites Document. The Local Planning Authority would not dispute the contribution of these areas, particularly the War Memorial, to the form and character of the settlement.				

Policy: SD1 - Existing Residential Commitments

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Barratt and DWH				
Comment				
The Site at Middleton Road Pickering, (site ref 116) should be allocated for residential development. It will create a sustainable, high quality and accessible development which will bring significant social and economic benefits. The site can deliver a comprehensive development of market and affordable housing. It is in a suitable location and there are no technical or environmental constraints to preclude development. It is available and under the control of a national housebuilder and is considered to be achievable. Its allocation will contribute to the shortfall in homes on account of deliverability concerns associated with SD6 (Malton Road, Pickering) and two Gladman sites (at Kirkbymoorside and Sherburn).				
RDC Comment				
The Local Planning Authority consider that the proposed residential land allocations comply with the objectives of the adopted Local Plan Strategy and are supported by the sustainability appraisal process/ site assessment process. The combination of proposed sites at Pickering will provide for the housing requirements for the Town which are established in the Local Plan Strategy. The site at Middleton Road is less accessible to the Town Centre and is more sensitive in landscape terms.				
The landowner of SD6 remains clear of their commitment to delivering a plan-compliant scheme on the site, and have a planning consultancy engaged in the process. They have made clear representations and it is considered that just because a major housebuilder is not currently promoting the site does not mean that it is not deliverable. The site could be available to a wider range of builders / developers.				
The sites at Kirkbymoorside and Sherburn are relatively recently granted planning permissions, and the Council is not aware of any impediment to their delivery.				
The Plan builds in additional flexibility in terms of housing land supply and the Council do not believe that further sites need to be identified to meet housing requirements. It should be noted that Policy SP2 of the Local Plan Strategy provides a framework for the release of further sites should commitments fail to come forward and if this is required to ensure a deliverable five year land supply. As part of the annual update to the SHLAA, Gladman has confirmed that the sites which it has an interest in, remain deliverable.				

Policy: SD1 - Existing Residential Commitments

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Taylor Wimpey (N Yorks)				
Comment				
SD1- sound. Support Policy D1 which confirms that 'residential development sites shown on the Policies Map as existing residential commitments will continue to be supported in principle, for residential development which is consistent with a site's existing permission. Currently developing Land north of Broughton Road, the scheme includes a total of 345 dwellings, with the final phase to commence spring 2018.				
RDC Comment				

Noted.

Policy: SD1 - Existing Residential Commitments

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo W&W Estates				
Comment				
Concerned over the deliverability of the Westfield/Gladman site. Reserved matters have been submitted by Gladman themselves. There is a lack of developer appetite for the site and there is a risk that the site will never come forward or that it will not all come forward within the plan period. Also concerned that the Gladman Site at Sherburn is not deliverable. When combined, these two sites equate to circa 300 homes that have been included in housing delivery calculations. If they don't come forward, their housing delivery capacity should be re-located to other deliverable and sustainable development sites including the larger proposed site option at Swineherd Lane which could deliver 80 of these 300 homes in the next five years. If the (committed) sites are not deliverable, the socio-economic benefits associated with the delivery of 300 homes will be lost, including the provision of up to 105 affordable homes.				
RDC Comment				
The plan allocates land for 1,097 dwellings in addition to committed sites and completions (not including the residential land allocations at Helmsley). It makes provision for circa 3,902 new homes over the plan period which is 30 % above the housing requirement of 3,000 homes over the plan period. The plan builds in sufficient flexibility in its land supply and includes a policy framework (Policy SP2 of the Local Plan Strategy) to support the release of further sites if this is required in the event that commitments or allocations fail to come forward.				

Policy: SD1 - Existing Residential Commitments

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Highways England	No	Justified		
Comment				
Highways England does not support the approach of continuing to support sites in principle in the event the current permission expires. There may have been a material change in the operation of the SRN since the time the permission was granted. It is expected that Highways England would be consulted on each planning application to re-assess the impact on the SRN.				
RDC Comment				
The Local Planning Authority is only committing sites which have been considered through the adopted development plan since April 2012 and recognising their ability to contribute to the delivery of the housing requirement as set out in the adopted development Plan. This is over 700 dwellings, the rest are under construction. If we were unable to rely on such permissions we would be committed to allocating land well above the Ryedale Plan-Local Plan				

Strategy's requirements and tolerances, which would be, contrary to the adopted strategic plan (which was supported by Highways England), place significant pressure on the settlements subject of these sites, and result in a material change to the operation of the SRN, as at present those committed sites have planning consent and would still come forward (as we have evidence that they are deliverable) alongside the extra allocations. If planning applications were made Highways England would be consulted in accordance with the prescribed requirements.

Policy: SD1 - Existing Residential Commitments

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
Kirkbymoorside – 225 + 61 LP dwellings - one approved outline planning application (225) is to provide extra education land for use by Kirkbymoorside CP School. Without this additional land it would be difficult to develop the existing restricted site in response to any new housing. Ryedale Secondary School has been recently expanded.				
RDC Comment				
Noted. The permission is subject to a Reserved Matters application. The update of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will reflect the need to ensure that land is retained for future education expansion at Primary level.				

Policy: SD1 - Existing Residential Commitments

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
Malton Primary – existing permissions + 60 LP dwellings may need some small scale expansion of Malton CP School. NYCC are working with the diocese St Mary's RC Primary Malton which will add additional capacity to provide for the impacts of new housing in both Malton and Norton. NYCC are reviewing the position of Malton Secondary to determine the need for and degree of any future expansion.				
RDC Comment				
Noted. The existing permissions in Malton have been pre-CIL, and subject to educational contributions. As The District Council has a CIL charge in place, Education contributions would be covered by the CIL charge, if the resulting scheme generates such a requirement.				

Policy: SD2 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Ryedale District Council				

A Harrison	No	Effective		
Comment				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development in non-service villages should not have occupancy clauses imposed on them. There is room for development in many villages, but with this clause attached it makes the building of any more development non-viable, thus impacting on that village and its community. Development is being encouraged and focussed solely on the towns, which is very much to the detriment of the villages. It is perfectly reasonable to allow some development in villages, as well as in towns. There is pressure from central Government to support small and medium sized builders, the Ryedale policy does not help this, it prevents it. Whilst this policy in theory has merits, it does not work in practice as sites are not coming forward; they are blighted as the finished article is not worth the investment. Mortgage finance seems to be impossible. In my opinion the plan is 'unsafe' as it cannot deliver in allowing rural communities to thrive. 				
<p>Many houses have already been built in the gardens of existing houses in Moor Lane, Broughton. I would like to downsize from my current home and build a more suitable dwelling in the rear garden, but the current occupancy clauses mean that this is just not a viable option even though this would then open up a larger home for another family to move into Broughton and experience/add to the community here.</p> <p>The development line has also been drawn up around only my garden on this side of the street, even though there are houses either side of it, so a precedent has been set and a build in this particular place would only be filling in a line of dwellings that is almost complete.</p>				
RDC Comment				
<p>The Local Plan Sites Document has been produced in accordance with the Local Plan Strategy. This has sought to delivery the majority of housing within the market towns, with some development at the Service Villages, and small-scale development to meet identified local needs. The change of approach could only be considered through a new strategic plan. The respondent did not identify where their property was to allow further comment.</p>				

Policy: SD2 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
C Garner	No		No	
Comment				
<p>Not sound, not legally compliant regarding policies map. Takes no cognisance of our desire to preserve Sand Hutton Walled Garden and its remaining walls. House could be built under paragraph 55 rules, i.e. as a passivhaus. No cognisance has been taken by RDC Planning Department to consider this approach. Should be more flexible to permit building outside the permitted villages, and development zones. Villages in terminal decline owing to lack of movement of householders except when they die.</p>				

RDC Comment
The Local Plan Sites Document is in accordance with the Local Plan Strategy, and embodies the purpose of Paragraph 55 of the NPPF. Passivhaus is not sufficient to meet the requirements of the fourth requirement of Paragraph 55. The Local Plan Strategy provides a range of specific means for the delivery of housing to meet identified local needs within areas of which are in the Other Villages or Open Countryside.

Policy: SD2 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
J Blackburne- Maze				
Comment				
Restore site 266 to being part of the previous line of the village framework. The site was removed in 1997/8. Site previously had farm buildings on it, should be brought back into the development framework. Would not be detrimental to the village and could provide the site for a house.				
RDC Comment				
The Ryedale Plan Local Plan Strategy sought to restrict development in the smaller (Other Villages) through the use of the Settlement Hierarchy, Development Limits and allowing infill development in certain circumstances to meet local needs. The Local Plan Sites Document is in conformity with that approach. The Development Limits in Broughton are split into two areas. Site 266 is in between the Development Limits. No whole scale review of Development Limits has been undertaken, based on the chosen development strategy set out in the Local Plan Strategy.				

Policy: SD2 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
J Fields				
Comment				
With regard to site no.109 at Thornton le Dale. I note that this site is classed as having high visual value. I believe that as the site is screened from the east by a mature shelter belt, having housing on the southern border & the remaining village to the west this will mean that there is no visual value to the site as it cannot be seen from the north. I would therefore ask that the site is considered for future inclusion in planned development of Thornton le Dale.				
RDC Comment				
A planning permission to the south of the site has resulted in Thornton le Dale (Ryedale Part) having residential development which contributes to the Service Village Tier. The Local Planning Authority consider that site 109 has some sensitivities concerning elevation.				

Policy: SD2 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo A L Kirk	No			
Comment				
<p>Site 160 is not included within the proposed allocations. The Local Plan Strategy does not define a total number of dwellings for Ampleforth or any of the other Service Villages. The Local Plan Strategy seeks to ensure that the extent to which suitable sites exist, will influence the distribution of housing across such Service Villages. It is within this context that Site 160 should be viewed favourably for a residential allocation within Ampleforth. Consider that the total number of dwellings planned for the Service Villages should indeed be viewed as a minimum to provide flexibility. There are a number of valid planning reasons to promote growth in this location, which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The site represents a 0.99ha site with no technical constraints that would hinder the delivery of housing in this location. <input type="checkbox"/> The site is advantageously located, with good accessibility to the main strategic transport routes within the District also offering a choice of sustainable transport choices such as bus, pedestrian and cycle routes. <input type="checkbox"/> The site has potential to sustainably accommodate a moderate number of houses to contribute to the housing requirement within Ryedale. <input type="checkbox"/> The Site Assessment Methodology confirms that Site 160 is considered to be a suitable site for a residential allocation and we therefore consider this site should be included within the proposed Local Plan Sites DPD as a residential allocation. <input type="checkbox"/> The site is immediately available for development and can come forward within the period of 0-5 years. <input type="checkbox"/> There are no known technical constraints that could preclude the site coming forward for development. 				
RDC Comment				
<p>Site 160 was identified through the site assessment process as a Group 4 site, but was not taken forward as an allocation due to the delivery of the scheme of over 30 houses in Ampleforth within the Plan Period. The Council has modestly exceeded the Local Plan Strategy's requirement for housing at the Service Village Tier, with proposed allocations at Slingsby and Amotherby, to ensure plan flexibility and ensuring that as equitably as possible development is distributed across the tier. The site performed well through the site assessment process as it has limited sensitivities and constraints. However, since the original site assessment was undertaken, and the majority of site 288 has been built out, the access situation has changed. The access identified as being through 'the Laurels' has been discounted by the Highway Authority. The access would need to be provided from the site 288. The layout of the completed scheme precludes direct access, and so access would be through the undeveloped part of 288, and the landowner of 288 has not engaged with the Council to confirm as to whether this is possible. On that basis, as the access is legally and physically unclear, the site would now be identified as a Group 2 site.</p>				

Policy: SD2 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Ryedale District Council				

obo A L Kirk				
Comment				
<p>The Background Paper states; the site (Site 632) is very visually prominent from long distance view across to the village from the eastern part of Yearsley Moor, close to Gilling East, about 2.5 km to the south east of Ampleforth. The historic linear form of the village is an important element of its character. Development of the site would extend the village in a way which would lead to the coalescence of Ampleforth village with buildings associated with the Ampleforth College site. In this respect, it is considered that by virtue of its location and scale the development of the site would compromise the landscape setting of the village, within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The Background Paper confirms that the Site is considered to be a Group 2 site. Further justification is required to support the above assumptions. It's not considered that the development of Site 632 would result in coalescence with the collage area, there are additional properties between the site and the college therefore the above assumptions and reasons for discounting the site do not appear to be robust. Notwithstanding the above, if the Council consider it inappropriate to develop the site in its entirety, it may be possible to develop a smaller proportion of the site to mirror the development pattern on the northern side of East Lane without any adverse impacts on the relationship between the village and the college area. The reasons for discounting Site 632 for development do not appear to be robust. Further evidence is required to support the above assumptions. The applicant would encourage the Council to reconsider their position on the above site and consider at least a small proportion of the site for residential development, to mirror the development pattern on land to the north of East Lane.</p>				

Policy: SD2 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Barratt and DWH	No			
Comment				
<p>The Site at Middleton Road Pickering, (site ref 116) should be allocated for residential development. It will create a sustainable, high quality and accessible development which will bring significant social and economic benefits. The site can deliver a comprehensive development of market and affordable housing. It is in a suitable location and there are no technical or environmental constraints to preclude development. It is available and under the control of a national housebuilder and is considered to be achievable. Its allocation will contribute to the shortfall in homes on account of deliverability concerns associated with SD6 (Malton Road, Pickering) and two Gladman sites (at Kirkbymoorside and Sherburn).</p>				
RDC Comment				
<p>The Local Planning Authority consider that the proposed residential land allocations comply with the objectives of the adopted Local Plan Strategy and are</p>				

supported by the sustainability appraisal process/ site assessment process. The combination of proposed sites at Pickering will provide for the housing requirements for the Town which are established in the Local Plan Strategy. The site at Middleton Road is less accessible to the Town Centre and is more sensitive in landscape terms.

The landowner of SD6 remains clear of their commitment to delivering a plan-compliant scheme on the site, and have a planning consultancy engaged in the process. They have made clear representations and it is considered that just because a major housebuilder is not currently promoting the site does not mean that it is not deliverable. The site could be available to a wider range of builders / developers.

The sites at Kirkbymoorside and Sherburn are relatively recently granted planning permissions, and the Council is not aware of any impediment to their delivery.

The Plan builds in additional flexibility in terms of housing land supply and the Council do not believe that further sites need to be identified to meet housing requirements. It should be noted that Policy SP2 of the Local Plan Strategy provides a framework for the release of further sites should commitments fail to come forward and if this is required to ensure a deliverable five year land supply. As part of the annual update to the SHLAA, Gladman has confirmed that the sites which it has an interest in, remain deliverable.

Policy: SD2 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Bede Homes Ltd				
Comment				
The majority of the housing need for Malton / Norton is proposed to be delivered on a greenfield site on the edge of Norton. The Ryedale House site comprises brownfield land but currently lies outside the settlement limits.				
Despite the former Woolgrowers site comprising brownfield land within the settlement limits of Malton / Norton and in close proximity to Malton town centre, this site has not been identified as a proposed housing allocation as the Council consider that concerns relating to flood risk, access and contamination cannot be mitigated.				
No objections to the above allocations, but consider that the identified site constraints can be mitigated such that the site can deliver housing within the proposed plan period and should therefore be duly allocated for residential development. Submits that Westwood have undertaken a sequential assessment which concludes the Woolgrowers site is the only site within the appropriate size parameters and geographical area which meets the flood risk sequential criteria of availability and deliverability. Suggests a series of mitigation measures. Access and highways is confirmed that for a scheme of 50 units access can be achieved from Park Lane. An ecological appraisal identifies some areas of high value for nesting birds, and would be retained. Contamination is expected, but no evidence that the site cannot be remediated, and as such not considered to constrain development. Include Land at the former Woolgrowers Site, Park Road, Malton (4.5ha) circa 50 dwellings				
RDC Comment				
No site submission information was received after 2009. Site is subject of long-standing awareness. It is a brownfield site, within Development Limits, and with the geographic capability to forge sustainable links to Malton and Norton Town Centres, subject to the provision of a crossing of the railway. However,				

the individual site 121 was not considered to be deliverable or developable: complex contamination issues with the site, and the uncertain means of access and high flood risk. The site is almost entirely within Flood Zone 3, and also is within a Rapid Inundation Zone. There are other sites in a lower level of flood risk which are available, developable and are also sustainably located. Therefore the site fails the Sequential Test, as alternatives are present, and is unable to move onto the Exception Test. Matters regarding access are noted, but would need to be assessed within the context of strategic junction capacity considerations. The ecological appraisal has not considered the proximity of the site to the River Derwent SAC. The Council is aware that the site can be remediated, but is concerned that the costs of such remediation would affect viability, the representations do not confirm the viability position.

Policy: SD2 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Church Commissioners for England				
Comment				
Proposes Claxton as an example where the Development Limits should be changed- and a parcel of land is indicated on a map. Identifies the site as being available, suitable and achievable.				
RDC Comment				
This site is in Claxton, not one of the villages which are identified as Service Villages, and therefore not capable in principle of allocations being made, in accordance with the Local Plan Strategy. In respect of the site submitted, this has only been submitted at Publication Stage.				

Policy: SD2 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Commercial Development Projects and Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation	No		No	
Comment				
Not sound not legally compliant. Particular reference to site 324 (Land South of Westgate Lane and north of Green Lane, Malton). Was identified as a preferred site in 2015 consultation, submitted representations which confirmed the sites were suitable as they were deliverable and developable. Now not included. The site was accompanied by a considerable body of supporting information which confirmed the site's suitability. Reconsider the VIUA designation, and identify the site for housing, as part of the Malton Option.				
RDC Comment				
It was identified as an option choice. The choice of other sites over this site is not a soundness issue. The decision to chose other sites is made from a suite of information to inform site choices. It includes the SSM, Background Papers, and technical assessments to evidence that approach.				

Policy: SD2 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo D Dale-Sunley	No		Yes	Yes
Comment				
Propose the allocation of a large site to the south of Kirkbymoorside (RDC refs 524,644,213,210,385,159,509) to meet housing need and the associated buffer. In its entirety the site is in a central location, is well related to the existing built form of the Town and is close to services and facilities. Development of the site would not lead to coalescence with Keldholme and the site is not a VIUA or in the AHLV. It is an appropriate, suitable and sustainable location. There are no legal, policy or physical constraints to its development.				
The Council's housing figure is a minimum figure and it is important that the Council addresses the requirements of the Zone of Tolerance when allocating land. If the Council fails to plan properly to meet objectively assessed needs it will fail the tests of soundness in failing to be consistent with the Local Plan Strategy and the plan will not be effective. The Council is not planning positively to accommodate the flexible buffer and Zone of Tolerance.				
On the edge of the more sustainable settlements, land should be identified/safeguarded to be used if needed. This would ensure that the long term expansion of the towns continues to be plan-led.				
RDC Comment				
The Council considers that the proposed allocations, and the identified commitments are capable of delivering the plan requirements, and the evidence has been produced to demonstrate this. The land to the north of the A170 at Kirkbymoorside is identified within the Local Plan Strategy as being the area of focus for housing (Policy SP2), and the strategic principles for the Town. Conversely the land to south is expected to " consolidate existing redevelopment opportunities without redefining the traditional built form of the town.". The development of these sites would be contrary to the adopted Development Plan.				

Policy: SD2 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo D Dale-Sunley				
Comment				
The Council is not planning positively to accommodate the flexible buffer and Zone of Tolerance. Site 203 at Outgang Road in Pickering should be allocated for residential or employment purposes. The site is adjacent to the built form of Pickering and there are no technical constraints which would prevent its development. It is a suitable location for development and can be viably developed. There is also an existing commitment on the site for a B1/B2 unit (planning application ref: 17/00398/FUL).				
The Council's site assessment does not take account of surrounding development or the existing permission. If allocated for housing, the effects of the existing industrial estate can be mitigated.				
On the edge of the more sustainable settlements, land should be identified or safeguarded to be used if needed. This would ensure that the long term expansion of the Towns continues to be plan-led.				

RDC Comment

The Council's approach is positive and aligns with commitments in the Local Plan Strategy. An additional supply is identified in the plan to provide flexibility. The role of the Zone of Tolerance has been misunderstood. Its purpose is to provide positive /responsive management of housing delivery: by allowing an annual 25% uplift in completions to not affect the following 5 year land supply position. Its operation is demonstrated in the SHLAA Part 1 annual update.

Site 203 is in close proximity to the Industrial Estate, and now a B2 use (which is not appropriate to occur in a residential area) is adjacent. The Council has taken into account the surrounding development, and this is evidenced in the Site Selection Methodology Tables. The permission for the B1/B2 units covers an area of land which is not contiguous to the established Development Limits. The site is not considered to be an appropriate site for housing and other sites provide more appropriate sites to meet housing requirements. It is noted that the respondent has not sought to demonstrate why the sites proposed in the plan are considered to be unsound.

Policy: SD2 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo D Hume				
Comment				
Site 365 at Amotherby should be proposed as an allocation above alternatives. It has the support of the Parish Council and local residents. The site meets the Local Plan Strategy requirements for 'limited small scale sites in or adjacent to current development limits'. The development of the site will not create parking issues in the village and will result in minimal impact on the street scene, countryside and AONB in contrast to the preferred proposed site. The site selection methodology includes a number of inaccuracies about the site. There have been two planning applications for the development of the site and supporting technical information is available. The Parish Council and site (365) owner wish to challenge the grouping of the site as a Group 2 site. The source protection zone is irrelevant and Nosie is no greater than that experienced by current residents. The advantages and lesser impact of site 365 outweigh those of site 148.				
RDC Comment				
The Local Planning Authority is well aware of the submission of documents about the site to both the planning application process and the Development Plan production process, and that documentation is on the website. Neither application has been approved (one returned, one refused). Site 635 has been principally ruled out due to the risks to a private water supply bore hole which serves a food manufacturing enterprise, the Environment Agency has been clear about the very high potential for contamination of the aquifer, it is not an irrelevance. Nor is the impacts of noise which must be based on current standards of amenity for residents, and the inability to achieve this was a reason for refusal on the second planning application. The representor has not substantiated the impacts of the proposed allocation (site SD11) on the AONB, the wider countryside or the street scene. Within the Development Principles, it is proposed that alongside the housing there is to be a play area (which is not currently available) and a kiss and drop facility for the school is to be provided as a solution to the issues with traffic at the school starting and finishing. The Site Selection Methodology has identified the proximity of the AONB as a sensitivity and suggested mitigation measures as part of that, which would also be required in terms of noise impacts (which 635 was unable to overcome).				

Policy: SD2 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Linden Homes	No			
Comment				
In summary, we consider that the housing requirement for Malton/Norton for the Plan period can be most appropriately and sustainably delivered via the allocation of Site 649 and Site 194, which we consider to be a more sustainable and deliverable option than Site 450 and one which would also provide a greater buffer to the supply of housing should the significant infrastructure requirements associated with Site 649 result in the delivery of residential development on that site not coming forward at the rates anticipated. Consider that the exclusion of site 194 renders the plan unsound				
Not being justified: We consider there to be insufficient justification to support the allocation of Site 450 (Ryedale House) over Site 194.				
Not being effective: We note the net residual requirement for the delivery of 246no. dwellings in Malton/Norton across the Plan period but we have concerns over the rates at which new residential development can potentially be delivered on Sites 450 and 649 (Norton Lodge) and consider provision should therefore be made for alternative/additional allocations by way of a buffer should these two sites fail to deliver to the anticipated rates for those reasons.				
Not being consistent with national policy: We consider Site 194 represents a more sustainable and deliverable option than Site 450 and that the housing requirement for Malton/Norton should be increased to ensure the delivery of an adequate supply, given the deliverability rates for residential development on Site 649 could be constrained by the need to deliver significant infrastructure as part of that development				
RDC Comment				
No representations on the development capability of this site have been submitted since the site was originally submitted- the site could not be considered deliverable. Identified as a potential group 3 site, but not identified as an option choice in 2015 due to lack of information, and the concerns with sites on western Norton resulting in greater pressure on existing junction capacity. Maps were of the site submissions. The Council is confident that with the commitments and proposed allocations that across the district the 200 homes per annum as a minimum can be delivered. For clarification, SD4 is not adjacent to the Scheduled Monument, known as 'Derventio'. There is another property, also known as Ryedale House, which is directly to the north of the Scheduled Site.				

Policy: SD2 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo M Green				
Comment				
I regret that Site 539 (7) in Allerston has been excluded from the Development Limits map. It would have allowed a neglected brownfield site in a visually important location to be improved. Please therefore accept this as a formal objection to the Council's proposals. I understand why the Council's search for				

sites to meet its housing needs is concentrating on larger sites and is restricted to Market Towns and Service Villages. Should amend existing Development Limits in the 2002 Ryedale Local Plan if needed. It is important that required amendments are made as they will continue to be used in the smaller 'other' villages. I therefore object on this point, on behalf of Mr Martin Green.

As you know from previous correspondence I consider that there is an ambiguity between Inset Map 7 and 2.2 of the supporting text and this should be clarified. The other argument I have made is that the existing mid-20C agricultural buildings on site are an eyesore. They continue to deteriorate. Removal of them would be a benefit to the Conservation Area, as would be their replacement with appropriate development.

RDC Comment

The proposed allocations identified are in accordance with the Spatial Strategy as set out in the Local Plan Strategy, the adopted Development Plan. Allerston is not identified as a Service Village. To amend the Development Limits at such settlements would be contrary to the adopted Development Plan.

Policy: SD2 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Maw Family	No			
Comment				
Contend that Site 259 remains an available, deliverable and achievable development site to meet arising housing needs while also providing the means to maintain economic opportunities in the area – either through facilitating relocation or redevelopment of the adjoining Sylatech site to site 650 in Pickering. Our clients land is proposed for allocation for expansion purposes and could be pursued on a mixed-use basis given previous comments submitted as part of the plan process, the underlying objective and past collaborative approach. The need to ensure a 'willing landowner' is key in this regard and should be duly appreciated. We reserve the right and opportunity to comment further in the light of evolving circumstances also associated with the progression of the committed housing site owned by Gladman Developments and how actual delivery of that site may progress.				

RDC Comment

The Local Plan Strategy looks to avoid the allocation of residential development to the south of the A170 as a spatial principle. The use of the site would be contrary to this. The Council has considered the extent to which the residential use of the site would help to facilitate the move of the adjacent factory to Pickering. It is understood that this is no longer an aspiration of Sylatech who have now confirmed that they will remain and expand at the Kirkbymoorside site and that this is something that all parties are aware of.

The identification of the expansion land at Kirkbymoorside has been a longstanding allocation in the development plan and there has no indication that the land would not continue to be available for this purpose if required. As the previous representations have shown, the site has oscillated between being a site promoted for residential development and as land for employment expansion. Since Sylatech have confirmed that they are not relocating, the identification of part of site 259 for employment expansion is sound.

The Council is confident that the proposed sites, together with commitments are appropriate and deliverable and that they will meet Kirkbymoorside's planned housing requirement in a way which is consistent with the principles of the Local Plan Strategy. A reserved matters application has been submitted by Gladman and the landowners have confirmed that it remains their intention to develop the site.

Policy: SD2 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Mr B Newcombe	No			
Comment				
I regret that Site 125 in Rillington has been excluded from the Development Limits map. It would have allowed a neglected site to be used and so improved. Please therefore accept this as a formal objection to the Council's proposals.				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I have studied the 2017 Full Site Selection Methodology papers for Rillington. In comparison to the 2015 version I note that it has been accepted that neither the trees on site or the nearby footpath would necessarily preclude development. Disagree the site no longer has the use class of a domestic property. I do not agree as this use has not been abandoned. The comments from C Methan on page 34 would appear to have been misapplied to Site 125. (I would welcome your comments on this). <p>Q7. "... This is a small, but prominent site which is heavily treed ..." and "... There is an existing timber building, which the site submitter proposes to replace with a new dwelling. It is unlikely to cause wider landscape impacts by virtue of its size, but an adverse localised impact would be present."</p> <p>This seems somewhat of an exaggeration – a replacement dwelling of similar size (a bungalow?) would have no significant impact in this respect.</p> <p>Q11, 'C'. Disagree with this – suggest 'neutral impact' would be more appropriate; proposal would have minimal adverse impact on ... etc.</p> <p>Q13. "intrusive development in streetscene" - how? Surely, if anything, the trees referred to would help minimise any visual intrusion, helping to cloak the development? Being on the periphery of the village, it would help to define the boundary. Also, there have indeed been significant archaeological discoveries in and around the Wolds area but we cannot recall anything of that nature in the immediate vicinity of Rillington. However, we accept that this is a requirement that, as with all sites, must be legally addressed.</p> <p>Q13, 'D'. We would respectfully suggest that 'Development would not adversely affect etc.' would be more appropriate.</p> <p>Q16 'E'. 'Site capable of incorporating low carbon, etc.' We would be quite happy to follow this route, voltaic panels, etc.</p> <p>Q46. This seems to contradict the assessment for Q3. "... and conflicts anticipated with playing pitch access". One small dwelling access teed off the adequately wide playing field access road; it's not really likely to cause any conflicts.</p> <p>Q48. The report is correct in stating that the site is adjacent to the PROW. Cannot see how there would be any need to transect the PROW. Proposal would not therefore affect the PROW.</p> <p>Q52, 'M'. We would respectfully suggest, given the responses we have made above, that 'Site has no adverse impact, etc.' or at the very least, 'Site does not have significant adverse impact, etc.' would be more appropriate here.</p>				
RDC Comment				
This site falls below the site assessment threshold of 0.15ha at the Service Villages. This threshold was, as part of the Site Selection Methodology,				

consulted upon extensively and approved by Members. The site selection process automatically discounted sites below the site size threshold. The lawful use is a legal matter.

Policy: SD2 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo W&W Estates				
Comment				
There is a planning case for a larger site proposal than the proposed allocation SD7 to include a further parcel of land to the east. Together, the sites would measure 2.67ha and both are well located to services and facilities in the Town. Taking into account of the Local Plan Strategy, there are no planning policies which would preclude the development of the site. It would represent a logical extension to the town and there are no unsurmountable issues in terms of design or technical matters. The site is deliverable and would form a logical extension to the Town. The socio-economic benefits of developing the land would double if the larger site was allocated. A larger site would only represent an additional 35 dwellings (1% of the Districts housing needs). This would not be detrimental to the spatial strategy and could be allocated in addition to other proposed allocations. Allocation of a larger site would also provide further flexibility should other sites not prove deliverable.				
RDC Comment				
The Council would resist the expansion of the proposed allocation to include Site 666. It would represent unnecessary further incursion into the historic strip fields and would have an unnecessary adverse landscape impact.				
Additional housing land supply flexibility is built into the plan and a policy framework (Policy SP2 of the Local Plan Strategy) exists to support the release of suitable sites in the event that current commitments or allocations fail.				

Policy: SD2 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Watts (North Cotes Farm)	No		Yes	Yes
Comment				
Sites 648 and 647 at Welham Road should be allocated for housing. The 7.34ha of land is well located to the existing built up area. Development of this site will not materially harm the supply of productive agricultural land and the site is not an SSSI; SAC or Scheduled Monument. Vehicular and pedestrian access can be provided and the scheme can be designed to safeguard the setting of Listed Buildings in the vicinity. The land is available and deliverable.				
RDC Comment				
The representations have not explained why the Council's proposed allocations are unsound. The Council have a comprehensive body of evidence which explains the decisions made on site choices and why sites 648 and 647 would not represent the most sustainable sites for housing delivery when compared				

to the identified allocations. To meet residual requirements two sites are proposed at the Principal Town. The proposed site at Norton provides the opportunity for significant highway and school improvements to be delivered which cannot be secured through alternative sites. The site is also in a location which would encourage the use of the Brambling Fields junction as an alternative to the central road network.

Policy: SD2 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Wharfedale Homes				
Comment				
Allocate Beckett Close, Nawton site 252:				
The site performed well through the Council's assessment process.				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are a number of local services and facilities available within close proximity of the site, in particular Ryedale School, and the sustainable benefits that arise by virtue of proximity to such services; • There are no known technical issues that would preclude the development of the site; • The site would not have an adverse impact of the character of the Village or the wider landscape setting due to its location in the context of the Village's settlement form. • Deliverability concerns associated with RDC Housing Allocations Ref.SD10 & Ref.SD11. • Deliverability concerns associated with the two existing Gladman Development site interests in Kirkbymoorside and Sherburn. • Deliverability concerns associated with two of the proposed housing allocations in Helmsley. 				
Furthermore, it is our clear view that a settlement of the size of Beadlam and Nawton, with the range of facilities it contains, has the capacity to accommodate this housing allocation over the remaining plan period and is of a scale that enables the viable delivery of benefits to the local area, which would importantly include affordable housing.				
Allocation of the Beckett Close, Nawton site would represent approximately 1% of the District's identified housing needs, a scale which would not be detrimental to the spatial strategy of the District and thus the site could be allocated without the need to reduce the size or number of other proposed allocations across the District. Its allocation would also ensure further flexibility within the plan should other potential sites not prove deliverable in the plan period.				
Initial survey work undertaken by our client in respect of the site's development have not identified any issues that would adversely impact on the site's deliverability. Subject to the site being identified as a draft housing allocation, our client would seek to be in a position to submit a planning application for development by summer 2018.				
RDC Comment				
The favourable performance of site 252 through the site assessment process is noted. Despite being a group 4 Site, the Council is committed to ensuring				

that for the Service Village Tier, allocations reflect the need to as equitably as possible distribute the housing requirement, subject to suitable sites and existing commitments. This results in a very modest 'over provision' of 58 units across the service village tier. Nawton has experienced a level of development (in excess of 30 dwellings) which is commensurate with its status in the Local Plan Strategy as a Service Village. This has been provided through the release of land in advance of the Sites Document and to support affordable housing delivery and housing land supply.

The Council consider that the presence of a developer is not necessary to identify a site as deliverable. The Helmsley Plan was adopted in 2015 as a separate Development Plan Document. Planning permission is currently being sought for one of the sites and it is anticipated that if approved, an application to develop the second site will follow. The Gladman Sites have planning permission.

The Plan builds in additional flexibility in terms of housing land supply and the Council do not believe that further sites need to be identified to meet housing requirements for the plan period. It should be noted that Policy SP2 of the Local Plan Strategy provides a framework for the release of further sites should commitments fail to come forward and if this is required to ensure a deliverable five year land supply. As part of the annual update to the SHLAA, Gladman has confirmed that the sites which it has an interest in, remain deliverable.

Policy: SD2 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Persimmon Homes	No		No	
Comment				
The plan is therefore not sufficiently justified because it does not present the most appropriate allocations strategy to best meet the needs of the town of Pickering, and the plan therefore fails a test of soundness. The Council discounted an alternative site located south of Firthland Road and west of Greenlands Road (referenced Site 205/387). The site complies with the criteria that the Council have outlined for site releases in the town. It is in an area at low risk of flooding, the scale of the site is such that it will retain the compact and accessible market town feel, and the site does not affect views across the town and into the North York Moors National Park. The site is enveloped by existing development to the north, south and east and would not extend Pickering further west towards Middleton, therefore avoiding coalescence. The site is also not located in a position where it would result in the encroachment of the town along Malton Road. The last criterion regards the preservation of surrounding historic strip field patterns. The site features a strip field pattern though these have been altered over the years and therefore their significance has declined as a result of this. The strip field pattern in the location of this proposed development has not been identified for designation as a VIUA. Site 205/387 should be selected for allocation because it accords with the objectives and policies of the RP-LPS. The site will provide the opportunity to bring additional benefits to the town of Pickering. Land in the north west of the site has been reserved for a primary school to meet future educational needs in the town. Furthermore, the site is deliverable and will make a significant contribution to providing affordable homes, and a legal agreement is in place with a Registered Provider allowing them to acquire and manage affordable homes on the site. This demonstrates a clear commitment to delivery. The proposal will also over-provide publicly accessible open space and provide an area for ecological enhancement.				
RDC Comment				
The Council has chosen the sites which it considers best reflect the objectives and requirements of the Ryedale Plan Local Plan Strategy and which are considered to be the more sustainable combination of sites to meet needs. The LPS provides a framework for the selection of sites. The Council has always been clear that there have been more sites put forward for development in the locations supported by the LPS than will be needed and a choice needs to be				

made. The rationale for the proposed sites is set out in a suite of evidence, together with reasons why other sites have not been chosen at this time.

Site 205/387 was consulted on as an option choice in 2015 . At that time, it was considered that land for a new primary school would be required in Pickering and that this could be secured from this site. It was primarily for that reason that the site was selected as an option , despite the fact that the land forms part of the historic medieval strip field system which the Council would look to avoid developing as part of the application of the Site Selection Methodology. If the site is allocated along with the proposed site allocations at Pickering, the evidence demonstrates that this will have an adverse effect on the Vivis Lane junction and it will trigger a need for a new primary school. Whilst land for a school is being promoted by the developer, the Council and NYCC are not confident that there will be sufficient resources to fund the building of a new school. The priority for this is at the Principal Town.

Policy: SD2 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo The Brewis Family/Halifax Estate	No		No	Yes
Comment				
Policy SD2 - Objection - The non-identification of sites 655 and 184 as potential employment or housing sites to meet need within the plan period (either as a comprehensive redevelopment or on a phased basis) within SD2; Policy SD2 - Objection – Lack of recognition of the immediate development credentials of site 184D and 655B (part thereof);				
RDC Comment				
This is a confused representation. SD2 is concerned with housing land, not employment land which is under SD12. The Council is keen to ensure that the land use position is clear regarding the proposed allocations. To identify a mixed approach would leave uncertainties in the land supply. Had the Council been considering a strategic site, such as the a larger area of land as submitted under 655 this would specifically identify such uses as part of the comprehensive development of the site. Re. 184 D and 655b these components of larger sites would still have form and character issues with their development, and the Council has identified the sites it considers best meet the residual requirements .				

Policy: SD2 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
T M Barker and Son				
Comment				
Disappointed that my land has been taken of the land put forward for building schedule. I disagree with your view this development would be detrimental to landscape and visual image of area, it is the natural progression of the village should any houses need to be built in Beadlam in the future. In view of successive Government's building policies for more affordable houses to be available in rural areas I would ask that my site be retained or at the least				

included in any future village plan.
RDC Comment
It is not clear from the response which sites are being referred to, but our records show sites 147 and 267 were submitted by TM Barker and Son. Nawton and Beadlam are considered together for the purposes of designation as a Service Village, aside from the form and character and landscape sensitivities identified through the Site Selection Methodology, Nawton has seen 36 dwellings completed within the Plan Period.

Policy: SD2 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Scaling and Falkingham	No	Justified		
Comment				
Site 666 (Land south of Swineherd Lane, Kirkbymoorside) should be allocated for residential development in preference to the allocation of site 201 and 265. Site 666 can be delivered in conjunction with the proposed allocation to the south of Swineherd Lane (Site 156).				
Sites 156 and 666 would be in accordance with SP1 of the Local Plan Strategy and are well located to the town. They are deliverable and will provide significant social and economic benefits without significant detriment to the environmental quality of the area.				
The delivery of the Gladman site at Kirkbymoorside might be questionable. Therefore it is essential that the net requirement of 61 is considered as a minimum only. The comprehensive development of sites 156 and 666 could deliver a sustainable development of circa 70-75 dwellings.				
RDC Comment				
Site 666 does extend beyond the sports field, making it, as an incursion into the AHLV and Strip Field system, more visually prominent than site 156 alone. Site 156 is a Group 2 site, acknowledging that the ability to read the field boundaries will be affected, with the addition of site 666 the field boundary between the sites would be rendered 'illegible'. Site 156 was chosen because of the good connectivity to the Town Centre. The Gladman site is subject to a Reserved Matters Application.				

Policy: SD2 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Scaling and Falkingham	No	Effective		
Comment				
Site 666 (Land south of Swineherd Lane, Kirkbymoorside) should be allocated for residential development in preference to the allocation of site 201 and 265. Site 666 can be delivered in conjunction with the proposed allocation to the south of Swineherd Lane (Site 156).				
Sites 156 and 666 would be in accordance with SP1 of the Local Plan Strategy and are well located to the town. They are deliverable and will provide				

significant social and economic benefits without significant detriment to the environmental quality of the area.
The delivery of the Gladman site at Kirkbymoorside might be questionable. Therefore it is essential that the net requirement of 61 is considered as a minimum only. The comprehensive development of sites 156 and 666 could deliver a sustainable development of circa 70-75 dwellings.
RDC Comment
Site 666 does extend beyond the sports field, making it, as an incursion into the AHLV and Strip Field system, more visually prominent than site 156 alone. Site 156 is a Group 2 site, acknowledging that the ability to read the field boundaries will be affected, with the addition of site 666 the field boundary between the sites would be rendered 'illegible'. Site 156 was chosen because of the good connectivity to the Town Centre. The Gladman site is subject to a Reserved Matters Application.

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
I Conlan				
Comment				
Climate Change, Wildlife Diversity and Food Security are the top priorities. Therefore any use of Greenfield Sites that are otherwise productive and/or good wildlife habitats should be protected.				
RDC Comment				
Those aspects are recognised as being integral to the delivery of sustainable development, which needs to also consider that the delivery of homes and employment opportunities is part of delivering sustainable development. The allocations have sought to reduce the need to travel, be sited on areas of least flood risk, provide biodiversity enhancement. The consideration of land allocations is balancing the need to bring forward sustainable housing and employment land a minimising the loss of Best and Most Versatile Land. Agricultural land practices outside of scope of the planning system.				

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
A Purser	No	Justified		
Comment				
Site 156 should be removed from the plan. The development of site 156 would result in coalescence with Keldholme which contravenes objectives of the plan. It would also result in the loss of dog walking amenity land at a Town with deficiencies in Market Town amenity space. The site is also part of a medieval field system; is a VIUA and is within an Area of High Landscape Value which should mean that it is not suitable for development.				
The site is graded as a Group 2 site but another site (ref 431) which was grouped in Group 3 was not taken forward.				

RDC Comment

Site 156 was chosen as a proposed allocation for a range of reasons. The loss of the site from the strip field system is acknowledged as the reason for a Group 2 status. However, account was taken of the fact that the field boundary is retained, the site does not extend beyond the sports field, therefore is not resulting in visual/physical coalescence. The relationship to Kirkbymoorside's built form was also taken into account, and it was considered that this, combined with the sustainable location of the site, as it is well located to the town centre, meant that it was considered on balance acceptable to be identified as an allocation. The Area of High Landscape Value and VIUA designations, and the impact on those designations was considered, and it was concluded that development of this site would not materially undermine the residual areas of land which are subject to those landscape designations. The Public Rights of Way will remain in place and provide access to the fields beyond. 431 is a large site, of which the southern half would have been particularly prominent. The Council also received no subsequent information about that site's capability of being developed.

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Amotherby Parish Council	No	Justified	Yes	Yes
Comment				
<p>The designation of Amotherby as a Service Village should be reassessed. This is due to the loss of a service (shop) originally deemed to be significant. The overprovision of housing in the Service Villages by 58 dwellings calls into question the need for any substantial development in Amotherby at all. The proposed allocation is not small scale and the proposed number of dwellings is excessive for Amotherby, inconsistent with definition in the Local Plan Strategy and is therefore unsound.</p> <p>If found sound, the number of dwellings on the site should be reduced to a number that complies with the definition of small scale.</p>				
RDC Comment				
<p>Amotherby is identified as a Service Village in the development plan (Local Plan Strategy).The presence of a shop was one factor that supported its status in the settlement hierarchy. Despite the District Council regularly monitoring village service provision, the closure of the shop was not something that the District Council was aware of as it published the plan. The Local Plan Strategy makes it clear that the level of provision of services at the service villages will be taken into account as the sites document is prepared to reflect any change in circumstances. In this respect, there would not be a policy requirement to allocate land at Amotherby. The District Council is of the view that the proposed site is, in all other respects, a suitable site for housing development which provides the unique opportunity to secure benefits for the village and the school.</p> <p>The Local Plan Strategy makes it clear that the size of sites (para 4.18) is indicative.</p> <p>The Ryedale Plan aims to distribute development across the serviced village tier. Amotherby has had no recent development of any meaningful scale and no development which has supported the delivery of affordable housing in recent times. The 'overprovision' of housing at the service village tier is not at a scale which is considered to undermine the Local Plan Strategy. It reflects a positive approach to the granting of planning permissions at these settlements to address housing requirements.</p>				

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Amotherby Parish Council				
Comment				
If the Planning Authority persists with the designation of Amotherby as a Service Village and the proposed allocation (site 148) cannot be modified to make it sound and to meet requirements of the Local Plan Strategy, the Parish Council would favour the development of site 635.				
This would provide a more realistic number of dwellings (20), have less impact on the character of the village and with greater certainty that the development will come forward.				
RDC Comment				
The Local Planning Authority is of the view that the proposed site is a more appropriate development site for the village for a range of reasons. The Parish Council will be aware that a planning application to develop site 635 was recently refused by the Local Planning Authority.				

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
C D Wilson				
Comment				
Object to the development of site 347 (Whitby Road, Pickering) for the following reasons:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none">-potential for flooding-Loss of trees and hedgerows-density will contribute to flooding-Loss of privacy-Dangerous siting of access road, road safety and congestion-insufficient infrastructure (schools, Doctors, Dentists)				
RDC Comment				
The proposed allocation identifies the principle of development, and key parameters concerning site specific matters. The response is made in relation to a submitted planning application on the site. The Highway Authority have advised that the access is acceptable in principle. Matters around residential				

amenity, surface water management are important and will need to be satisfactorily addressed. The Local Education Authority has identified no provision issues for the proposed allocations. The Doctors Surgeries and CCGs have been made aware over a number of years of the housing delivery across the District, prior to the adoption of the Local Plan Strategy, and during the production of the Local Plan Sites Document.

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
D and A Bales	No			
Comment				
Object to the proposed allocation at Whitby Road, Pickering. Concerns relate to:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access and highway safety - Density of development which is not in keeping with the area - Potential for flooding - Loss of trees and hedges - Unclear why the site is now considered to be suitable for development when previously it was considered unsuitable 				
RDC Comment				
The proposed allocation identifies the principle of development, and key parameters concerning site specific matters. It (as an allocation) represents the progression of planning policy since the 2002 Ryedale Local Plan. Allocations are made in response to the adopted Development Plan (Local Plan Strategy) and a required to deliver the housing requirement. The site was identified in the 2015 Sites Consultation as an Option Choice, and has performed well through the site assessment process. The response is made in relation to a submitted planning application on the site. The Highway Authority have advised that the access is acceptable in principle. Matters around density, residential amenity, surface water management are important and will need to be satisfactorily addressed.				

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
E Hazelwood Bell	No			
Comment				
Object to the proposed development of site 347 (Whitby Road, Pickering). Concerns relate to:				
-highway safety and congestion with increased pollution and fumes				

-layout and density which is not in keeping with a semi-rural area
-loss of trees and impact on nature conservation
-loss of light, privacy and outlook to the detriment of the residential amenity of neighbours
-flood risk , in particular at the southern boundary and the potential for increased risk of flooding on adjacent/nearby lower ground

RDC Comment

The proposed allocation identifies the principle of development, and key parameters concerning site specific matters. Allocations are made in response to the adopted Development Plan (Local Plan Strategy) and a required to deliver the housing requirement. The site was identified in the 2015 Sites Consultation as an Option Choice, and has performed well through the site assessment process. The response is made in relation to a submitted planning application on the site. The Highway Authority have advised that the access is acceptable in principle. Matters around density, residential amenity, surface water management, and the impacts on protected trees are important and will need to be satisfactorily addressed.

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Gladman				
Comment				
Sets out national tests of soundness. Refers to the Housing White Paper of 2017 and Autumn Budget regarding Government's commitment to the delivery of housing. Gladman consider that it is appropriate that development is focussed upon the main settlement of Malton and Norton, as these represent the most sustainable locations for growth. However, the Council should recognise that directing further growth to Ryedale's smaller settlements will result in a number of benefits for their ongoing vibrancy.				
RDC Comment				
The Local Planning Authority is responsive to the tests of soundness. It is also acutely aware of the emphasis placed on the delivery of new housing, in the right locations, to meet needs within our District. Ryedale District Local Planning Authority has a post NPPF adopted Development Plan in which the objectively assessed housing need is being met as confirmed in the 2016 SHMA. Local Planning Authority has applied the principles of the established Development Plan, and released land for housing in advance of the allocations resulting in a robust, trajectorised land supply which is well in excess of 5 years. The Local Plan Sites Document reflects the Local Plan Strategy, and creates opportunities for housing in the smaller settlements.				

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
I Conlan				

Comment	
Any green space used not be offset with more growing crops elsewhere. Recovering brownfield sites for agriculture and wildlife diversification projects	
RDC Comment	
Accepting that brownfield sites can have a biodiversity value, the 'use' of land for wildlife projects would not necessarily require planning permission. The development principles in the Local Plan Sites Document outline site-specific green infrastructure/recreational/biodiversity enhancement; with the requirements of SP11, SP14, SP15 ensuring that on-site open space is delivered to meet a range of requirements. Agricultural activity on the land is not a planning consideration.	

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
M France	No			
Comment				
Find it intriguing that the 40+sites identified for residential development at Pickering has suddenly reduced to 2 housing land allocations at the Town.				
RDC Comment				
The large number of site submissions is a reflection of landowner interest. The Local Planning Authority received 667 sites for consideration for allocation for a range of uses, Pickering, being a major town in the District received a number of those. The Development Plan production process assesses and refines down the wide range of site submissions to those which best met the objectives of the Local Plan Strategy, and perform the best through the Sustainability Appraisal process. This process also took account of existing permissions, and this has resulted in only two sites needing to be allocated at Pickering.				

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
M France				
Comment				
Baffled by the fact that site 347 (Whitby Road, Pickering) has been elevated to that of land being ripe for development when previously it has been deemed unsuitable.				
RDC Comment				
Site 347 was identified in 2015 as an option choice with four other sites. Therefore the site has not experienced a rapid change of position in its consideration for allocation. New allocations are made to meet future plan requirements in the emerging plan. On that basis, these are on land which				

hitherto had not been identified for development. The Local Plan Strategy is the adopted development plan- an it provides a steer which the Local Plan Sites Document has reflected.

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
M France				
Comment				
In theory the Council has granted sufficient permissions to satisfy the requirements of the Local Plan Strategy for the next 5 years and the strategy does state that the plan does not rely on strategic sites. (comment made in context of concerns over why the Whitby Road site at Pickering has been allocated).				
RDC Comment				
The Local Planning Authority needs to ensure there is sufficient land either through permissions or allocations to, as minimum, meet the Plan Period of which 9 years remain. Strategic Sites are sites which are of a scale/approach which is essential to the delivery of the strategy, and their failure to come forward would result in the failure to deliver the Plan. No such sites have been proposed in the allocations document- as by their definition and purpose they would be set out in the Local Plan Strategy. The Council has also built into the allocations and commitment a 20% land supply buffer.				

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Malton Town Council	No			
Comment				
No further development should be given permission in Malton until satisfactory 'complimentary' measures are in place.				
RDC Comment				
The complementary measures are being undertaken by the County Council in their capacity as the Highway Authority. The District Council has undertaken transport modelling work and Air Quality Impact Assessment to assess the impact of different scenarios of development on the highway network to ensure that junction capacity is optimised and that air quality is not adversely effected. The proposed allocations in conjunction with existing commitments can be acceptably accommodated and the link road which is necessary to accommodate the traffic from the proposed Norton site (SD3) will also have advantages for the wider movement of traffic. This is in conjunction with highway improvements that have been completed or which are underway or which will be delivered in the future. These include the full grade separation at Brambling Fields (additional slip road); changes to the Pasture Lane/Wheelgate junction; the change in priority at the level crossing between Church Street and Welham Road; an HCV restriction; the Hugden Way/Beverley Road link; signal optimisation where feasible, together with cycle and pedestrian improvements.				
The Highway Authority has resolved not to take forward two of the 'complementary' measures which were originally thought to be necessary to encourage				

traffic to use the A64 Brambling Fields junction - The removal of the right hand turn lane at Castlegate and the one way restriction on Norton Road/Railway Street. It is understood that this is for air quality reasons.

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Network Rail				
Comment				
The emerging sites document proposes to locate employment and housing opportunities in the market towns in particular within Malton which is served by the only train station within the Ryedale Council area (and thus provides more opportunities to use public transport than the remainder of the district).				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Network Rail				
Comment				
Malton Level Crossing is the most significant level crossing within Ryedale. Malton is a manually controlled (full) barrier crossing, operated by the Signaller located in the adjacent signal box. At present there are no plans to change the operation of the crossing control until at least 2030. In the meantime, concerns have been raised locally regarding traffic congestion and air pollution caused, in part, by the level crossing barrier down times; having timed these several times each year since 2013, the level crossings manager suggests level crossing barrier down time plays a very minor part (the barriers are typically raised for 55 minutes in each hour) in what is an already heavily-trafficked area, with adjoining road junctions on both sides of the crossing. In conjunction with future plans to enhance rail services on the York-Malton-Scarborough line (longer trains and new hourly service). Network Rail is part of a working group alongside North Yorkshire County Council, Ryedale District Council, TPE, Northern and community stakeholders with the aims of easing traffic congestion, reducing air pollution and enabling growth in the Malton and Norton area. The Local Plan will obviously form part of the work of this group, with particular study on the road network, pedestrian and traffic flows. The proposed allocations are likely to increase the use of Malton level crossing this should be acknowledged within the sites allocation document and emphasis placed on the need to reduce travel by car to town centre facilities.				
RDC Comment				
Noted. The plan as a whole, including the Local Plan Strategy and suite of evidence acknowledges that there will be an increase in traffic associated with growth. The need to improve cycling and pedestrian facilities is recognised in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and this will be supplemented with further congestion alleviation measures. RDC and NYCC are have commissioned work to identify such measures following confirmation of the increased rail services.				

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Church Commissioners for England				
Comment				
Local Plan Sites Document should identify sites beyond 2027, based this on up to date housing requirements and needs of rural areas within the district. This would indicate appropriate housing development in sustainable rural locations to allow for the continued viability of these settlements. This is something echoed within the aforementioned Housing White Paper (which suggests identifying small and medium sites for such purposes) and paragraph 55 of the NPPF.				
RDC Comment				
The Local Plan Sites Document, in order to be legally compliant, needs to be in conformity with the Local Plan Strategy, on which it is based. To extend the life of the Local Plan Sites Document on that basis would be unsound. The Spatial Strategy and resulting Settlement Hierarchy is post NPPF, and pairing of villages took place to identify Service Villages where allocations could be identified. The allocations reflects this. The Council has a SHMA of 2016 which identified Local Plan Strategy housing requirement of 200 homes was still appropriate and there is still the capability to bring forward housing to meet the needs of rural areas such as Exception Site Housing and Enabling Development, and dwellings subject to the Local Needs Occupancy.				

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Church Commissioners for England	No			
Comment				
Local Plan Sites Document should allow alterations to Development Limits within Villages to accommodate growth.				
RDC Comment				
The Development Limits are part of the adopted Development Plan and operate with SP1 and SP2 as a policy tool to implement the spatial strategy and ensure that housing allocations are delivered in the larger, more sustainable locations. With Exception Sites and Enabling Development scenarios being capable of being brought forward. If the Local Planning Authority proposed to allow alterations to Development Limits as a principle at the Other Villages, this would totally undermine the spatial approach as set out in the adopted Local Plan Strategy.				

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
-------------	--------	-----------------	------------------	-------------------

obo D Hume				
Comment				
Despite the planned supply of housing at the Service Villages being exceeded, a supply of housing from small infill sites of lower impact , like site 365, should be maintained. The site individually or in conjunction with other sites, will help to maintain a healthy housing supply.				
RDC Comment				

Infill sites (which meet the definition set out in SP2) can still come forward within the provisions of the adopted Development Plan. Site 635 is not an infill site as it is outside Development Limits. Site 635 has been ruled out due to the risks to a private water supply bore hole which serves a food manufacturing enterprise, the Environment Agency has been clear about the very high potential for contamination of the aquifer. The response is confused, in so far as it acknowledges that there is some over provision in the tier, but then suggests sites like 635 should come forward, when it is not within Development Limits, and is not an infill site. Such proposals would be contrary to the overall spatial approach which seeks to ascribe some of the housing supply to the Service Village Tier.

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo David Wilson Homes	Yes			
Comment				
Support the allocation of the Whitby Road site. Whilst the site is the subject of a planning application, DWH consider it prudent to continue to promote the site as an allocation.				
The site represents a deliverable residential development site in a sustainable and accessible location. It will deliver substantial economic and social benefits (including CIL; indirect and direct spending in the local economy; open space and affordable housing) and it will make an important contribution to Ryedale's housing requirements. The development of the site would comply with the Local Plan Strategy and the NPPF. The site is deliverable. It is suitable for housing and there are no technical constraints which would preclude its development. The site is available and there are no legal or ownership constraints to its development. The development of the site is achievable and 35 dph are anticipated.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo E Humble	Yes		Yes	Yes

Comment
Support the allocation of site 201 in Kirkbymoorside and the principles set out in the plan.
RDC Comment
Noted.

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Fitzwilliam Malton Estate				
Comment				
Supporting paragraphs (1.2,1.3 and 2.2) emphasise the need to allocate sites to meet needs. However the document or supporting evidence do not set out information which is required to demonstrate that delivery can and will take place. In the absence of this certainty the requirements that the Draft Plan itself sets out cannot be guaranteed. Evidence is required to demonstrate that delivery can be achieved.				
RDC Comment				
The Local Planning Authority has, in the case of SD3, received headline viability information around the costs of the site's delivery, which the developers considered they would be plan-compliant, and this was independently appraised. The Independent Appraisal concluded that given the costs of the road, affordable housing provision may not quite meet plan- requirements, but the road is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms combined with the land for the school (as a new school would be required in Norton) and will deliver wider benefits for general traffic circulation. Other developers have confirmed in their representations that they can deliver a plan-compliant development in light of the CIL Charge, and they do not have the same infrastructure requirements. No viability evidence was provided concerning the FME sites as part of the Development Plan production.				

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Fitzwilliam Malton Estate				
Comment				
The proposed allocations (notably the site subject of SD 3) are not sound (as set out in separate submissions) and alternative should be included. Additional sites need to be referenced and tested to allow full comparative assessment and to ensure that the requirements of the Local Plan Strategy can be delivered in the plan period.				
RDC Comment				
The process for testing sites and referencing them is evidenced in all the Sustainability Appraisal, Site Selection Methodologies, background papers, and				

technical evidence through the transport modelling work and the air quality impact assessment, it is not the role of the plan to explain the chosen allocations, but that of the supporting documents. The 2015 Sites Consultation outlined the site options and choices which the Council were considering, and as a result of that consultation, in conjunction with the above-referenced material it made informed judgements on the suitability of sites to meet the plan requirements, and based on the evidence provided to the Council regarding alternative sites, this has confirmed that SD3 and the other proposed allocations are the most appropriate sites to deliver the plan requirements.

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Langton Estate	No			
Comment				
Fails to acknowledge the Development Potential of smaller villages, such as Langton, fails to propose development limits that are consistent with what on the ground and reflects development potential. No allocation of any land in smaller villages such as Langton is not positively prepared, and is inconsistent with the para 55 of the NPPF. Such an approach is not justified as sites are available. Policy SP2 advises that infill development is acceptable in the other villages. We therefore object to draft Policy SD2, which does not allocate any sites for residential development in the smaller villages.				
RDC Comment				
The proposed expansion of the Development Limits, as suggested, would amount to incremental allocations contrary to the adopted Spatial Approach and Settlement Hierarchy in the Adopted Local Plan Strategy. The settlement Hierarchy was adopted post NPPF, and was identified as being consistent with Paragraph 55 of the NPPF. The plan provides opportunities to meet local needs and enabling development, with small scale infill for local needs. These sites identified have been submitted at Publication Stage. Policy SP2 works in conjunction with SP1, in order for infill (prescribed definition) to be identified as being within other villages because it is within Development Limits and not 'wider open countryside'. Therefore the absence of allocations in the other villages is in accordance with Policies SP1 and SP2.				

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Local Residents	No			
Comment				
Concerns over the allocation of land at Whitby Road, Pickering and the degree of dependence on large site allocations such as this represents a risk to the fulfilment of the housing strategy.				
RDC Comment				
The proposed allocation, at c 200 dwellings, would be a large site, but it is not a strategic site, as it is one of a number of sites identified as either completions, commitments and allocations which make up the total housing land supply to deliver the Local Plan Strategy's housing requirement, with a				

robust land supply buffer. The Council has a suite of evidence which demonstrates that there are no constraints on the site in principle, which would render the site undevelopable or undeliverable.

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Local Residents				
Comment				
Concerned/object to the allocation of the Whitby Road site at Pickering. The application of the Site Selection Methodology has not been shown to be sufficiently rigorous to justify this scale of allocation at this site. It is yet to be demonstrated that the site is capable of being delivered at the scale proposed whilst complying with the Local Plan Strategy and development principles. There are fundamental issues which should be explored before the allocation is confirmed. These include risk of flooding, highway safety and congestion and the development principles are less than adequate for an allocation of this significance.				
RDC Comment				
The Development Principles are site-specific matters which are to then supplemented by the submission of the standard requirements such as Transport Assessments and Travel Plans. The Site Selection Methodology has been compiled with evidence derived from specialist organisations, including the Highway Authority, the Environment Agency, Yorkshire Water. The evidence base does not go into the level of detail required for a planning application, but provides proportionate detail to establish the principle, and to outline any matters which will need specific consideration- and to demonstrate that there are no constraints which would render the site undevelopable or undeliverable.				

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Maw Family				
Comment				
We reserve the right and opportunity to comment further in the light of evolving circumstances also associated with the progression of the committed housing site owned by Gladman Developments and how actual delivery of that site may progress (or not). This is an evolving context and the plan should appropriately reflect the need for flexibility and the positive benefits derived from development on our clients' land in delivering key objectives of the local authority.				
RDC Comment				
The identification of Westfields, a site which is 75% of the Plan requirement to Kirkbymoorside is an extant permission and is subject to a reserved matters application.				

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate				
obo W&W Estates								
Comment	<p>Support the proposed allocation of land south of Swineherd Lane for residential development. The site can deliver a comprehensive development of market and affordable housing and other socio-economic benefits in a sustainable and suitable location. There are no technical or environmental constraints that would preclude the development of the site. The site is deliverable (suitable, available and achievable) and is a logical extension to the Town. Development proposals for the site will deliver each of the development principles for the site.</p>							
RDC Comment								
<p>Noted. The Council has proposed the allocation of the site for a number of reasons. It is well located to the Town Centre and the size of the site (and others proposed at Kirkbymoorside) provide a combination/range of sites of different sizes at the Town. The development of the site will result in a limited incursion into historic strip fields and the Area of High Landscape Value and VIUA but this is balanced against accessibility of the site, its relationship to existing development and the spatial principles for growing the town which are included in the Local Plan Strategy and is mitigated by the limited extent of the proposed allocation.</p>								

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate				
obo W&W Estates								
Comment	<p>A larger development option at land south of Swineherd Lane should be considered preferable to both of the proposed land allocations SD8 and SD9 or allocated in addition to them given that it can be considered a more sustainable and deliverable site than both of the proposed allocations. A comprehensive development in one single location will bring greater socio-economic benefits and will reduce the impact on the character of the Town and the wider landscape setting. There is direct developer interest in this option. It is not known whether there is developer interest in sites SD8 and SD9 which could be a delay to delivery or a reflection of a lack of developer interest.</p>							
RDC Comment								
<p>The Council would resist a larger development option in this location. The Council is confident that the other proposed sites in Kirkbymoorside are deliverable/ developable.</p>								

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
S Dick	No			
Comment				
Object to the proposed development of site 347 (Whitby Road, Pickering) and have the following concerns:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there is a high risk of surface water flooding at the southern boundary of the site - highway safety and traffic congestion on the A169 causing pollution - loss of protected trees - reduction in light and privacy for neighbouring residents - layout and density is out of keeping with a historic market town and the density will result in traffic and parking problems - infrastructure of the town (.g. schools, doctors, dentists) cannot cope with additional people 				
RDC Comment				
<p>The proposed allocation identifies the principle of development, and key parameters concerning site specific matters. Allocations are made in response to the adopted Development Plan (Local Plan Strategy) and a required to deliver the housing requirement. The site was identified in the 2015 Sites Consultation as an Option Choice, and has performed well through the site assessment process. The response is made in relation to a submitted planning application on the site. The Highway Authority have advised that the access is acceptable in principle. Matters around density, residential amenity, surface water management, and the impacts on protected trees are important and will need to be satisfactorily addressed. The Council has discussed the proposals with infrastructure providers, and this has raised no objections in principle. The Council have had discussions with health care providers regarding the sites.</p>				

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust				
Comment				
<p>The Trust is however concerned that the policies in the full plan for no net loss of biodiversity and net gain of biodiversity as a result of development in Ryedale will mean that land may be required to mitigate or compensate for loss of habitat within development sites. There may be a need for an assessment of whether additional land will be required to ensure biodiversity is protected. For the larger sites a draft masterplan may be required to ensure that there will be sufficient open space or compensation habitat.</p>				
RDC Comment				
<p>The sites identified for allocation have limited biodiversity, most being cropped farmland. Were there any particular sensitivities, these will be addressed through the planning application process, as matters regarding conservation of habitats and species, in terms of establishing mitigation/compensatory</p>				

habitats cannot be undertaken by condition. The larger sites have indicative masterplans, which have identified green infrastructure elements to enhance biodiversity. It is not expected that site's extents will be enlarged for habitat compensation/mitigation as they will be expected to ensure that these are integrated into the site.

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Highways England	No	Justified		
Comment				
The cumulative impacts of allocated sites in SD2, SD12 and SD15 should be assessed in terms of their impact on the SRN. The 2016 Jacobs work only considered impact on the local network.				
RDC Comment				
Sites allocated in SD2 and SD12 represent a contribution to the quanta of Development which the Highways England endorsed as part of the Strategic Plan, the Local Plan Strategy. These sites (and the completions and commitments) do not exceed those tolerances.				
SD15 is designed to support in principle, further development within these sites. At present there are no specific proposals which can be quantified in terms of their impact on the SRN. This would be something that would need to be undertaken if and when subsequent planning applications are received.				
Work undertaken by Jacobs in response to Highways England comments has demonstrated that the operation of the three A64 junctions is well within operating capacity with planned growth/proposed allocations.				

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Historic England	No	Justified		
Comment				
Several of the sites lie within an extensive archaeological landscape which stretches along the Vale of Pickering. There is a high probability that the area will contain archaeological remains, many of which are likely to be of national significance. The NPPF makes it clear that the status of non-designated archaeological remains of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments should be considered as if they were a designated asset. SP12 of the Local Plan Strategy recognises the importance of this archaeological landscape.				
The reasons why it is considered appropriate to allocate sites which will result in the loss of nationally important archaeology in conflict with the Local Plan Strategy and national policy will need to be justified. It is suggested that this could be based upon the approach set out in para 2.32 of the adopted Scarborough Local Plan.				
RDC Comment				

The plan has identified sites for development which is in accordance with the spatial strategy established in the adopted Local Plan Strategy. The spatial strategy was fully justified as part of that process and in the knowledge of the significance of the Vale Of Pickering.

In considering sites, the Council has sought the advice of the County Council's Heritage Unit at an early stage on all the sites subjected to the Site Selection Methodology, who advised on the likelihood of archaeological remains based on the HER. A number of sites which have become allocations have also undertaken archaeological evaluation, including trial trenching at some sites, which has been considered by the County Heritage Unit. The allocation of the sites proposed and broad location for employment have been made on the basis that they represent sustainably located sites. Policy SP12 of the Local Plan Strategy will be applied when planning applications are prepared and will be used to minimise loss of important archaeology.

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Councillor P Andrews	No	Justified		
Comment				
All extant planning permissions should be taken into account in assessing land allocation requirements. It is understood that sites granted on appeal (Langton Road) have not been included in the calculations. The figures should be revised to reflect this.				
RDC Comment				
The Council is confident that the approach of the identification of deliverable commitments and proposed allocations, in combination with the identified land supply buffer and the operation of the 'zone of tolerance' is a positive, and responsive approach to ensuring the Local Plan Strategy housing requirements are delivered. Langton Road has been included in the land supply calculations. The ATS site has not been included in the land supply calculations as the landowner has confirmed that the current permission is not viable.				

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
Given the progress with the Joint Plan it is considered that there are emerging policies that are relevant to the consideration of some of the proposed Ryedale allocation sites as they proceed through the Local Plan process. In particular these include: Policy S01 Safeguarding mineral resources; Policy S02 Developments proposed within Minerals Safeguarding Areas; and Policy S06 Consideration of applications in Consultation Areas, as well also the text regarding safeguarding exemption criteria. However, there are currently representations with regard to these Policies that are at present unresolved. With regard to the exemption criteria set out in paragraph 8.47 of the Joint Plan, the 12th bullet point refers to 'applications for development on land which is already allocated in an				

adopted plan where the plan took account of minerals and waste safeguarding requirements'. There is a revision to this bullet proposed, but doesn't change the essence of the Policy. If the District Council can add to the development requirements of a proposed site allocation text regarding safeguarding then that could lead to a position that a future planning application for the development of that allocation falls within the exemption criteria as it 'took account of ... safeguarding requirements'.

RDC Comment

The Site Selection Methodology identified sites where a minerals safeguarding designation was in place. It also recognised that some sites, being adjacent to existing residential development would not be suitable to provide a mineral extraction resource. The Council has taken the emerging safeguarding policy into account in identifying land allocations in line with the Local Plan Strategy and in balancing a range of sustainability considerations. The plan process itself has taken these issues into account and on that basis, the text of the plan does not need to make explicit reference to this matter.

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
I B Corfe	Yes		Yes	Yes
Comment				
Support the decision not to allocate site 387/305 at Firthland Road, Pickering. Concerned about the very large quantity of traffic that would be generated trying to use the present completely inadequate access into and out of this part of the Town . It would be unsustainable with the present road layout. Also concerned about advertising material that Persimmon have produced which contains inaccurate information about facilities at the Town				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Scaling and Falkingham	Yes	Justified		
Comment				
Advocate the inclusion of site 156 in the plan.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Scaling and Falkingham	No	National Policy		
Comment				
The development of site 156 along with site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more appropriate and comprehensive alternative to the allocation of sites 201 and 265.				
Sites 201 and 265 are not considered to be as deliverable as site 666 particularly given the infrastructure works required to facilitate the development of site 201 and remediation and limited potential yield associated with site 265.				
The development of site 156 and our clients site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more sustainable option than sites 201 and 265 particularly given the peripheral locations of the two other sites away from the Town Centre.				
RDC Comment				
Site 265 is subject of a planning application, and is only 70 metres further east than site 666, it is a Brownfield site. Site 201 is closest of the option choices to the north and is still within walking distance of the town. Site 201 is a modest greenfield site, with residential development adjacent to it. Site 156, a Group 2 site based on the strip field system, was also included due to its good connectivity to the town centre. It is no more requiring of infrastructure works than site 666, and is on a flatter area of land. The Proposed allocations provide opportunities for a range of house-builders.				

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Scaling and Falkingham	No	Justified		
Comment				
The development of site 156 along with site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more appropriate and comprehensive alternative to the allocation of sites 201 and 265.				
Sites 201 and 265 are not considered to be as deliverable as site 666 particularly given the infrastructure works required to facilitate the development of site 201 and remediation and limited potential yield associated with site 265.				
The development of site 156 and our clients site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more sustainable option than sites 201 and 265 particularly given the peripheral locations of the two other sites away from the Town Centre.				
RDC Comment				
Site 265 is subject of a planning application, and is only 70 metres further east than site 666, it is a Brownfield site. Site 201 is closest of the option choices to the north and is still within walking distance of the town. Site 201 is a modest greenfield site, with residential development adjacent to it. Site 156, a Group 2 site based on the strip field system, was also included due to its good connectivity to the town centre. It is no more requiring of infrastructure works than site 666, and is on a flatter area of land. The Proposed allocations provide opportunities for a range of house-builders.				

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Scaling and Falkingham	No	Effective		
Comment				
The development of site 156 along with site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more appropriate and comprehensive alternative to the allocation of sites 201 and 265.				
Sites 201 and 265 are not considered to be as deliverable as site 666 particularly given the infrastructure works required to facilitate the development of site 201 and remediation and limited potential yield associated with site 265.				
The development of site 156 and our clients site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more sustainable option than sites 201 and 265 particularly given the peripheral locations of the two other sites away from the Town Centre.				
RDC Comment				
Site 265 is subject of a planning application, and is only 70 metres further east than site 666, it is a Brownfield site. Site 201 is closest of the option choices to the north and is still within walking distance of the town. Site 201 is a modest greenfield site, with residential development adjacent to it. Site 156, a Group 2 site based on the strip field system, was also included due to its good connectivity to the town centre. It is no more requiring of infrastructure works than site 666, and is on a flatter area of land. The Proposed allocations provide opportunities for a range of house-builders.				

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Howardian Hills AONB Manager	No	Justified		
Comment				
Considerable concerns about the location of the proposed land allocation at Amotherby (Site 148) next to the boundary of the AONB and the potential impact on the setting of the AONB. It was not clear in previous material that the site was to be considered and this has led me to miss it in responses to previous consultations.				
RDC Comment				
The site in question has been put forward by landowners and has been part of consultations on the plan. In 2015 as part of the public consultation, the site was identified as a group 2 site due to land ownership complexities, which have since been resolved.				
The LPA is aware of the sites location in relation to the AONB and has considered this as part of the plan process. It is the view of the Local Planning Authority that the development of the site would not have an unacceptable impact on the nationally protected landscape or its setting. The development				

would be strongly visually linked with the existing settlement in the landscape.

Policy: SD2 - Residential Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Councillor P Andrews	No	Justified		
Comment				
Support the inclusion of the Beverley Road site as a residential land allocation. Object to all other land allocations for residential development in Malton and Norton. The land allocation at Ryedale House should be deleted and any other land allocations other than extant permissions and the Beverley Road site.				
RDC Comment				
Note support for Beverley Road site. The delivery of housing on the Ryedale House would be subject to specific parameters regarding scale, design and massing of the development.				

Policy: SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Gladman				
Comment				
Whilst the identification of strategic allocations (SD3) is an approach that can be 'made sustainable' through the timely provision of associated infrastructure, it is essential that local plans take into account the risks associated with the delivery of any such schemes and the knock-on effect that this can have in terms of housing delivery. It is considered essential that the Council are confident and can robustly demonstrate that the sites that are proposed for residential development are suitable and deliverable.				
As the Council will be aware, a failure in the ability of any allocations to deliver over the plan period, will lead to significant undersupply for the authority.				
RDC Comment				
The site in Norton, SD3, is not a strategic allocation, but will deliver key infrastructure requirements. The Local Planning Authority will consider speculative planning applications in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. We have an established monitoring framework.				

Policy: SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Ryedale District Council				

I Conlan								
Comment	Climate change and sustainability considerations mean we need to encourage people to live as close as possible to their work place and/or use sustainable transport. Need to reduce traffic congestion and avoid air pollution. Greater car use is to be expected through the Beverley Road site unless sufficient employment opportunities are included. It is essential that a school and doctors surgery are sited as close as possible to allow Norton to become self sufficient.							
RDC Comment								
People's relationship between home and work has become more flexible with home working. The ability to link new residential development with new employment land is simply not consequential- and is very complex, and changes over time, based on a wide range of factors. The role of the local planning authority is to ensure that there is a supply of new homes to meet objectively assessed need, and provide employment land for latent demand and for existing and new businesses in the district. It cannot pre-determine the relationship between such land uses or actually deliver the uses. The ability to use sustainable modes of transport, through Travel Plans, would be sought, as a matter of course, and proposals which sought to move towards electric vehicles and less polluting vehicles. The Norton Lodge Site (SD3) is allocated with land for a school, and the LEA and District Council are aware that the delivery of the school will require a combination of CIL revenue and government funding.								

Policy: SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate				
Natural England								
Comment	We recognise that recreational disturbance impacts will be mitigated through the provision of on-site greenspace as well as wider green infrastructure improvements. The appropriate assessment identifies that with mitigation measures in place, there will still be some increased recreational activity along parts of the River Derwent Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Although this increased pressure may not be at a level at which the integrity of the designated site would be effected, Natural England advises that an Access Management Plan (e.g. signage and supply of information where possible) should also be required when development comes forward. This approach would ensure recreational disturbance impacts are minimised as far as reasonably possible; for example it is recognised there are already a number of informal access routes to the River Derwent SAC which may only become more established with increased recreational activity. A well designed Access Management Plan should also ensure that the use of green infrastructure and on-site greenspace provided by development will be maximised.							
RDC Comment								
Noted, this will be undertaken through the planning application process.								

Policy: SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Natural England				
Comment				
Impacts associated with water quality and discharges into the River Derwent SAC are proposed to be mitigated through the implementation of SUDs and drainage into mains sewers. We strongly advise the Local Planning Authority to ensure the SUDs are well maintained and remain fully functional in the long term.				
We recognise that Yorkshire Water is aware of proposed development sites and has factored this into their improvement programme to increase mains sewers capacity as a result. However, in relation to the additional capacity required to cope with the expansion we have concern that Yorkshire Water may not be able to meet SSSI phosphate targets through additional discharge. Natural England have separately asked for confirmation from Yorkshire Water via the PR19 process that phosphate targets will be able to be met in the future alongside any additional capacity, therefore we expect this issue will be addressed outside of these proposals.				
It is noted that at development site 218 there is an intention to implement a soakaway system rather than connection to mains sewage. In this area it is necessary to ensure that any sewage or water treatment system is sufficiently well maintained over time and that it is not located close to a water course. NECR171 (Natural England Commissioned report 171) provides guidance on recommended distances from a water dependent site/ receiving watercourse (e.g. 30m); this report needs to be taken into account in addition to the CIRA 697 guidance referred to in the Appropriate Assessment.				
RDC Comment				
Noted. The long term maintenance of SUDs is usually set out in conditions. Site 218 is not being taken forward as an allocation.				

Policy: SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Network Rail				
Comment				
Disappointed to note that the Housing allocation (SD3) within Malton does not seek measures to improve connectivity with public transport facilities or improvements to the existing station facilities to support travel by train. We would request that the housing allocation SD3 is amended to ensure the introduction of measures to support the use of public transport. Applications should be supported by Transport Assessments and Travel Plans. Identified improvements to support the use of public transport should be provided through CIL or section 106 contributions. In addition the presumption to support employment and housing land commitments if the current permission expires should acknowledge the need for renewal applications to consider how improvements to public transport to support sustainable travel objectives can be achieved.				
RDC Comment				
The site is accessible by public transport and is in an accessible location to access on foot/bicycle. It is proposed to be allocated as it is in accordance with the Local Plan Strategy - a strategy which recognises that Malton and Norton offer the most significant public transport opportunities.				

A planning application will be supported by a Transport Assessments and Travel Plans which would seek to maximise non-vehicular modes of transport and which would be used to secure improvements if required by the Local Highway Authority.

Policy: SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Norton on Derwent Town Council	Yes			
Comment				
SD3- supportive of this site and its development principles- provided that a new link road from Beverley Road to Hugden Way and the land allocation for a new primary school are included and not compromised in any way.				
RDC Comment				
Noted. These key infrastructure requirements are integral to the delivery of the site.				

Policy: SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Commercial Development Projects and Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation				
Comment				
Not sound not legally compliant. The LPA has placed significant weight on a number of untested assertions: no evidence that the link road is deliverable and developable. No viability evidence concerning affordable housing provision, with the link road and land for a new primary school; thirdly it is understood that the Malton Option was also acceptable in transport and highway terms. Differentiation on landscape terms due to misplaced sensitivity. Reconsider the VIUA designation, and identify the site for housing, as part of the Malton Option.				
RDC Comment				
The Local Planning authority received headline viability information, which was externally evaluated which confirmed that with all infrastructure requirements a level of affordable housing which was still acceptable, based on the strategic importance of the link road and the land for a school. The Norton Lodge site heritage setting considerations is much less sensitive than that of the Peasey Hills site. Both sites have low landscape sensitivity.				

Policy: SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Fitzwilliam Malton Estate				

Comment
The viability of the site has not been soundly demonstrated and relies on assertions. Evidence needs to be produced which can be tested to demonstrate that delivery can be achieved incorporating the full requirements of the plan (para 2.13).
RDC Comment
The Local Planning Authority has, in the case of SD3, received headline viability information around the costs of the site's delivery, which the developers considered they would be plan-compliant, and this was independently appraised. The Independent Appraisal concluded that given the costs of the road, affordable housing provision may not quite meet plan- requirements, but the road is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms combined with the land for the school (as a new school would be required in Norton) and will deliver wider benefits for general traffic circulation. Other developers have confirmed in their representations that they can deliver a plan-compliant development in light of the CIL Charge, and they do not have the same infrastructure requirements. No viability evidence was provided concerning the FME sites as part of the Development Plan production.

Policy: SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Karro Food Group				
Comment				
Karro Food Group who operate from Hugden Way in Malton. It is the largest employer in Malton and operates 24 hours from the site 7 days a week. Operations in meat production, and through its geographic size, generates a certain level of noise, light, smells and substantial vehicle movements around the clock. The land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton is proposed to be allocated under Policy SD2, which sets out the detailed proposals for the development of the site (SD3), identifies land for 600 dwellings adjacent to my client's site. Concerns regarding sensitivity of new occupants to operations. These representations do not seek to object to the principle of residential development of this site but it must be ensured the development principles for the site support the operation of the Karro Food Group site in its current manner and do not prejudice or compromise the ability of the company to grow in the future. To ensure the plan is sound we consider further detail should be set out within the development principles for the site which are identified in associated Policy SD3 to ensure any future residential development will not result in conflict with Karro's existing and future operations. Of critical importance in this regard are the appropriate siting of dwellings, a buffer between the proposed dwellings and the site, along with noise and light attenuation in the site design and landscaping, and in the design and fabric of the dwellings most likely to be affected. We can confirm that discussions are in progress with the proposed developers of the proposed allocation. We will continue to work with them prior to the submission of a planning application and throughout the determination period.				
RDC Comment				
The impact of industrial operations is a material planning consideration both to ensure an acceptable level of residential amenity for prospective and existing residents, and the continued operation of established businesses. The identification of the site was undertaken in the knowledge that the layout of the proposed development, and noise attenuation measures would need to result in no adverse impacts for prospective residents.				

Policy: SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Karro Food Group				
Comment				
<p>Note fourth bullet point which seeks a substantive landscape, visual and noise attenuation buffer between the housing development and the Malton Bacon Factory. Whilst this bullet point does seek to address potential conflict between the Karro site and the proposed residential dwellings by providing a buffer area, it is maintained this is not enough to give comfort to the Karro Food Group site that the buffer would not prejudice or compromise the ability of the company to grow in the future. An illustrative masterplan has been submitted which shows a new car parking area for Karro Food Group with 780 spaces proposed and an adjacent area of public open space. However, Karro Food Group is not planning to take up this new car parking area, and this area will need to be redesigned, potentially to incorporate an acoustic bund, acoustic fencing and landscaping, as technical consultants determine appropriate. The proximity of a public open space area to Karro's operation is also questioned. The Site Selection Methodology Assessment for the site (Q. 29) advises the site submitter has prepared a noise assessment which has informed the buffer shown on the indicative masterplan for the site. It should be a requirement of the allocation that the noise attenuation buffer is informed by an up to date noise assessment, carried out on a mid-week, full production activity day.</p>				
Amendments to Policy SD3 Development Principles to make the plan sound:				
<p>1 – A new road linking Beverley Road to Hugden Way which accommodates existing goods vehicles associated with the Karro Food Group site and safe pedestrian movements between the existing Karro Food Group car park and the main factory site.</p>				
<p>4 – A substantive landscape, visual and noise attenuation buffers between the housing development and the Karro Food Group site and be subject to discussions with Karro Food Group in order that the nature of their operations can be fully understood. A noise assessment should inform the noise attenuation buffer. A new Development Principle: An odour report should form part of any planning application submission and should identify measures to ensure the design and layout of the scheme addresses odour associated with the Karro Food Group site.</p>				
<p>A New Development Principle: Any future planning applications, including reserved matters, must include a Statement of Community Involvement and in particular make reference to consultation with key stakeholders, including Karro Food Group.</p>				
RDC Comment				

Policy: SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Karro Food Group				
Comment				
<p>Given the allocation also seeks to deliver a link road which will connect to Hugden Way, it is essential the design of the road and the associated highways assessment takes into account and accommodates truck yard movements associated with the Karro site and a safe pedestrian crossing from the existing car park to the main factory site. It is also noted that the extent of the allocation encroaches onto land that lies within the existing employment allocation</p>				

(SP6). From reviewing the illustrative masterplan it appears this relates to part of the link road and we will be seeking further clarification from the council in respect of this particular matter.

RDC Comment

The link road is an integral element of the delivery of the housing allocation, and is a strategic solution to improving traffic circulation around the towns.

Policy: SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Linden Homes				
Comment				

Deliverability Issues relating to Site 649 (Norton Lodge)

We consider Site 649 has potentially significant deliverability issues, which could prevent residential development being delivered at the anticipated rates for the following reasons:

- The sheer scale of Site 649 is such that it is required to deliver significant infrastructure to mitigate its impact, including a new link, which will potentially constrain the timescales for delivering new residential dwellings on site.
- Site 649 is located in close proximity to an industrial estate and Malton Bacon Factory, which constrains the Site in terms of its layout/potential yield and requirement for noise mitigation.
- Site 649 has been shown to have a high potential for survival of prehistoric ad Romano-British remains. The course of a Roman road also passes through the area, as does a prehistoric triple dyke boundary feature known from crop marks. Iron Age square barrow burials and other ditched enclosures have also been plotted from aerial photographs. The site is therefore potentially heavily constrained by existing heritage assets that could feasibly dictate the layout/potential yield of the site and/or delay the delivery of residential development below the anticipated rates.

In summary, we consider that the housing requirement for Malton/Norton for the Plan period can be most appropriately and sustainably delivered via the allocation of Site 649 and Site 194, which we consider to be a more sustainable and deliverable option than Site 450 and one which would also provide a greater buffer to the supply of housing should the significant infrastructure requirements associated with Site 649 result in the delivery of residential development on that site not coming forward at the rates anticipated.

RDC Comment

The site's size is a key benefit, as the site will ensure the delivery of two major elements of infrastructure for the towns: the link road, and the land for a primary school, which the Local Education Authority have identified as being necessary, wherever the majority of the allocation remains to be delivered (Norton). The Norton Lodge site is subject to two major, national housebuilders, and they have identified that the delivery of housing will be necessary in tandem with the infrastructure to deliver the scheme as a whole, and they will both delivering housing on the site. The site has been subject to archaeological evaluation which has not identified archaeological remains of such significance that would preclude the development or unduly dictate the layout. The proximity of Karro Foods site is important consideration, and the noise mitigation is recognised as being essential to ensure the two uses can

operate without impairment.

Policy: SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
Support the recognition and inclusion of essential infrastructure within the Development Principles. Could be strengthened by providing more clarity regarding layout, design and connectivity and how infrastructure will be funded. Particularly for the more significant sites such as SD3. This could be done by expanding the Development Principles, Supplementary Planning Documents as development briefs or master plans. Improve confidence in the delivery of the sites. Developer contributions will be required to secure necessary infrastructure. Without adequate funding the viability and delivery of sites may be compromised- leading to delay in provision. The CIL charging Schedule, and Regulation 123 list are already adopted, but pre-date the Local Plan Sites Document, and that the Reg.123 list should be reviewed prior to the Examination. The County Council would welcome this with regards to ensuring adequate provision is made for County Council infrastructure. Discussions have taken place regarding the development of an Infrastructure Deliverability Statement, to set out delivery and we are keen to continue this work.				
RDC Comment				
The LPA considers that the key/necessary development principles for the sites are included in the policies and will provide an appropriate basis for the compilation of detailed schemes.				
The LPA sees no reason to review the Regulation 123 list prior to the examination. The list refers to the infrastructure requirements required to support planned growth and is compliant with the regulations as it stands. The list is clear about those requirements which will be funded through CIL and the site specific Section 106 and developers are aware of this.				
The Council has conducted clear discussions with service providers to understand the implications of site choices and the impacts on infrastructure provision. The Regulation 123 List was written with a degree of flexibility to allow the document to respond where the need is greatest. The Council will work with NYCC on the completion of the Infrastructure Delivery Statement to ensure priorities for CIL expenditure are clear and reflect other sources of funding. The major allocation at Norton has been progressed on the basis that the link road is a necessary on-site scheme to be provided by the developers and this is acknowledged in their supporting material. Land for a school will be provided by the developer (to be offset in the CIL contribution) and CIL payments will be used to fund a new school. The development is not of a size to justify the school via Section 106 contribution.				

Policy: SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Historic England	No	Justified		
Comment				

The area lies within an extensive archaeological landscape which stretches along the Vale of Pickering with a high probability that the area will contain archaeological remains potentially of national significance. It is essential that the plan alerts prospective developers to the likelihood that they may encounter important archaeological remains and that it explains how they might need to deal with this. (Suggested wording for the policy and for an appendix to the document, based on the approach taken by Scarborough Borough Council is provided).

RDC Comment

Noted. The Council would have no objection to the inclusion of the proposed appendix which would operate / be applied in conjunction with Policy SP12 of the Local Plan Strategy.

Policy: SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Barratt Homes and Taylor Wimpey				
Comment	<p>We fully support the principle of the proposed allocation of the site by RDC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The allocation boundary needs to be expanded in order to provide a more sympathetically designed development which places the new primary school within the proposed link road boundary, and also to enable the delivery of additional public open space and landscaping on the site's southern boundary. • The development proposals will deliver circa 600 homes, a new primary school, a new link road, public open space, green networks and enhanced boundary landscaping. • The proposed development can enhance the south-eastern area of Norton through a sensitive extension to the existing urban area. • The development will enhance identified areas of landscape and habitat value in perpetuity. • The proposed number of homes to be delivered at this site are required to meet Malton/Norton's and the District's housing needs. • The development provides the opportunity to facilitate the delivery of a significant number of environmental benefits. • No other potential site option located within Malton/Norton can deliver the socio-economic, community or highways benefits that the site can deliver. The development proposals are situated in a suitable and highly sustainable location in respect of existing settlement form and there are no technical or environmental (built and natural) constraints that would preclude the development of the site. • The site is available now as it is under the control of two national house builders who are actively seeking to secure planning permission for the residential development of the site. • The site can also be considered achievable as our clients can deliver new homes on the site within the next 5 years. <p>Creating a sustainable community of 600 homes, meeting market and affordable housing needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposals will deliver a new link road connecting Beverley Road and Hugden Way. As shown on the enclosed Indicative Masterplan and Site Location 			

Pan. The junctions, alignment and standard of the new link road has been agreed with NYCC.

- At this point we believe that the requested implementation of a MOVA system at the junction with Scarborough Road and Westfield Way is pre-emptive in advance of the submission of the planning application. This specific scheme may well form part of the proposals in due course, but it has not been discussed with NYCC at this point and our highways consultants have not specifically identified that it is needed. In fact, our highways consultants are currently predicting that the Scarborough Road and Westfield Way junction will operate with significant reserve capacity in the future, meaning we are not expecting that mitigation will be required at this location. In any event, this is a matter that we will work with NYCC on over the course of the determination of the impending planning application.
- The development proposals include 2Ha of land for a new two form entry primary school.
- Site and boundary landscaping has been integrated into the proposals to include landscape areas for play and fitness. Including new additional boundary landscape planting along the site's northern and southern boundaries.
- The scheme has been designed to deliver well defined hierarchy of streets and spaces.
- Pedestrian and cycle only routes have been designed throughout the scheme and will circumnavigate the proposed areas of public open space throughout the site and alongside the proposed link road. Connecting the site to existing surrounding areas, the town centre and the countryside to the south of the site. All existing PROW and Bridleways through the site are to be retained. A direct connection will be provided to the new proposed primary school site from the north.
- Vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access will be provided from two access point along Beverley Road via the new link road and a separate access for the development proposals.
- The development proposals will include significant areas of gr

RDC Comment

Note for support for the proposed allocation. The Development Principles outline particular site-specific matters for which its is important that delivery of these matters is articulated in the Development Plan to give them full weight. NYCC and the modelling work undertaken for the Council have identified that utilising efficient junction capacity is important for overall vehicular movements and reducing congestion. The Air Quality Impact Assessment identifies the importance of ensuring new residences have the capability to charge vehicles, and the council is keen to ensure that this is established as part of the Development Plan rather than as a condition. The precise means of lighting the schemes will be discussed as part of any resulting planning application, but the Council wants to ensure that the Development Plan sets out a clear position regarding lighting.

Policy: SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
Site 649 lies within/or partly within an area identified under a Policy or (if applicable, several Policies) of the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for safeguarding.				

Therefore, in the event that the Joint Plan is adopted and the site is allocated in the Local Plan adopted by the District Council, the County Council should be consulted on the planning application associated with this development as it is not considered currently to meet the exemption criteria in the Joint Plan.

RDC Comment

The Site Selection Methodology identified sites where a minerals safeguarding designation was in place. It also recognised that some sites, being adjacent to existing residential development would not be suitable to provide a mineral extraction resource. The Council has taken the emerging safeguarding policy into account in identifying land allocations in line with the Local Plan Strategy and in balancing a range of sustainability considerations. The plan process itself has taken these issues into account and on that basis, the text of the plan does not need to make explicit reference to this matter.

Policy: SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
Norton Primary – 600 LP dwellings – the existing split-site provision and capacity of Norton CP School would be exceeded. Potential new school site with Norton Lodge planning application. Secondary provision in Norton may also need expansion in the long-term.				
RDC Comment				
Noted. The existing permissions in Norton have been pre-CIL, and subject to educational contributions. Normally, as The District Council has a CIL charge in place, Education contributions would be covered by the CIL charge. The District Council have been in discussions with the County Council and are aware that a new school will be required in Norton and NYCC are aware that this will be at the proposed allocation site.				

Policy: SD3 - Housing Allocation -Land to the east of Beverley Road, Norton: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Councillor P Andrews	Yes	Justified		
Comment				
Support the inclusion of the Beverley Road site as a residential land allocation.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD4 - Housing Allocation - Land to the west of Old Maltongate (Ryedale House), Malton: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
I Conlan				
Comment				
Existing workplace and service accessibility needs to be protected - the Ryedale House site is well-suited for accessibility for staff and service users, with good connectivity to public transport, to move to an out of town location would be less accessible. They (including the Police site) should be protected.				
RDC Comment				
The Local Planning Authority has considered to suitability of the site of Ryedale House alone for residential development. The Local Planning authority is aware that the District Council will be utilising existing assets and sites to ensure that services to the Local community are not compromised, in order to ensure compliance with other local plan strategy policies, such as SP11, and deliver more sustainable working practices for staff.				

Policy: SD4 - Housing Allocation - Land to the west of Old Maltongate (Ryedale House), Malton: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Malton Town Council				
Comment				
Object to the re-development of the Ryedale House site for housing.				
RDC Comment				
The Council is looking to relocate and reconfigure service provision with partners. The site is well located in relation to existing housing and accessible to the town, services, recreational facilities and is served by public transport. The traffic movements associated with the site as a residential use will be no greater than those associated with its current use.				

Policy: SD4 - Housing Allocation - Land to the west of Old Maltongate (Ryedale House), Malton: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Natural England				
Comment				
We recognise that recreational disturbance impacts will be mitigated through the provision of on-site greenspace as well as wider green infrastructure improvements. The appropriate assessment identifies that with mitigation measures in place, there will still be some increased recreational activity along parts of the River Derwent Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Although this increased pressure may not be at a level at which the integrity of the designated site would be effected, Natural England advises that an Access Management Plan (e.g. signage and supply of information where possible) should also be required when development comes forward. This approach would ensure recreational disturbance impacts are minimised as far as				

reasonably possible; for example it is recognised there are already a number of informal access routes to the River Derwent SAC which may only become more established with increased recreational activity. A well designed Access Management Plan should also ensure that the use of green infrastructure and on-site greenspace provided by development will be maximised.

RDC Comment

Noted, this will be undertaken through the planning application process.

Policy: SD4 - Housing Allocation - Land to the west of Old Maltongate (Ryedale House), Malton: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Norton on Derwent Town Council				
Comment				
No comment.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD4 - Housing Allocation - Land to the west of Old Maltongate (Ryedale House), Malton: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Linden Homes				
Comment				
Constraints and Deliverability Issues relating to Site 450 (Ryedale House)				
We consider Site 194 represents a more appropriate and deliverable option to Site 450 for the following reasons:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site 450 is stated to have potential to accommodate approximately only 60 dwellings, which does not provide for an appropriate buffer should delivery of residential dwellings on Site 649 stall due to its significant infrastructure requirements (see below). • The frontage to Site 450 is constrained by the presence of a number of mature trees, which are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order(s). • Land to the south-east of Site 450 is open and subject to a Visually Important Undeveloped Area, which constrains the site in terms of its potential impact on the adjoining landscape. • The aforementioned open land adjoining Site 450 is also part of the Scheduled Monument to the Derventio Site, which constrains the site in terms of its potential impact on designated heritage assets. • Pockets of Site 450 are known to have problems with surface water flooding. 				

- Significant existing parking over the last few decades on Site 450 is likely to result in potential contamination issues that will need to be remediated.
- Site 450 currently comprises the occupied HQ of Ryedale District Council and, whilst it is claimed that the Council has resolved in principle to the release of the site for development, there are no assurances as to the mechanisms or logistics for this, which clearly places a potential constraint on the actual delivery of development on the site.

RDC Comment

There are a number of extant permissions which are under construction, and subject to Reserved Matters at present. The allocation SD3 is not expected to stall due to the infrastructure requirements, in so far as the house-building will facilitate the delivery of the infrastructure. The presence of the VIUA across the road from the site, the presence of the trees subject to TPO, and some surface water flooding matters (Site is Flood Zone 1) are material considerations as sensitivities, that will influence the form and siting of any resulting building, but are not constraints to the site's development in principle. The Development Principles respond to these sensitivities. It is also a brownfield site, and the Council has taken account of the demolition of existing buildings and hardstanding. SD4 is not adjacent to the Scheduled Monument, known as 'Derventio'. There is another property, also known as Ryedale House, which is directly to the north of the Scheduled Site. The Council has agreed to release the site in principle.

Policy: SD4 - Housing Allocation - Land to the west of Old Maltongate (Ryedale House), Malton: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Councillor P Andrews				
Comment				
The land allocation at Ryedale House should be deleted.				
RDC Comment				
The Council have carefully considered the principle of residential development, through the site selection methodology, and concluded that subject to general development parameters and site specific consideration which are set out in the Local Plan Strategy and the Development Principles, respectively, the site represents a sustainable location for housing. The site assessment process undertaken by the LPA , and that undertaken by the District Council through a Independent Chartered Surveyor have found no unsurmountable constraints on delivery.				

Policy: SD4 - Housing Allocation - Land to the west of Old Maltongate (Ryedale House), Malton: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Councillor P Andrews	No	Justified		
Comment				
Object to the proposed allocation of land at Ryedale House. The maintenance of Ryedale House has been neglected and the Council has not managed its resources wisely. There is other public sector land adjacent to the site and the allocation of the Ryedale House site may be the thin end of the wedge. The				

land fits in with green spaces on the other side of the road and provides a natural break between Malton and Old Malton. The proposed allocation should be deleted from the plan.

RDC Comment

The condition of Ryedale House is not a material planning consideration- it is not a building Listed for its historic or architectural merit. The Development Principles make specific reference to the need for retaining frontage and reflecting the design character of buildings in the area. The site is a brownfield site. It is not clear what is meant by the 'thin end of the wedge'.

Policy: SD4 - Housing Allocation - Land to the west of Old Maltongate (Ryedale House), Malton: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment	<p>Site 450 lies within an area identified under a minerals safeguarding policy or (if applicable, several Policies) and the development proposed may fit within the exemption criteria identified in the Joint Plan (if adopted).</p>			
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD4 - Housing Allocation - Land to the west of Old Maltongate (Ryedale House), Malton: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment	<p>Malton Primary – existing permissions + 60 LP dwellings may need some small scale expansion of Malton CP School. NYCC are working with the diocese St Mary's RC Primary Malton which will add additional capacity to provide for the impacts of new housing in both Malton and Norton. NYCC are reviewing the position of Malton Secondary to determine the need for and degree of any future expansion.</p>			
RDC Comment				
Noted. The existing permissions in Malton have been pre-CIL, and subject to educational contributions. As The District Council has a CIL charge in place, Education contributions would be covered by the CIL charge, if the resulting scheme generates such a requirement.				

Policy: SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
A Overton				
Comment	<p>The site density is too large for this size of plot, with only one access into and out of the site which is on a blind bend, therefore making crossing a very busy road at all times dangerous for pedestrian and traffic.</p> <p>The congestion in Pickering is heavy at most times of the day especially along the A169 Whitby Road down to the roundabout and then out on the A170 Hungate Road to the traffic lights at Lidl. Such a big development site would cause more traffic , pollution, health and safety and air quality. Also the local doctors and dentist and schools do not have the capacity to cope with the extra people this site would bring into Pickering. There is also concern that emergency services would have difficulty accessing the site due to not enough parking spaces being allocated to the properties on the site. This site will take 6 years to build – 40 houses per year, so we will have six years of noise, dirt, pollution etc. to deal with. Plus we were told that bungalows for bungalows were being built on the site but this is not now the case – I live in a bungalow and I will have a two storey house built in front of me therefore blocking my light and privacy. It is bad enough a bungalow being built in front of me but not a two storey house. There are also concerns regarding the Tree Preservation Order on all the trees on this site together with the wildlife. I am also concerned regarding the drainage of this site and any possible flooding coming down.</p>			
RDC Comment	<p>The Publication of the Local Plan Sites Document has coincided with the submission of a planning application. The proposed allocation of the site in the Development Plan sets out key parameters. The Local Planning Authority has considered the implications of the development of this site amongst many other sites around Pickering, and it has concluded that the site is acceptable in planning terms for residential development, and the strategic implications of this have been considered and matters of principle such as the provision of an acceptable access. Other site-specific matters, in terms of residential amenity, trees and biodiversity and surface water management will be considered through the consideration, and determination of the planning application to ensure the proposal is acceptable in planning terms. In terms of construction activities and their duration, this is not a reason for refusal, however, there will be conditions imposed on the operations, to ensure that there are no adverse impacts during construction.</p>			

Policy: SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
C Barker				
Comment	<p>Object to the application to build an estate of houses off The Whitby Road. (SD5)</p> <p>I live on Corbie Way, and my bungalow backs on to proposed site.</p> <p>The lack of privacy that this develop will cause to all the houses on Whitby Road, Corbie Way and Marshall Drive.</p> <p>The increased risk of flooding. Many reports have been written about fields being built on and the increases of flooding.</p>			
Ryedale District Council	Page 79 of 140			

I do not believe that the exit/entrance to the proposed site is safe, either for vehicles or pedestrians.

The effect that this increase in populations is going to have on the Schools and Doctors surgery, (there is still the ongoing building at Mickle Hill) This development is too big and unnecessary.

RDC Comment

The proposed allocation identifies the principle of development, and key parameters concerning site specific matters through the Development Principles. The response is made in relation to a submitted planning application on the site. The Highway Authority have advised that the access is acceptable in principle. Matters around residential amenity, surface water management are important and will need to be satisfactorily addressed. The Local Education Authority has identified no provision issues for the proposed allocations. The Doctors Surgeries and CCGs have been made aware over a number of years of the housing delivery across the District, prior to the adoption of the Local Plan Strategy, and during the production of the Local Plan Sites Document.

Policy: SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
C D Wilson				
Comment				
Object to the development of site 347 (Whitby Road, Pickering) for the following reasons:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none">-potential for flooding-Loss of trees and hedgerows-density will contribute to flooding-Loss of privacy-Dangerous siting of access road, road safety and congestion-insufficient infrastructure (schools, Doctors, Dentists)				
RDC Comment				
The allocation identifies the principle of development, and key parameters concerning site specific matters. The response is made in relation to a submitted planning application on the site. The Highway Authority have advised that the access is acceptable in principle. Matters around residential amenity, surface water management are important and will need to be satisfactorily addressed. The Local Education Authority has identified no provision issues for the proposed allocations. The Doctors Surgeries and CCGs have been made aware over a number of years of the housing delivery across the District, prior to the adoption of the Local Plan Strategy, and during the production of the Local Plan Sites Document.				

Policy: SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
D and A Bales				
Comment				
Object to the proposed allocation at Whitby Road, Pickering. Concerns relate to:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access and highway safety - Density of development which is not in keeping with the area - Potential for flooding - Loss of trees and hedges - Unclear why the site is now considered to be suitable for development when previously it was considered unsuitable 				
RDC Comment				
<p>The proposed allocation identifies the principle of development, and key parameters concerning site specific matters. It (as an allocation) represents the progression of planning policy since the 2002 Ryedale Local Plan. Allocations are made in response to the adopted Development Plan (Local Plan Strategy) and a required to deliver the housing requirement. The site was identified in the 2015 Sites Consultation as an Option Choice, and has performed well through the site assessment process. The response is made in relation to a submitted planning application on the site. The Highway Authority have advised that the access is acceptable in principle. Matters around density, residential amenity, surface water management are important and will need to be satisfactorily addressed.</p>				

Policy: SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
E Hazelwood Bell				
Comment				
Object to the proposed development of site 347 (Whitby Road, Pickering). Concerns relate to:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -highway safety and congestion with increased pollution and fumes -layout and density which is not in keeping with a semi-rural area -loss of trees and impact on nature conservation -loss of light, privacy and outlook to the detriment of the residential amenity of neighbours -flood risk , in particular at the southern boundary and the potential for increased risk of flooding on adjacent/nearby lower ground 				

RDC Comment
The proposed allocation identifies the principle of development, and key parameters concerning site specific matters. Allocations are made in response to the adopted Development Plan (Local Plan Strategy) and a required to deliver the housing requirement. The site was identified in the 2015 Sites Consultation as an Option Choice, and has performed well through the site assessment process. The response is made in relation to a submitted planning application on the site. The Highway Authority have advised that the access is acceptable in principle. Matters around density, residential amenity, surface water management, and the impacts on protected trees are important and will need to be satisfactorily addressed.

Policy: SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
J Brown				
Comment				
I wish to object to the proposed development at Whitby Road, Pickering, based on matters with which you will already be familiar, namely:				
Access issues.				
The layout and density of the proposed buildings.				
Loss of trees currently under TPOs.				
Detimental outlook for existing residents.				
Drainage and flooding issues, particularly with reference to my property and others on Marshall Drive				
RDC Comment				
The proposed allocation identifies the principle of development, and key parameters concerning site specific matters. The site was identified in the 2015 Sites Consultation as an Option Choice, and has performed well through the site assessment process. The response is made in relation to a submitted planning application on the site. The Highway Authority have advised that the access is acceptable in principle. Matters around density, residential amenity, surface water management are important and will need to be satisfactorily addressed.				

Policy: SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
M France				

Comment
Baffled by the fact that site 347 (Whitby Road, Pickering) has been elevated to that of land being ripe for development when previously it has been deemed unsuitable.
RDC Comment
Site 347 was identified in 2015 as an option choice with four other sites. Therefore the site has not experienced a rapid change of position in its consideration for allocation. New allocations are made to meet future plan requirements in the emerging plan. On that basis, these are on land which hitherto had not been identified for development. The Local Plan Strategy is the adopted development plan- an it provides a steer which the Local Plan Sites Document has reflected.

Policy: SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Natural England				
Comment				
There are allocation sites with potential impacts on designated sites that fall outside of the scope of the Habitats Regulations Assessment discussed above. These sites are 116 and 347 which are approximately 1.5km from Newtondale Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Haugh and Gundale Slacks SSSI. The Local Plan Sites Document explains that adverse impacts on the interest features of the SSSIs are unlikely. Increases in recreational pressure can be avoided through the provision of on-site or local open space, which we advise should be implemented upon the development on these sites.				
Although we do not have any other specific comments to make on site allocations, we recommend that all forthcoming sites and development proposals are assessed against SSSI IRZs that can be viewed on the MAGIC website (http://magic.defra.gov.uk/).				
RDC Comment				
Noted, and development principles and compliance with the Local Plan Strategy will secure appropriate mitigation. Site 116 is not being taken forward, site 347 is being taking forward. The sites have been assessed against the impact risk zones.				

Policy: SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo David Wilson Homes				
Comment				
Support the allocation of the Whitby Road site. Whilst the site is the subject of a planning application, DWH consider it prudent to continue to promote the site as an allocation.				

The site represents a deliverable residential development site in a sustainable and accessible location. It will deliver substantial economic and social benefits (including CIL; indirect and direct spending in the local economy; open space and affordable housing) and it will make an important contribution to Ryedale's housing requirements. The development of the site would comply with the Local Plan Strategy and the NPPF. The site is deliverable. It is suitable for housing and there are no technical constraints which would preclude its development. The site is available and there are no legal or ownership constraints to its development. The development of the site is achievable and 35 dph are anticipated.

RDC Comment

Noted.

Policy: SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Local Residents				
Comment				
Without prejudice to the question of the suitability of SD5 for development, the development principles listed should be reinforced, made explicit, extended in scope and incorporated into a planning brief which should have SPD status. (To include reference to drainage, landscaping/tree protection, housing mix and, to give effect to SP17 (Air Quality) and SP18 (Renewable and Low Carbon Energy).				
RDC Comment				
An SPD is not part of the Development Plan, and would have less weight than the Development Principles as proposed in the Local Plan Sites Document, this would also need to be related to a Policy/Allocation in the adopted Local Plan Sites Document. The role of the Development Principles is not to supersede the detailed consideration of the application in respect of the matters discussed above, and matters of detail Furthermore, to presuppose such a level of detail provides no flexibility and resilience to the plan-should, for example, a different developer come forward. There is the adopted Development Plan- which is referred to in the representation- which provides a strategic steer to consider those matters which are not defined in the Development Principles.				

Policy: SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
P Littlewood Chair of Heatherside (Pickering) Residents Association	No			
Comment				
Concerned about the allocation of land at Whitby Road. The Council need to justify the conclusion that SD5 is suitable for development. Many of the site assessment scores appear to be optimistic and/or based on little more than a wing and a prayer.				
The sheer size of the site means that it fails to meet local plan objectives of not relying on strategic sites. The yield has been over estimated and is too				

dense for development on the edge of a market town. No plans have been published to show how infrastructure would be developed to cope.
Fails to meet government strategy to promote the use of brownfield sites and development of smaller sites by smaller developers.
RDC Comment
The proposed allocation is a large site at over 200 dwellings, as defined by the Local Plan Strategy, but not a strategic site in planning policy terms, such a site is that which is essential to deliver the spatial approach of the strategy. The Local Plan Strategy identified that greenfield land releases would be necessary to meet the housing requirement of the plan. The Local Plan Strategy provides a range of scenarios where smaller sites can obtain permission, provided that they comply with the other policies within the Local Plan Strategy. The site assessment process uses a range of information some of which is headline, and is to help inform the principle of the site's development. Matters of specific detail would be considered through the planning application process.

Policy: SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Persimmon Homes				
Comment				

Site 347 is located to the north east of Pickering. This site affects a historic strip field pattern which is shown on the OS County Series map of Yorkshire from 1854 and on maps produced since this date. At this location, the patterns runs in an east-to-west direction, though the site affects part of a north-south running field at the north-eastern extent of the site. The development of this site therefore affects strip field patterns to the north of Pickering, which the regression of maps indicates has seen very little change. When considered against the criteria listed above it is clear that the site will affect historic strip field patterns, which run east to west through the site and, in part, a north to south running field. The site is located within an area identified as an 'Area of High Landscape Value' (AHLV), designated under Policy SP13 of the RP-LPS. This therefore conflicts with a further two objectives which seek to ensure that development is sensitive to the landscape setting of the town and the safeguarding of the setting and views of the North York Moors National Park. The RP-LPS notes that there are longstanding local landscape designations in the district including the AHLV covering the 'Fringe of the Moors'. This designation was made in recognition of the natural beauty and scenic qualities of the area. In designating sites through Policy SP13, the Council seeks to ensure the retention of areas with high landscape value and to reinforce local landscape quality and recognise the local value attached to these landscapes. The policy seeks also to protect the setting of the North York Moors National Park. The Fringe of the Moors is identified as a locally valued landscape. The fringe has a particular visual sensitivity given the topography of the moors and the resulting long distance skyline views within Ryedale and the area has a particular landscape character which is sensitive to change.

RDC Comment
The point is not factually accurate. Site SD5 does not form part of the Mediaeval Strip Field System. This is evidence of from the work undertaken by Historic England and NYCC (and other authorities) in 2013 in respect of the Historic Landscape Characterisation. The fields are enclosed land whilst some boundaries pre-date 1851, they are not identified as Mediaeval Historic Strip Fields. In respect of the Area of High Landscape Value, the designation does not preclude development (this was a point noted by the Local Plan Strategy Inspector) and the site has despite its elevation, makes a very limited contribution to the wider form and character of Pickering and its setting and the features of the AHLV. Regarding its relationship to the North York Moors, it

should be noted that North York Moors National Park have no concerns about the site having any impact on the setting of the protected landscape. Additionally, Natural England have raised no concerns in this respect. The topography is undulating and enclosing, resulting in a site which is not capable of being read in the wider landscape, this has also been identified by Pickering Town Council.

Policy: SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
S Dick				
Comment				
Object to the proposed development of site 347 (Whitby Road, Pickering) and have the following concerns:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there is a high risk of surface water flooding at the southern boundary of the site - highway safety and traffic congestion on the A169 causing pollution - loss of protected trees - reduction in light and privacy for neighbouring residents - layout and density is out of keeping with a historic market town and the density will result in traffic and parking problems - infrastructure of the town (e.g. schools, doctors, dentists) cannot cope with additional people 				
RDC Comment				
The proposed allocation identifies the principle of development, and key parameters concerning site specific matters. Allocations are made in response to the adopted Development Plan (Local Plan Strategy) and a required to deliver the housing requirement. The site was identified in the 2015 Sites Consultation as an Option Choice, and has performed well through the site assessment process. The response is made in relation to a submitted planning application on the site. The Highway Authority have advised that the access is acceptable in principle. Matters around density, residential amenity, surface water management, and the impacts on protected trees are important and will need to be satisfactorily addressed. The Council has discussed the proposals with infrastructure providers, and this has raised no objections in principle. The Council have had discussions with health care providers regarding the sites.				

Policy: SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
S H Jennings				
Comment				
My property abuts onto the southern boundary of the site. I appreciate the national need for new homes and in principle do not oppose the use of this land for housing. However I would like to object to the current application.				

1. Density and size of development - after discounting a sizeable area of the site for other uses, in particular the proposed drainage basin, the semi-circular green area at the south (in a gully) and the underground storage tank. The housing planned for the remaining areas appears unduly dense, especially in the eastern sector. There appears to be relatively few green areas within the housing zones (verges, front gardens) when compared with other developments over recent decades in Pickering. The nearby Woodlands Park estate (by the same developer) shows the same level of density. As well as a lack of green areas and trees within the Woodlands estate, the density has resulted in substantial numbers of cars parked astride the pavement, or using the Community Park car park (not an option in the proposed development). There are also implications for surface water drainage and general quality of life for residents closely surrounded by housing, especially as the proposed development will be about two and a half times as big as Woodlands Park. Overall, the design would appear more suitable to an inner-city site than one on the edge of a market town.

The size of the development (239 homes) would seem to be at odds with the Local Plan. Section 3, p.18, 3.8 states: "An important element of this Strategy is that it looks to accommodate new development through a pattern of small and medium sized sites spread within and around each of the towns as opposed to relying on the delivery of one or more 'strategic sites' capable of accommodating a significant proportion of Ryedale's development requirements in a limited number of locations." Under the council's definition, a large site consists of 100+ dwellings.

2. Access

The proposed single entrance/exit road leading directly onto the A169 would appear dangerous. Without additional traffic-calming measures, vehicles emerging from the estate, and those waiting in the middle of the road to turn into it, will have to cope with traffic from both directions that frequently exceeds the speed limit. Even more concerning is the prospect of pedestrians, including schoolchildren, having to cross the A169 at or near the same location to access all of the town's schools, shops and services.

3. Archaeology

I am concerned that the recent (Dec. 2017) trial trenching by MAP Archaeology Practice may have been inadequate. The exercise consisted of two field workers and a digger, and appeared, to those of us watching, to be completed very quickly. Unfortunately their report (doc. no. 1794755, 13/12/17) gives no details of the time that was spent on site. Two field workers, with one digger, over a couple of days for a site of over 8 hectares seems insufficiently thorough. They conclude: "The trial trenching revealed no significant archaeological features. Therefore, no archaeological mitigation is required" (p.3) Accepting the first sentence to be true, in the small proportion of the site that they explored, the second does not follow logically, as implied.

My main concern, however, is that the trial trenches did not cover two areas of potential importance.

(i) A sub-circular earthwork and crop mark enclosure. This has been recorded by English Heritage (Eng. Her. Pastscape website, Mon. no. 1370351).

This is visible from Google Maps, and lies NE of trial trench 12. I do not understand why this was not investigated by the field workers while they were so near it. It is due to be built over.

(ii) The hedge, and specifically the ridge on which it stands, which runs north from the southern boundary of the site (from behind 49 Corbie Way) into the

centre of the site. This marks the western boundary of the series of historic strip fields running

RDC Comment

The support for the principle of development for housing is noted. The planning application is being considered on its merits. The use of Strategic sites is much larger sites which are integral to the delivery of the plan. This site would be identified as a large site, but not strategic. The access has been identified as being acceptable to the Highway Authority in principle.

Policy: SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
Site 347 lies within/or partly within an area identified under a Policy or (if applicable, several Policies) of the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for safeguarding. Therefore, in the event that the Joint Plan is adopted and the site is allocated in the Local Plan adopted by the District Council, the County Council should be consulted on the planning application associated with this development as it not considered currently to meet the exemption criteria in the Joint Plan.				
RDC Comment				
The Site Selection Methodology identified sites where a minerals safeguarding designation was in place. It also recognised that some sites, being adjacent to existing residential development would not be suitable to provide a mineral extraction resource. The Council has taken the emerging safeguarding policy into account in identifying land allocations in line with the Local Plan Strategy and in balancing a range of sustainability considerations. The plan process itself has taken these issues into account and on that basis, the text of the plan does not need to make explicit reference to this matter.				

Policy: SD5 - Housing Allocation - Land to the east of Whitby Road, Pickering: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
Pickering Primary – 360 LP dwellings – both the existing community Schools, Pickering Infants and Pickering Junior, would need some expansion. Any significant uplift in the allocation figure would need a review of the need for an additional education site. For Pickering secondary; Lady Lumley's has surplus capacity so no expansion would be needed.				
RDC Comment				
Noted. The existing permissions in Pickering have been pre-CIL, and subject to educational contributions. As The District Council has a CIL charge in place, Education contributions would be covered by the CIL charge.				

Policy: SD6 - Housing Allocation - Land to the West of Malton Road, Pickering: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Barratt and DWH				
Comment				
The Site at Middleton Road Pickering, (site ref 116) should be allocated for residential development. It will create a sustainable, high quality and accessible development which will bring significant social and economic benefits. The site can deliver a comprehensive development of market and affordable housing. It is in a suitable location and there are no technical or environmental constraints to preclude development. It is available and under the control of a national housebuilder and is considered to be achievable. Its allocation will contribute to the shortfall in homes on account of deliverability concerns associated with SD6 (Malton Road, Pickering) and two Gladman sites (at Kirkbymoorside and Sherburn).				
RDC Comment				
The Local Planning Authority consider that the proposed residential land allocations comply with the objectives of the adopted Local Plan Strategy and are supported by the sustainability appraisal process/ site assessment process. The combination of proposed sites at Pickering will provide for the housing requirements for the Town which are established in the Local Plan Strategy. The site at Middleton Road is less accessible to the Town Centre and is more sensitive in landscape terms.				
The landowner of SD6 remains clear of their commitment to delivering a plan-compliant scheme on the site, and have a planning consultancy engaged in the process. They have made clear representations and it is considered that just because a major housebuilder is not currently promoting the site does not mean that it is not deliverable. The site could be available to a wider range of builders / developers.				
The sites at Kirkbymoorside and Sherburn are relatively recently granted planning permissions, and the Council is not aware of any impediment to their delivery.				
The Plan builds in additional flexibility in terms of housing land supply and the Council do not believe that further sites need to be identified to meet housing requirements. It should be noted that Policy SP2 of the Local Plan Strategy provides a framework for the release of further sites should commitments fail to come forward and if this is required to ensure a deliverable five year land supply. As part of the annual update to the SHLAA, Gladman has confirmed that the sites which it has an interest in, remain deliverable.				

Policy: SD6 - Housing Allocation - Land to the West of Malton Road, Pickering: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo D Beal	Yes		Yes	Yes
Comment				
The Master Plan although draft and prepared ahead of the Local Plan Sites Document, shows general conformity with all the key Development Principles.				

We would anticipate there being enough flexibility within the Site to address the more minor elements such as a suitable lighting scheme and capability of electric vehicle charging points at detailed planning stage. An Access Feasibility Report demonstrates that access from Malton Road without compromise to the operation of the existing junctions, is achievable. Accept that a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan will still be required, as well as the provision of electric vehicle charging through a 13 amp electrical socket for each property with a dedicated car parking space within its curtilage. The site is in a Sustainable location and there is the opportunity to connect to and enhance the existing pedestrian and cycle only routes in and through the development to the site access. That principle will be embraced at the time of application. Part of the site (western edge) is within Flood Zone 2, and so there is recognition that this area of the site submission fails the Sequential Test, and as shown in the submitted Master Plan has been excluded from the developable area. It has been identified that consideration will need to be given to the treatment of surface water through the implementation of SuDS in line with the North Yorkshire County Council SuDS Design Guidance.

RDC Comment

Noted. Compliance with the Development Principles would be required, as if adopted they would form part of the Development Plan.

Policy: SD6 - Housing Allocation - Land to the West of Malton Road, Pickering: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo D Beal				
Comment				
We are unaware of any evidence, planning policy or case law which states or even implies that to be deliverable a developer has to be involved. The Landowner has taken the decision with regard to Site 200 to self-fund the planning allocation and application process. The reason for doing that is to retain more control of the process, both in regard to the quality of the proposals (which is important to our client being a local landowner) and in terms of the timing of the development coming forward. It is our experience that where developers have under control via an option agreement, this can take a significant amount of time to commence development post consent, including time to agree price and serve option notices, which can take 6-24 months.				
RDC Comment				
Noted. The Council is confident that the site is in a location which would be attractive to a range of housebuilders, including some of the more local, smaller builders.				

Policy: SD6 - Housing Allocation - Land to the West of Malton Road, Pickering: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Persimmon Homes				
Comment				
Site 200 is located directly to the east, and accessed from, Malton Road. The plan states that in allocating sites the Council will avoid the incremental urbanisation of Malton Road, yet this site is proposed for allocation which would urbanise this road in a southerly direction. This would affect views towards				

the town which currently benefits from relatively open aspects on this approach. Part of this site is located within Flood Zone 2 and 3.
RDC Comment
The Council disagree and consider the proposed allocation to be sound, and evidenced by the SSM and background papers. The part of the site which is in flood zones 2 and 3 is explicitly excluded from the developable area, and forms an important green infrastructure opportunity as it is already a well used area for walking and this area provides a buffer to mitigate the impact of the development on the setting of the Grade II Listed Viviers Mill. The current edge of Pickering to the north of site 200 is reflective of post war estate development, which does not complement Pickering's form and character. The site is very well located to the centre of the Town and key recreational facilities. The development of the site represents an opportunity to enhance the setting and entrance to Pickering and the proposed development principles have sought to make specific reference to this. The allocation would not be incremental development along Malton Road. The Plan is concerned with managing pressure for various enterprises and land uses which stretch along this key route and at some distance from the settlement.

Policy: SD6 - Housing Allocation - Land to the West of Malton Road, Pickering: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Historic England	No	Justified		
Comment				
The area lies within an extensive archaeological landscape which stretches along the Vale of Pickering with a high probability that the area will contain archaeological remains potentially of national significance. It is essential that the plan alerts prospective developers to the likelihood that they may encounter important archaeological remains and that it explains how they might need to deal with this. (Suggested wording for the policy and for an appendix to the document, based on the approach taken by Scarborough Borough Council is provided).				
RDC Comment				
Noted. The Council would have no objection to the inclusion of the proposed appendix which would operate / be applied in conjunction with Policy SP12 of the Local Plan Strategy.				

Policy: SD6 - Housing Allocation - Land to the West of Malton Road, Pickering: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Historic England	No	Justified		
Comment				
Vivers Mill, its outbuildings, Mill House and Mill Cottages are Grade II Listed buildings. In order to demonstrate that the allocation of this area is not incompatible with national policy or SP12 of the Local Plan Strategy, there needs to be an assessment of what contribution this undeveloped area makes to those elements which contribute to the significance of the Listed Building and what effect loss/development of the site might have on its significance.				

The Local Planning Authority will have to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving a Listed Building or its setting when planning applications for the development of allocated sites are submitted. This may mean that the site cannot be developed if the anticipated quantum of development is undeliverable.

RDC Comment

The Council has considered the effect of the proposed allocation on the significance of Vivers Mill and this is summarised in the Site Selection Methodology and settlement background paper. The Council has prepared a further paper which expands on this to outline the considerations in more detail.

Policy: SD6 - Housing Allocation - Land to the West of Malton Road, Pickering: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
Site 200 lies within/or partly within an area identified under a Policy or (if applicable, several Policies) of the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for safeguarding. Therefore, in the event that the Joint Plan is adopted and the site is allocated in the Local Plan adopted by the District Council, the County Council should be consulted on the planning application associated with this development as it is not considered currently to meet the exemption criteria in the Joint Plan.				
RDC Comment				
The Site Selection Methodology identified sites where a minerals safeguarding designation was in place. It also recognised that some sites, being adjacent to existing residential development would not be suitable to provide a mineral extraction resource. The Council has taken the emerging safeguarding policy into account in identifying land allocations in line with the Local Plan Strategy and in balancing a range of sustainability considerations. The plan process itself has taken these issues into account and on that basis, the text of the plan does not need to make explicit reference to this matter.				

Policy: SD6 - Housing Allocation - Land to the West of Malton Road, Pickering: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
Pickering Primary – 360 LP dwellings – both the existing community Schools, Pickering Infants and Pickering Junior, would need some expansion. Any significant uplift in the allocation figure would need a review of the need for an additional education site. For Pickering secondary; Lady Lumley's has surplus capacity so no expansion would be needed.				
RDC Comment				
Noted. The existing permissions in Pickering have been pre-CIL, and subject to educational contributions. As the District Council has a CIL charge in place,				

Education contributions would be covered by the CIL charge.

Policy: SD7 - Housing Allocation - Land to the south of Swineherd Lane, Kirkbymoorside: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
A Purser				
Comment				
Site 156 should be removed from the plan. The development of site 156 would result in coalescence with Keldholme which contravenes objectives of the plan. It would also result in the loss of dog walking amenity land at a Town with deficiencies in Market Town amenity space. The site is also part of a medieval field system; is a VIUA and is within an Area of High Landscape Value which should mean that it is not suitable for development.				
The site is graded as a Group 2 site but another site (ref 431) which was grouped in Group 3 was not taken forward.				
RDC Comment				
Site 156 was chosen as a proposed allocation for a range of reasons. The loss of the site from the strip field system is acknowledged as the reason for a Group 2 status. However, account was taken of the fact that the field boundary is retained, the site does not extend beyond the sports field, therefore is not resulting in visual/physical coalescence. The relationship to Kirkbymoorside's built form was also taken into account, and it was considered that this, combined with the sustainable location of the site, as it is well located to the town centre, meant that it was considered on balance acceptable to be identified as an allocation. The Area of High Landscape Value and VIUA designations, and the impact on those designations was considered, and it was concluded that development of this site would not materially undermine the residual areas of land which are subject to those landscape designations. The Public Rights of Way will remain in place and provide access to the fields beyond. 431 is a large site, of which the southern half would have been particularly prominent. The Council also received no subsequent information about that site's capability of being developed.				

Policy: SD7 - Housing Allocation - Land to the south of Swineherd Lane, Kirkbymoorside: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo W&W Estates	No			
Comment				
Support the proposed allocation of land south of Swineherd Lane for residential development. The site can deliver a comprehensive development of market and affordable housing and other socio-economic benefits in a sustainable and suitable location. There are no technical or environmental constraints that would preclude the development of the site. The site is deliverable (suitable, available and achievable) and is a logical extension to the Town. Development proposals for the site will deliver each of the development principles for the site.				
RDC Comment				
Noted. The Council has proposed the allocation of the site for a number of reasons. It is well located to the Town Centre and the size of the site (and others				

proposed at Kirkbymoorside) provide a combination/range of sites of different sizes at the Town. The development of the site will result in a limited incursion into historic strip fields and the Area of High Landscape Value and VIUA but this is balanced against accessibility of the site, its relationship to existing development and the spatial principles for growing the town which are included in the Local Plan Strategy and is mitigated by the limited extent of the proposed allocation.

Policy: SD7 - Housing Allocation - Land to the south of Swineherd Lane, Kirkbymoorside: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
Site 156 lies outside any area identified within the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for safeguarding and hence it is not considered that any safeguarding issues are likely to arise.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD7 - Housing Allocation - Land to the south of Swineherd Lane, Kirkbymoorside: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Scaling and Falkingham	Yes	Justified		
Comment				
Advocate the inclusion of site 156 in the plan.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD8 - Housing Allocation - Land to the north of Keld Head Close, Kirkbymoorside: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo E Humble				
Comment				
Support the allocation of site 201 in Kirkbymoorside and the principles set out in the plan.				

RDC Comment

Policy: SD8 - Housing Allocation - Land to the north of Keld Head Close, Kirkbymoorside: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
Site 206 lies within/or partly within an area identified under a Policy or (if applicable, several Policies) of the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for safeguarding. Therefore, in the event that the Joint Plan is adopted and the site is allocated in the Local Plan adopted by the District Council, the County Council should be consulted on the planning application associated with this development as it not considered currently to meet the exemption criteria in the Joint Plan.				
RDC Comment				
There is no site 206 identified on the policies map, there is a site 201 which is SD8. The Site Selection Methodology identified sites where a minerals safeguarding designation was in place. It also recognised that some sites, being adjacent to existing residential development would not be suitable to provide a mineral extraction resource. The Council has taken the emerging safeguarding policy into account in identifying land allocations in line with the Local Plan Strategy and in balancing a range of sustainability considerations. The plan process itself has taken these issues into account and on that basis, the text of the plan does not need to make explicit reference to this matter.				

Policy: SD8 - Housing Allocation - Land to the north of Keld Head Close, Kirkbymoorside: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Scaling and Falkingham	No	National Policy		
Comment				
The development of site 156 along with site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more appropriate and comprehensive alternative to the allocation of sites 201 and 265.				
Sites 201 and 265 are not considered to be as deliverable as site 666 particularly given the infrastructure works required to facilitate the development of site 201 and remediation and limited potential yield associated with site 265.				
The development of site 156 and our clients site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more sustainable option than sites 201 and 265 particularly given the peripheral locations of the two other sites away from the Town Centre.				
RDC Comment				
Site 265 is subject of a planning application, and is only 70 metres further east than site 666, it is a Brownfield Site. Site 201 is closest of the option choices				

to the north, and it is because of the lack of connectivity, site 156, a Group 2 site based on the strip field system, was also included. Site 201 is a modest greenfield site, with residential development adjacent to it. It is no more requiring of infrastructure works than site 666, and is on a flatter area of land.

Policy: SD8 - Housing Allocation - Land to the north of Keld Head Close, Kirkbymoorside: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Scaling and Falkingham	No	Justified		
Comment				
The development of site 156 along with site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more appropriate and comprehensive alternative to the allocation of sites 201 and 265.				
Sites 201 and 265 are not considered to be as deliverable as site 666 particularly given the infrastructure works required to facilitate the development of site 201 and remediation and limited potential yield associated with site 265.				
The development of site 156 and our clients site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more sustainable option than sites 201 and 265 particularly given the peripheral locations of the two other sites away from the Town Centre.				
RDC Comment				
Site 265 is subject of a planning application, and is only 70 metres further east than site 666, it is a Brownfield Site. Site 201 is closest of the option choices to the north, and it is because of the lack of connectivity, site 156, a Group 2 site based on the strip field system, was also included. Site 201 is a modest greenfield site, with residential development adjacent to it. It is no more requiring of infrastructure works than site 666, and is on a flatter area of land.				

Policy: SD8 - Housing Allocation - Land to the north of Keld Head Close, Kirkbymoorside: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Scaling and Falkingham	No	Effective		
Comment				
The development of site 156 along with site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more appropriate and comprehensive alternative to the allocation of sites 201 and 265.				
Sites 201 and 265 are not considered to be as deliverable as site 666 particularly given the infrastructure works required to facilitate the development of site 201 and remediation and limited potential yield associated with site 265.				
The development of site 156 and our clients site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more sustainable option than sites 201 and 265 particularly given the peripheral locations of the two other sites away from the Town Centre.				
RDC Comment				

Site 265 is subject of a planning application, and is only 70 metres further east than site 666, it is a Brownfield Site. Site 201 is closest of the option choices to the north, and it is because of the lack of connectivity, site 156, a Group 2 site based on the strip field system, was also included. Site 201 is a modest greenfield site, with residential development adjacent to it. It is no more requiring of infrastructure works than site 666, and is on a flatter area of land.

Policy: SD9 - Housing Allocation - Brickworks Site, to north of Swineherd Lane, Kirkbymoorside: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo W&W Estates				
Comment				
A larger development option at land south of Swineherd Lane should be considered preferable to both of the proposed land allocations SD8 and SD9 or allocated in addition to them given that it can be considered a more sustainable and deliverable site than both of the proposed allocations. A comprehensive development in one single location will bring greater socio-economic benefits and will reduce the impact on the character of the Town and the wider landscape setting. There is direct developer interest in this option. It is not known whether there is developer interest in sites SD8 and SD9 which could be a delay to delivery or a reflection of a lack of developer interest.				
RDC Comment				
The deliverability of other sites in Kirkbymoorside is not in question. The Local Planning Authority has set out in the evidence base to support the plan the reasons why it has not chosen to include site 666. Site 156, a Group 2 site based on the strip field system, was included because of the accessibility of the site combined with a limited incursion into the Area of High Landscape Value and VIUA. The extended site (including 666) would represent a significant visual incursion into the Area of High Landscape Value, and would be further eroding the strip field system. Site 265 is subject of a planning application, and is only 70 metres further east than site 666, it is a Brownfield site. Site 201 is closest of the option choices to the north, and although elevated is within walking distance of the town centre. Site 201 is a modest greenfield site, with residential development adjacent to it. It is no more requiring of infrastructure works than site 666, and is on a flatter area of land.				

Policy: SD9 - Housing Allocation - Brickworks Site, to north of Swineherd Lane, Kirkbymoorside: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
Site 265 lies within/or partly within an area identified under a Policy or (if applicable, several Policies) of the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for safeguarding. Therefore, in the event that the Joint Plan is adopted and the site is allocated in the Local Plan adopted by the District Council, the County Council should be consulted on the planning application associated with this development as it is not considered currently to meet the exemption criteria in the Joint Plan.				
RDC Comment				

The Site Selection Methodology identified sites where a minerals safeguarding designation was in place. It also recognised that some sites, being adjacent to existing residential development would not be suitable to provide a mineral extraction resource. The Council has taken the emerging safeguarding policy into account in identifying land allocations in line with the Local Plan Strategy and in balancing a range of sustainability considerations. The plan process itself has taken these issues into account and on that basis, the text of the plan does not need to make explicit reference to this matter.

Policy: SD9 - Housing Allocation - Brickworks Site, to north of Swineherd Lane, Kirkbymoorside: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Scaling and Falkingham	No	National Policy		
Comment				
The development of site 156 along with site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more appropriate and comprehensive alternative to the allocation of sites 201 and 265.				
Sites 201 and 265 are not considered to be as deliverable as site 666 particularly given the infrastructure works required to facilitate the development of site 201 and remediation and limited potential yield associated with site 265.				
The development of site 156 and our clients site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more sustainable option than sites 201 and 265 particularly given the peripheral locations of the two other sites away from the Town Centre.				
RDC Comment				
Site 265 is subject of a planning application, and is only 70 metres further east than site 666. It is brownfield site. Site 201 is closest of the option choices to the north, and it is because of the lack of connectivity, site 156, a Group 2 site based on the strip field system, was also included. Site 201 is a modest greenfield site, with residential development adjacent to it. It is no more requiring of infrastructure works than site 666, and is on a flatter area of land.				

Policy: SD9 - Housing Allocation - Brickworks Site, to north of Swineherd Lane, Kirkbymoorside: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Scaling and Falkingham	No	Justified		
Comment				
The development of site 156 along with site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more appropriate and comprehensive alternative to the allocation of sites 201 and 265.				
Sites 201 and 265 are not considered to be as deliverable as site 666 particularly given the infrastructure works required to facilitate the development of site 201 and remediation and limited potential yield associated with site 265.				
The development of site 156 and our clients site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more sustainable option than sites 201 and 265 particularly				

given the peripheral locations of the two other sites away from the Town Centre.

RDC Comment

Site 265 is subject of a planning application, and is only 70 metres further east than site 666. It is brownfield site. Site 201 is closest of the option choices to the north, and it is because of the lack of connectivity, site 156, a Group 2 site based on the strip field system, was also included. Site 201 is a modest greenfield site, with residential development adjacent to it. It is no more requiring of infrastructure works than site 666, and is on a flatter area of land.

Policy: SD9 - Housing Allocation - Brickworks Site, to north of Swineherd Lane, Kirkbymoorside: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Scaling and Falkingham	No	Effective		
Comment				
The development of site 156 along with site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more appropriate and comprehensive alternative to the allocation of sites 201 and 265.				
Sites 201 and 265 are not considered to be as deliverable as site 666 particularly given the infrastructure works required to facilitate the development of site 201 and remediation and limited potential yield associated with site 265.				
The development of site 156 and our clients site 666 has been demonstrated to represent a more sustainable option than sites 201 and 265 particularly given the peripheral locations of the two other sites away from the Town Centre.				
RDC Comment				
Site 265 is subject of a planning application, and is only 70 metres further east than site 666. It is brownfield site. Site 201 is closest of the option choices to the north, and it is because of the lack of connectivity, site 156, a Group 2 site based on the strip field system, was also included. Site 201 is a modest greenfield site, with residential development adjacent to it. It is no more requiring of infrastructure works than site 666, and is on a flatter area of land.				

Policy: SD10 - Housing Allocation- Land to the south of Amotherby Primary School, Amotherby: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Amotherby Parish Council				
Comment				
The allocation fails to meet the policy requirements of the Local Plan Strategy and the NPPF. The development is not small in scale and in this respect will be in conflict with SP1 of the Local Plan Strategy. It will be detrimental to the character of the settlement and its setting in conflict with SP1, SP12,Sp13 and SP20 of the Local Plan Strategy.				
The site is too large and has a poor relationship with the village. Its development at the scale proposed will have an adverse impact on a substantially linear				

settlement.

Development of the site may lead to an expansion of the school which will add to traffic congestion and there is no guarantee that the proposed kiss and drop facility would be of benefit to the village.

RDC Comment

The Local Plan Strategy makes it clear that the size of sites (para 4.18) is indicative.

The District Council is of the view that the development of the site would not be detrimental to the character of the settlement and is well located to the village being immediately adjacent to the primary school which is centrally located in the village.

Policy: SD10 - Housing Allocation- Land to the south of Amotherby Primary School, Amotherby: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo D Hume	No			
Comment				
Object to the proposed allocation of Site 148 at Amotherby and its preference over Site 365. Concerned over inaccuracies in the Site Selection methodology and in the supporting information - (Amotherby Background Paper). There is no clarity around the deliverability of site 148. The site is not in a single ownership and there are known problems with running sand and non quantified ground conditions. (The Parish Council's concerns with the proposed allocation of site 148 are repeated in the response)				
RDC Comment				
The Council has previously responded to the perceived inaccuracies as part of the response to the Sites Consultation in 2015 regarding sites 365, 341, 8 and 148. The Council is aware that there is developer interest, and that whilst the land is multiple ownership all of the landowners are in agreement for the site's development, and a planning consultant has provided information about the potential delivery of the site. Whilst they have not made a representation as part of the Publication, they have provided confirmation subsequently. The ground conditions would be considered through a geotechnical survey which can be submitted with the planning application, noting the proximity of residential development already to the immediate east of the site.				

Policy: SD10 - Housing Allocation- Land to the south of Amotherby Primary School, Amotherby: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Howardian Hills AONB Manager				
Comment				
Considerable concerns about the location of the proposed land allocation at Amotherby (Site 148) next to the boundary of the AONB and the potential impact on the setting of the AONB. It was not clear in previous material that the site was to be considered and this has led me to miss it in responses to previous consultations.				

RDC Comment
The site in question has been put forward by landowners and has been part of consultations on the plan. In 2015 as part of the public consultation, the site was identified as a group 2 site due to land ownership complexities, which have since been resolved.
The LPA is aware of the sites location in relation to the AONB and has considered this as part of the plan process. It is the view of the Local Planning Authority that the development of the site would not have an unacceptable impact on the nationally protected landscape or its setting. The development would be strongly visually linked with the existing settlement in the landscape.

Policy: SD10 - Housing Allocation- Land to the south of Amotherby Primary School, Amotherby: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Historic England	No	Justified		
Comment				
The area lies within an extensive archaeological landscape which stretches along the Vale of Pickering with a high probability that the area will contain archaeological remains potentially of national significance. It is essential that the plan alerts prospective developers to the likelihood that they may encounter important archaeological remains and that it explains how they might need to deal with this. (Suggested wording for the policy and for an appendix to the document, based on the approach taken by Scarborough Borough Council is provided).				
RDC Comment				
Noted. The Council would have no objection to the inclusion of the proposed appendix which would operate / be applied in conjunction with Policy SP12 of the Local Plan Strategy.				

Policy: SD10 - Housing Allocation- Land to the south of Amotherby Primary School, Amotherby: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
Site 148 lies within/or partly within an area identified under a policy or (if applicable, several Policies) of the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for safeguarding. Therefore, in the event that the Joint Plan is adopted and the site is allocated in the Local Plan adopted by the District Council, the County Council should be consulted on the planning application associated with this development as it not considered currently to meet the exemption criteria in the Joint Plan.				
RDC Comment				
The Site Selection Methodology identified sites where a minerals safeguarding designation was in place. It also recognised that some sites, being adjacent				

to existing residential development would not be suitable to provide a mineral extraction resource. The Council has taken the emerging safeguarding policy into account in identifying land allocations in line with the Local Plan Strategy and in balancing a range of sustainability considerations. The plan process itself has taken these issues into account and on that basis, the text of the plan does not need to make explicit reference to this matter.

Policy: SD10 - Housing Allocation- Land to the south of Amotherby Primary School, Amotherby: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
Amotherby – 40 LP dwellings – Amotherby CP School is operating under capacity and it is anticipated no expansion will be needed.				
RDC Comment				
Noted. The Council has updated its IDP to reflect this information.				

Policy: SD11 - Housing Allocation - Land to the south of Aspen Way, Slingsby: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Historic England	No	Justified		
Comment				
The area lies within an extensive archaeological landscape which stretches along the Vale of Pickering with a high probability that the area will contain archaeological remains potentially of national significance. It is essential that the plan alerts prospective developers to the likelihood that they may encounter important archaeological remains and that it explains how they might need to deal with this. (Suggested wording for the policy and for an appendix to the document, based on the approach taken by Scarborough Borough Council is provided).				
RDC Comment				
Noted. The Council would have no objection to the inclusion of the proposed appendix which would operate / be applied in conjunction with Policy SP12 of the Local Plan Strategy.				

Policy: SD11 - Housing Allocation - Land to the south of Aspen Way, Slingsby: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Historic England	No	Justified		
Comment				

Part of this site lies within the Slingsby Conservation Area. In order to demonstrate that the allocation of this area is not incompatible with national policy or SP12 of the Local Plan Strategy, there needs to be an assessment of what contribution this undeveloped area makes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and what effect loss/development of the site might have on the designated area.

RDC Comment

The Council has considered the effect of the proposed allocation on the conservation area and this is summarised in the Site Selection Methodology and settlement background paper. The Council has prepared a further paper which expands on this to outline the considerations in more detail.

Policy: SD11 - Housing Allocation - Land to the south of Aspen Way, Slingsby: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
Site 464 lies within/or partly within an area identified under a Policy or (if applicable, several Policies) of the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for safeguarding. Therefore, in the event that the Joint Plan is adopted and the site is allocated in the Local Plan adopted by the District Council, the County Council should be consulted on the planning application associated with this development as it not considered currently to meet the exemption criteria in the Joint Plan.				
RDC Comment				
The Site Selection Methodology identified sites where a minerals safeguarding designation was in place. It also recognised that some sites, being adjacent to existing residential development would not be suitable to provide a mineral extraction resource. The Council has taken the emerging safeguarding policy into account in identifying land allocations in line with the Local Plan Strategy and in balancing a range of sustainability considerations. The plan process itself has taken these issues into account and on that basis, the text of the plan does not need to make explicit reference to this matter.				

Policy: SD11 - Housing Allocation - Land to the south of Aspen Way, Slingsby: Development Principles

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
Slingsby – 36 LP dwellings – School will be operating at capacity and difficult to expand, however significant numbers of children attending the school come from out-catchment so expansion may not be required				
RDC Comment				
Noted. The existing permissions in Slingsby have been pre-CIL, nor were of a scale which warranted an educational contribution. As The District Council has a CIL charge in place, Education contributions would be covered by the CIL charge.				

Policy: SD12 - New Employment Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Norton on Derwent Town Council				
Comment				
SD12 - New Employment land allocations - York Road Industrial Estate, land at Norton Grove and the Agri-Business Park, Eden House Road are broadly supported by the Council				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD12 - New Employment Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Commercial Development Projects and Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation				
Comment				
Not sound, not legally compliant. Particular reference to site 578 and 678 (579). Was identified as a preferred site in 2015 consultation, submitted representations which confirmed the sites were suitable as they were deliverable and developable. Note that a broad location has been identified but would help if the site was properly defined as per that in our 2015 representations that would remove any uncertainty/ ambiguity regarding the extent. Certainty will be a key issue for any interested occupier, and similarly will also be required if further investment in infrastructure on that site is to proceed. This out to be a relatively simple revision prior to the submission of the DPD.				
RDC Comment				
(678 does not exist) Council refer to 579. The LPA has set out the specific reasons why the site is not identified as a specifically defined extent. This is due to site specific issues such as archaeology, power lines, and the surface water management. It is also due to the land take of those site extents being well in excess of the plan requirements, and the low take up of sites at York Road, and the slow progress at Eden House Road. The Local Plan Sites Document identifies the locality as the longer-term area for expansion. This is sufficient for the remainder of this Plan Period.				

Policy: SD12 - New Employment Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust				

Comment
The Trust is however concerned that the policies in the full plan for no net loss of biodiversity and net gain of biodiversity as a result of development in Ryedale will mean that land may be required to mitigate or compensate for loss of habitat within development sites. There may be a need for an assessment of whether additional land will be required to ensure biodiversity is protected. For the larger sites a draft masterplan may be required to ensure that there will be sufficient open space or compensation habitat.
RDC Comment
The sites identified for allocation have limited biodiversity, most being cropped farmland. Were there any particular sensitivities, these will be addressed through the planning application process, as matters regarding conservation of habitats and species, in terms of establishing mitigation/compensatory habitats cannot be undertaken by condition. The larger sites have indicative masterplans, which have identified green infrastructure elements to enhance biodiversity. It is not expected that site's extents will be enlarged for habitat compensation/mitigation as they will be expected to ensure that these are integrated into the site.

Policy: SD12 - New Employment Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
Support principle of identification of future employment growth, but seek additional clarification of detailed site boundaries and principles of development to ensure effective alignment with the adopted Malton Food Enterprise Zone Local Development Order and Design Code, and to ensure compatibility of use and design that supports effective place-making.				
RDC Comment				
The Council has not established the boundaries due to only requiring a small residual requirement of employment land. The broad location is identified to steer future employment land needs if required during the plan period. The land would be provided to meet a range of employment land uses and is not necessarily aligned to the FEZ LDO.				

Policy: SD12 - New Employment Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Highways England	No	Justified		
Comment				
Highways England does not support the approach of continuing to support sites in principle in the event the current permission expires. There may have been a material change in the operation of the SRN since the time the permission was granted. It is expected that Highways England would be consulted on				

each planning application to re-assess the impact on the SRN.

RDC Comment

The Local Planning Authority is only committing sites which have been considered through the adopted development plan since April 2012 and identifying them to meet the employment land requirement as set out in the adopted development Plan. Most of the employment land is provided through existing permissions. If we were unable to rely on such permissions we would be committed to allocating land well above the Ryedale Plan-Local Plan Strategy's requirements and tolerances, which would be, contrary to the adopted strategic plan (which was supported by Highways England), place significant pressure on the settlements subject of these sites, and result in a material change to the operation of the SRN, as at present those committed sites have planning consent and would still come forward (as we have evidence that they are deliverable) alongside the extra allocations. If planning applications were made Highways England would be consulted in accordance with the prescribed requirements.

Policy: SD12 - New Employment Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Highways England	No	Justified		
Comment				
The cumulative impacts of allocated sites in SD2, SD12 and SD15 should be assessed in terms of their impact on the SRN. The 2016 Jacobs work only considered impact on the local network.				
RDC Comment				
Sites allocated in SD2 and SD12 represent a contribution to the quanitums of Development which the Highways England endorsed as part of the Strategic Plan, the Local Plan Strategy. These sites (and the completions and commitments) do not exceed those tolerances.				
SD15 is designed to support in principle, further development within these sites. At present there are no specific proposals which can be quantified in terms of their impact on the SRN. This would be something that would need to be undertaken if and when subsequent planning applications are received.				
Work undertaken by Jacobs in response to Highways England comments has demonstrated that the operation of the three A64 junctions is well within operating capacity with planned growth/proposed allocations.				

Policy: SD12 - New Employment Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Historic England	No	Justified		
Comment				
The employment land allocation at Thornton Road lies within an extensive archaeological landscape which stretches along the Vale of Pickering with a high probability that the area will contain archaeological remains potentially of national significance. It is essential that the plan alerts prospective developers to				

the likelihood that they may encounter important archaeological remains and that it explains how they might need to deal with this. (Suggested wording for the policy and for an appendix to the document, based on the approach taken by Scarborough Borough Council is provided).

RDC Comment

The plan has identified sites for development which is in accordance with the spatial strategy established in the adopted Local Plan Strategy. The spatial strategy was fully justified as part of that process and in the knowledge of the significance of the Vale Of Pickering.

In considering sites, the Council has sought the advice of the County Council's Heritage Unit at an early stage on all the sites subjected to the Site Selection Methodology, who advised on the likelihood of archaeological remains based on the HER. A number of sites which have become allocations have also undertaken archaeological evaluation, including trial trenching at some sites, which has been considered by the County Heritage Unit. The allocation of the sites proposed and broad location for employment have been made on the basis that they represent sustainably located sites. Policy SP12 of the Local Plan Strategy will be applied when planning applications are prepared and will be used to minimise loss of important archaeology.

Archaeological evaluation undertaken as part of a planning application for the site confirmed that there were no archaeological features present on these previously developed site.

Policy: SD12 - New Employment Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
It appears that the 'Broad Location for Future Employment' to the north east of Malton would, if developed, be on land to the north of the A64 and east of the A169, in which case it would also lie outside any area identified within the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for safeguarding.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD12 - New Employment Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
Sites 588, 650 and 657 lie outside any area identified within the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for safeguarding and hence it is not considered that any safeguarding issues are likely to arise.				
RDC Comment				

Noted.

Policy: SD12 - New Employment Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
Site 21 lies within an area identified under a minerals safeguarding policy or (if applicable, several Policies) and the development proposed may fit within the exemption criteria identified in the Joint Plan (if adopted).				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD12 - New Employment Land Allocations

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
Site 608 lies within/or partly within an area identified under a Policy or (if applicable, several Policies) of the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for safeguarding. Therefore, in the event that the Joint Plan is adopted and the site is allocated in the Local Plan adopted by the District Council, the County Council should be consulted on the planning application associated with this development as it not considered currently to meet the exemption criteria in the Joint Plan.				
RDC Comment				
The Site Selection Methodology identified sites where a minerals safeguarding designation was in place. It also recognised that some sites, being adjacent to existing residential development would not be suitable to provide a mineral extraction resource. The Council has taken the emerging safeguarding policy into account in identifying land allocations in line with the Local Plan Strategy and in balancing a range of sustainability considerations. The plan process itself has taken these issues into account and on that basis, the text of the plan does not need to make explicit reference to this matter.				

Policy: SD12 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
F T Gooder	No			

Comment
Sites 542 and 543. 542 Previously developed site of agricultural use. Allocated as an employment site in the 2006 Employment Land Review. Continued into the 2010 Employment Land Review, which mentioned flood risk. Consider that Beck House is outside Flood Zones 2 and 3. Disagrees with the SSM findings of significant flood risk, harm to the Derwent SAC and Harm to the setting of St. Mary's priory church. The site is further away from the church than the proposed sites. Re-development offers the potential to mitigate against pollution threats from intensive agriculture. Shouldn't be in group 1. Access can be delivered to Highways England Standards- documents provided, to confirm development of B1, B2, B8 uses and a petrol filling station.
RDC Comment
The Council is confident that it has identified the commitments and a proposed broad location for the sustainable supply of employment land to meet planned requirements and future growth. Agricultural buildings are not classified as brownfield land. The employment land review is a piece of evidence which informs planning policy. The site extent of site 68 would have some areas of Flood Zone 3, and the sites would be either adjacent or proximal to a tributary of the River Derwent SAC. The sites 68,542 and 543 did not pass stage one due to it not being proximal to Malton/Norton, nor an established or under construction industrial Estate/Business park, to provide strategically located employment land to deliver within the plan period employment land needs. The Local Planning Authority is confused with the reference to the SSM findings, as such conclusions regarding St. Mary's were not made regarding these sites. The access to the site was a concern, but until Publication, no documentation was provided to be able to consider it. Whether the sites now have a satisfactory access still does not overcome the lack of ability to contribute to strategic planning considerations.

Policy: SD12 - Omissions

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo The Brewis Family/Halifax Estate	No		No	Yes
Comment				
Policy SD12 - Objection - The focus of employment land on the NAFIC at the expense of other suitable locations in Malton / Norton and lack of inclusion of sites in Policy SD12. The Councils approach to the location of development is set out in Policy SP1 of the Local Plan Strategy (adopted in 2013). This policy sets out the focus for development being Malton and Norton, subject to various criteria. The site is promoted as the focus for employment investment in Malton / Norton allied to the Agri-Business Park / Food Enterprise Zone. This approach is not supported given:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Policy SD12 does not accord with the requirements of the NPPF in that the sites does not match the strategy for local and inward investment and does not meet anticipated needs over the plan period; <input type="checkbox"/> The identification of this site as the site to meet outstanding requirements is not soundly based; <input type="checkbox"/> The identification of land to the north of the A64 / east of the A169 (for B1, B2 and B8 uses) does not accord with the policy approach of Policy SP1; <input type="checkbox"/> The land to meet additional unidentified requirements is not located in a sustainable location; <input type="checkbox"/> There is no evidence to suggest that this expansion land will be required or be attractive to the market if associated solely with the Agri-Business Park / FEZ; 				

- | |
|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> The site is allocated for B1, B2 and B8 which could be readily accommodated elsewhere; and |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Alternative sites (such as sites 655 and 184 in combination) have not been considered as required by the NPPF. |

RDC Comment

The NAFIC site is not considered in SD12, but SD15. SD12 reflects the number of outstanding commitments and residual land supply, and the broad location identifies the strategic future direction for employment land (which is by its nature provided as B1,B2 and B8 uses), and is therefore not aligned to the agri business park or the FEZ. It is considered that it is suitable and appropriate approach given the existing commitments. 655 was considered for housing and/or employment land as it was mixed - and site 184 for employment land (as submitted by the site submitter) in various configurations had a number of constraints, which the identified broad location (SD12) does not have.

Policy: SD13 - Expansion Land for Existing Employers

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Maw Family				
Comment				

SD13 not sound. Contend that Site 259 remains an available, deliverable and achievable development site to meet arising housing needs while also providing the means to maintain economic opportunities in the area – either through facilitating relocation or redevelopment of the adjoining Sylatech site. Our clients land is proposed for allocation for expansion purposes and could be pursued on a mixed-use basis given previous comments submitted as part of the plan process, the underlying objective and past collaborative approach. Letter 23 November 2016 - Concerning Expansion Land for Existing Employers - conclusion premature to delete this designation, and that it should remain in place. Letters October 2016 and June 2017 - Set out delivery of housing on sites 259 and 454, and this would be phased to bring site 454 last. Allowing the Sylatech production to remain in operation through landscaping and boundary treatments. The development of site 259 with or without 454 will facilitate the delivery of site 650 at Pickering.

RDC Comment

It is not clear from the representation what the soundness issue is. The Local Planning Authority has retained the employment land expansion land, which is reflective of the letter sent by ELG for the retention of the designation. Sylatech has confirmed that they no longer have plans to relocate to Pickering and will remain at Kirkbymoorside. Sylatech have had a close relationship with the Maw family representative and the Local Planning Authority can only assume that in resolving to stay at Kirkbymoorside, that the company would be confident in the knowledge that expansion land would be available if required.

Policy: SD13 - Expansion Land for Existing Employers

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Vellco Tyres	No			
Comment				

An amendment to the development limits and allocation of land to the east of the existing employment site for the expansion of the operation would accord with SP6 and would allow for a continuation of existing operations in Weaverthorpe to the benefit of the local economy and in the interests of sustainable development. Although the site is in an Area of High Landscape Value, the site is of little landscape value. Development of the site would round off the village envelope.

RDC Comment

The role of SD13 is a continuation on from the original policy in the 2002 Local Plan, and was undertaken on the basis that the companies involved had made investment decisions on the land and that the land was important to their long term business plans. This is why the policy specifically refers to that company and so cannot be applied to other companies, and is not included within the Development Limits. Policy SP6 in the Local Plan Strategy, is concerned with the location and supply of economic development, and is the policy framework for considering other businesses proposals for expansion. Any proposal made under SD13 would still have comply with the rest of the provisions of the Development Plan.

Policy: SD13 - Expansion Land for Existing Employers

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Highways England	No	Justified		
Comment				
Highways England does not support the approach of continuing to support sites in principle in the event the current permission expires. There may have been a material change in the operation of the SRN since the time the permission was granted. It is expected that Highways England would be consulted on each planning application to re-assess the impact on the SRN.				
RDC Comment				
The expansion land for existing employers covers three sites in Kirkbymoorside and Amotherby, they are established businesses, the sites are not subject to a permission. Highways England is consulted on the planning applications in accordance with the statutory guidelines.				

Policy: SD13 - Expansion Land for Existing Employers

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Highways England	No	Justified		
Comment				
It is possible that the expansion of existing businesses could have an impact on the SRN. Highways England would require that an assessment is undertaken prior to any expansion that suitably details the impacts of the development.				
RDC Comment				

Noted. Any proposals on the land identified in SD13 would require the submission of a planning application, or in the first instance a pre-application enquiry, as it is not clear what if any changes could result from expansion/reconfiguration of the premises in terms of extra traffic generation. As part of our Local List Validation, substantive proposals Transport Assessments and Travel Plans would be required accordingly to provide the Highway Authority, and Highways England (if required) with an assessment of the impact of the proposal on the highway network.

Policy: SD13 - Expansion Land for Existing Employers

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
Site 259 lies outside any area identified within the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for safeguarding and hence it is not considered that any safeguarding issues are likely to arise.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD13 - Expansion Land for Existing Employers

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
Site 371 lies within an area identified under a minerals safeguarding policy or (if applicable, several Policies) and the development proposed may fit within the exemption criteria identified in the Joint Plan (if adopted).				
RDC Comment				
Noted				

Policy: SD13 - Expansion Land for Existing Employers

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				

Comment
Site 489 lies within/or partly within an area identified under a Policy or (if applicable, several Policies) of the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for safeguarding. Therefore, in the event that the Joint Plan is adopted and the site is allocated in the Local Plan adopted by the District Council, the County Council should be consulted on the planning application associated with this development as it not considered currently to meet the exemption criteria in the Joint Plan.
RDC Comment
The Site Selection Methodology identified sites where a minerals safeguarding designation was in place. It also recognised that some sites, being adjacent to existing residential development would not be suitable to provide a mineral extraction resource. The Council has taken the emerging safeguarding policy into account in identifying land allocations in line with the Local Plan Strategy and in balancing a range of sustainability considerations. The plan process itself has taken these issues into account and on that basis, the text of the plan does not need to make explicit reference to this matter.

Policy: SD13 - Expansion Land for Existing Employers

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Howardian Hills AONB Manager	No	Justified		
Comment				
Accept that this is an allocation the company wish to retain but this is a particularly open part of the AONB on the dip-slope of the escarpment with wide ranging views. Any future development will need to be sympathetically located and designed to comply with SP13 and national policy.				
RDC Comment				
It is noted that the siting of this expansion land for Zwanenberg (Malton Foods) is on land within the AONB, which has particular landscape sensitivities. The policy is very specific in its application, and would still require compliance with SP13 of the Local Plan Strategy, and other policies of the Local Plan Strategy.				

Policy: SD14 - Retail Commitments

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Norton on Derwent Town Council				
Comment				
SD14- Retail Commitments- Malton Livestock Market site and former Dewhirst Factory site are both supported by the Council				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD14 - Retail Commitments

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
Sites 250, 442 and Dewhirst site lie within an area identified under a minerals safeguarding policy or (if applicable, several Policies) and the development proposed may fit within the exemption criteria identified in the Joint Plan (if adopted).				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD15 - Flamingo Land and the National Agri-Food Innovation Campus

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Church Commissioners for England				
Comment				
Consider the rolling forward of existing Development Limits for the NAFIC site is unsound. Should identify neighbouring land (not within the Green belt) to allow for future expansion.				
RDC Comment				
The purpose of SD15 is to allow the reconfiguration of the existing site in principle, as the LEP identified that there was no need for expansion. There is policies SP6 an SP9 which would allow the principle of such expansion, if there was a need to expand. Such extensions to the site would be considered through the usual planning application process, examining the nature, scale and impact of the proposed use. No land has been submitted for an extension to the NAFIC site.				

Policy: SD15 - Flamingo Land and the National Agri-Food Innovation Campus

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Flamingo Land				
Comment				
There are areas on the fringes of the park which have been identified by the business to facilitate its expansion and SD15 should be amended to reflect this. Policy SP8 of the Local Plan Strategy aims to support the business plan and operational requirements of existing tourist and visitor attractions. The ability of				

the owners to implement their future business plans would be restricted by the development limits as currently drawn.

Flamingo land is generally supportive of the approach that has been taken in relation to development within the park boundary. We consider that additional wording should be included within SD15 which extends this approach to areas of the park that lie beyond the development limits to:

-support the reconfiguration of the holiday village to make qualitative improvements

-support the expansion of the zoo to the east

(suggested wording attached)

RDC Comment

The Local Planning Authority would need to understand the impact of the proposed works, and so the extending of the Development Limits in principle would not represent a justified and evidenced approach (acknowledging the existing development as a factual change)

Policy: SD15 - Flamingo Land and the National Agri-Food Innovation Campus

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Highways England	No	Justified		
Comment				
The cumulative impacts of allocated sites in SD2, SD12 and SD15 should be assessed in terms of their impact on the SRN. The 2016 Jacobs work only considered impact on the local network.				
RDC Comment				
SD15 is designed to support in principle, further development within these sites. At present there are no specific proposals which can be quantified in terms of their impact on the SRN. This would be something that would need to be undertaken if and when subsequent planning applications are received.				

Policy: SD15 - Flamingo Land and the National Agri-Food Innovation Campus

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Highways England	No	Justified		
Comment				
Highways England requires further information regarding the size of any potential expansion prior to confirming acceptability of the expansion of these sites.				
RDC Comment				
The policy aims to provide support in principle for the reconfiguration or intensification of uses within these sites. There are no specific expansion proposals at present. The LPA will consult HE on any future proposals to expand these uses if HE consider this to be necessary.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
A Dale	Yes			
Comment				
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites for the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
A Priestly	Yes			
Comment				
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites for the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents at all times of the year. This area should be protected in order to maintain the rural atmosphere of this beautiful town.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
A Resident of Welham Road	Yes			
Comment				
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and				

bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.
RDC Comment
Noted. This has no address on the representation.

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
C I Watson				
Comment				
It is unreasonable and unnecessary to designate part of my private garden as valued landscape when because of heavy vegetation screening this could only be valued by me. (Kirkbymoorside - 209 and 556)				
RDC Comment				
Visually Important Undeveloped areas are, in the vast majority, privately owned areas of land, which are unlikely to have public access. The site subject to this representation is not within the VIUA which runs down the eastern side of Kirkbymoorside. It is within a Conservation Area, and the land to the east is within the Area of High Landscape Value. This recognises that there are visual sensitivities, which would need to be considered if a development proposal is made.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
D A and J M Drinkwater	Yes			
Comment				
Support the proposed VIUA for land east of Welham Road. The Council is entitled to review and consider new sites for the area and to formulate a new policy for the Plan. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II listed buildings including historic racing stables. The PROW which run adjacent to the proposed VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Ryedale District Council				

D A Coe				
Comment	Object to the VIUA of plot 85 Low Street Thornton le Clay. Small area, on three side dwellings with a 15 metre road frontage. Not viewed when approaching the village, but only when passing it and so makes no contribution to the character and form of the village. The site is of no historical/archaeological interest nor near any such site or building- site does not fit any criteria used to identify VIUAs.			
RDC Comment	Council considers that form and character impacts regarding Visually Important Undeveloped Areas can be experienced from within the Settlement- as part of its character, and showing the intervisibility with other properties. As such it continues to meet the relevant test -Contribution the space makes to the overall form and character of the settlement.			

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
D Cartman	Yes			
Comment	Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.			
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
F Campion	No			
Comment	Strongly support the proposed VIUA between Welham Road and Langton Road, north of Bazeley's Lane and do not believe that development is appropriate in the area.			
The area of land which is the subject of outline planning permission should also be included in the proposed VIUA in the event that the permission expires.				
The VIUA is supported as this is not an area which is designated as apriority for development in the Local Plan. 'Area A' (map attached) forms part of an				

important division between the historic settlement of Whitewall and Norton. Whitewall House and stables are Grade II listed and are the oldest racing stables in Malton and Norton and the paddock in front has until recently been part of the training facilities.

Development in front of Whitewall would be catastrophic in terms of setting and noise. Bazeley's Lane is a Bridleway and Sustrans route which offer excellent views over the land by users of the lane.

The Area (Area A+B) are at the heart of Norton's racing industry and this is a sensitivity in this area. Development in this area would change its rural character and will be detrimental to the horse racing industry, setting of historic buildings and be detrimental to road safety on Bazeley's Lane.

RDC Comment

The support for the designation of the area of land between Welham and Langton Roads is noted. The Council has sought to explain that the designation of VIUA's is not concerned with intrinsic landscape character/quality. Whilst the area of land subject to the outline permission was consulted on as a potential VIUA, the Council is of the view that there is a very strong prospect of the application being taken forward. (A reserved matters application has been submitted).

The proposed VIUA designation has a set of criteria by which it is applied, and the setting of Listed Buildings and the ability of land to influence form and character are part of the criteria that are used by the LPA. Matters around the impact of traffic are not part of the consideration framework for the VIUA designation, and the designation has not been proposed on the basis of that matter. The District Council appreciate the concerns in this respect.

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
F Campion				
Comment				
The protection of the whole swathe of Norton (the approach to Norton from the south from Whitewall Hill, Langton Road and Beverley Road) should also be considered because together they constitute the main body of the racehorse training area of Norton.				
RDC Comment				
It is not the role of the VIUA designation to control potential conflicts between land uses. The purpose of the designation is to identify and retain undeveloped areas of land which contribute to the form and character of settlements and the setting of settlements and heritage assets.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
G Mort	Yes			
Comment				

Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables and contributes to the character of heritage assets. The footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.
RDC Comment
Noted.

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
G Perry	Yes			
Comment				
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites for the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables and contributes to the character of heritage assets. The footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
I Conlan				
Comment				
Any proposal to develop adjacent to the Howardian Hills AONB to be opposed such as along Castle Howard Road. Such development would harm a visually attractive area, and impact on the setting of the AONB in a harmful way and damage the amenity value for the dog walkers, and walkers and should be afforded the highest level of protection Green Space, or as a Visually Important Undeveloped Area.				
RDC Comment				
The Local Planning Authority has very carefully considered whether the land at Castle Howard Road should be a VIUA, and has concluded that whilst it provides an attractive edge to Malton, and forms part of the setting of the AONB, it is not considered that it meets the criteria established to assess undeveloped land for VIUA designation, as it does not influence the form and character of the settlement, and the Council has set out in detail in the background paper why it has not included this land within these designations.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
J A and AC Nolan				
Comment				
Wholeheartedly endorse the proposed extension to the existing VIUA to include land adjacent to Peasey Hills and all sides of Old Malton. Fully agree with the comments made by Conservation Officer. St. Mary's Priory Church is Grade I Listed, and important to the whole community so protecting the visual aspect by extending the VIUA is appropriate. This would fulfil the Council's long avowed intention to maintain open space separation between Malton and Old Malton.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
J A Goforth				
Comment				
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites from the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
J and J Pashby				
Comment				
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites from the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and				

bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.
RDC Comment
Noted.

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
J Farrow				
Comment				
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
J Halliwell				
Comment				
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
J Howard	Yes			

Comment
Supports VIUA for land east of Welham Road and provides a rebuttal to representations made in response to earlier consultation (by Gladman Development Ltd)
RDC Comment
Noted.

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
J Howden				
Comment				
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
J Priestley				
Comment				
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
J Rummel				
Comment	Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.			
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
K L Landahl				
Comment	Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.			
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
K Longmire				
Comment	Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.			
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
L M shirley				
Comment				
Support SP16 and Old Malton Map, all VIUAs around Old Malton, including land north of Westgate Lane. St Marys Priory Church is the only surviving Gilbertine Church in use. The open nature of the land surrounding the priory and village enhance the beauty of the of the priory and the village, it is imperative that these spaces remain as they are for future generations to enjoy.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
L Medley				
Comment				
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
L Tyler				
Comment				
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents. Welham Road and Bazeley's lane are already very				

busy routes and would struggle to take anymore activity.
RDC Comment
Noted.

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
M Dunning				
Comment				
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
M J Linsley	Yes			
Comment				
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
M Middlebrook	Yes			

Comment
I wish to commend the council for recognising that the area surrounding Old Malton in every direction should be designated as VIUA. It is vital that everything possible is done to protect the setting of the Old Malton conservation area. Wrapping the village with VIUA recognises the significant contribution that the surrounding open land makes to the character and setting of the village and also the important contribution it makes to the historical form and setting of Old Malton. The council has a long stated intention of keeping the separation between Old Malton and Malton and the VIUAs support this.
RDC Comment
Noted.

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo A L Kirk				
Comment				
Land at Back Lane VIUA designation SD16. There are no statutory or non-statutory designated sites and no known species of ecological importance on the site. There are no listed structures within or immediately adjacent to the site and whilst it is located adjacent to Ampleforth Conservation Area, it is not located within the Conservation Area itself. There are several Listed Buildings located within Ampleforth itself, the closest of which is located approximately 170m to the north west (The Manor House, Grade II Listed).				
The Proposed Local Plan Sites DPD outlines that sites are identified as VIUA's for one or more of the following reasons:				
<input type="checkbox"/> a site makes a significant contribution to the character or setting of the settlement; <input type="checkbox"/> a site provides an attractive setting for buildings within a settlement and/or; <input type="checkbox"/> a site makes an important contribution to the historical form and layout of a settlement.				
The Proposed Local Plan Sites DPD confirms that the site selection process used to assess the sites put forward for development by landowners has considered the merits of sites in terms of their contribution to the form, character and setting of settlements. The Proposed Local Plan Sites DPD confirms that landscape quality in itself is not a reason for the designation of a VIUA.				
Further justification is requested to explain the proposed allocation of land south of Back Lane as a VIUA. There is currently no evidence to support the proposed allocation therefore the proposed VIUA is not considered to be justified. It is not considered that the emerging Local Plan Sites DPD demonstrates up-to-date or robust evidence to support the allocation of a VIUA at land to the south of Back Lane, Ampleforth. There are several other sites allocated as VIUA's within Ampleforth which appear to align more closely with the above reasons for such an allocation. The site is located outside of the Conservation Area. This proposed allocation is not considered to be a robust approach or one that is consistent with National Policy that requires plans to be based on up to date and relevant evidence. It is considered, therefore, to ensure the plan is sound, a comprehensive criteria-based assessment and methodology for the designation of land as VIUA should be undertaken.				

RDC Comment

The proposed VIUA is in response to the Ampleforth Conservation Area Appraisal, undertaken by Ryedale District Council and the North York Moors National Park. This site is identified as being an area of land which is in the setting of the Conservation Area and which contributes to the character and appearance of the designated heritage asset. The Conservation Area appraisal was consulted on and is an adopted SPD. The reason for the proposed designation is set out on page 33 of the VIUA background paper.

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Commercial Development Projects and Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation				
Comment				
Not sound not legally compliant. The inclusion of site 324 as a VIUA is contrary to our evidence- the development of Peasey Hills, with retention of the Flatts is sufficient to provide open space between Malton and Old Malton. Our advice concerning archaeology is that this land, due to its distance from Old Malton cannot be considered as a substantive reason from a heritage perspective for the creation of a VIUA in this location. Any former connection between the site and St. Mary's Church is no longer perceptible. There is no justification for the proposed designation of the Peasey Hills Site as a new or extended VIUA. Reconsider the VIUA designation, and identify the site for housing, as part of the Malton Option.				
RDC Comment				
The proposed VIUA is not unsound or in breach of any legal requirement.				
The land is proposed as VIUA as it is considered that in its undeveloped state, it forms part of the setting of St Mary's Priory and the Old Malton Conservation Area. The Council has previously under estimated the role of this site in this respect and following the 2015 and 2016 consultations, reconsidered the site. Historic England and the Council's Conservation Officer have concerns that the Flatts itself was insufficient to preserve both the setting of the Old Malton Conservation Area, and the setting of St. Mary's Priory which is a Grade I Listed Building. The Council consider that the contribution of the land to the setting is about its contribution to significance, including, for example visibility and status as in this case. It is not necessarily about a physical direct connection of the land to the church in terms of current land ownership.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Langton Estate				
Comment				
Object to this inclusion of the former allotment area within the VIUA designation and request that it is removed.				
The Background Paper identifies this site as 'field between Milestone Cottage and Whittam Cottage' and states that the space continues to contribute to				

designation criteria 3 and 4 in particular. Respectively, these suggested areas should contribute to the form and character of the settlement and provide a vista/viewpoint into the surrounding countryside. It is not considered that the site meets these criteria. Whilst the other areas of VIUA in Langton form public areas of the village green and grassed verges, this site is the only enclosed, private space designated as VIUA. It is contained behind a walled frontage with little views possible into or beyond the site. A small area is used by the tenants of Wray Cottage and has a domestic appearance, used as a garden area with washing, areas of planting and outdoor seating. There are no views or vistas through the site into the surrounding countryside. We are therefore of the view that it no longer contributes

sufficiently to the character of the village to justify inclusion as a VIUA. A small scale, sensitive, residential development would be an appropriate use of the site, contributing to the District's housing supply and providing local needs housing within a sustainable location.

RDC Comment

VIUAs are a range of both private and publically accessible land. The observations made by the Estate were not made in 2016 as part of the VIUA consultation. The parcel of land referred to continues to provide a significant contribution to the form and character of Langton and provides intervisibility with the wider countryside and the trees within the site and the boundary of the site, so meeting two of the criteria (3 and 4) by which VIUAs are assessed.

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo M Campion	No			
Comment				
Support the proposed designation of land east of Welham Road and north of Whitewall as a VIUA. The designation is fully compliant with nationally and locally applied planning policy. The criteria used to justify and support the designation is considered to provide a generally robust methodology for assessment and inclusion of land south of Norton meets a number of criteria identified by the Council. It reflects the need to protect and provide setting for listed buildings at Whitewall and protects the landscape that has an intrinsic and historic relationship with the horseracing industry.				
RDC Comment				
Noted and welcomed.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo M Campion				
Comment				
The application of criteria relating to the protection of the character of settlements and the relationship of the urban edge with the Area of High Landscape Value would justify expansion of the boundaries of the VIUA currently proposed (Welham Road, Norton) to both east and west.				

RDC Comment

The role of the VIUA designation and the Area of High Landscape Value are different policies with a different purpose. The Latter is concerned with the identification of large areas of land of particular landscape quality and sensitivity and to ensure that this is considered in any proposals which come forward. VIUA's are not designated on the basis of landscape qualities or sensitivities but rather the extent to which land which is within or around a settlement contributes to the form, character and setting of settlements and the setting of historic assets.

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo M Campion				
Comment				
(Proposed VIUA at Welham Road, Norton). There is scope to review the assessment of the value of retaining the area of land in visual terms. A more comprehensive LVIA would reinforce the already robust case for supporting the designation and would support the case made here that the area of the designation should be extended further.				
RDC Comment				
It is considered that in terms of the purposes of the designation, the extent of the proposed VIUA is appropriate.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Watts (North Cotes Farm)				
Comment				
Land at Welham Road (plan provided) should not be identified as a VIUA. The land does not qualify for this designation as it does not meet the criteria that the Council use to justify the land's inclusion as a VIUA. This change is required so that the plan is positively prepared and can best meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements. The proposed VIUA would restrict possible development in a sustainable location and is therefore not effective. The proposed VIUA does not accord with the NPPF which seeks to protect valued landscapes and is contrary to para 113 of the NPPF which advises the use of criteria based policies rather than a blanket approach.				
RDC Comment				
The VIUA designation is not a landscape- designation, but a means to identify areas of land in and around settlements which contribute to their form and character. There has been a lack of understanding on the basis on which the land is designated as a VIUA, which uses a criteria based approach to identify what elements are important in the area of land to warrant the designation. It should be noted that the principle of VIUAs was continued through the adoption of the Local Plan Strategy, which is a post-NPPF plan. It is considered that is as important for Plans to identify areas which should remain				

undeveloped as well as identifying suitable development sites if plans are to ensure development is sustainable. The VIUA designation is a local policy approach designed to ensure development is sustainable in Ryedale. The designation is not blanket in its approach and looks at discrete parcels of land. The Council has consciously chosen to not extend the land to the south west and east, despite requests, because these areas of land did not meet the criteria of the VIUA.

The land is proposed as a VIUA on the basis that in its undeveloped state it is considered to contribute to the setting and form of Malton and Norton and to the setting of the designated heritage assets at Whitewall.

The land is not required to meet development or infrastructure requirements.

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
P and E Robinson	Yes			
Comment				
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites for the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
R Bigg				
Comment				
I am writing to express my support for the proposed VIUA on this land. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade 2 Listed Buildings including historic racing stables, adjacent to the proposed VIUA and as such leads to the character of the heritage assets. The footpath and bridle way that run adjacent to the proposed VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents .				
The infrastructure including the roads and junctions will not take anymore people/vehicles, they are already at full capacity as it is. In my opinion there are far more suitable sites for building on. It is for these reasons that I support the proposed VIUA.				
RDC Comment				
Noted. Development capacity considerations are not part of the criteria for assessing sites for VIUA status, but are in terms of site suitability.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
R Clayton	Yes			
Comment				
Site No: 130 - Local Plan Sites Documents and Policies Maps				
I note that you confirm that the VIUA is proposed to be lifted in the publication documents and naturally I support this action. I write to confirm that in my opinion the Plan is sound.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
R J Fussell				
Comment				
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites for the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
R Simpson and J Holder				
Comment				
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites for the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and				

bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.
RDC Comment
Noted.

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
S Major and L Prince				
Comment				
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites for the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				

Policy: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Weaverthorpe Parish Council	No	Justified		
Comment				
The Parish Council would like two further areas to be included as VIUA's at Weaverthorpe. (Plan attached).				
RDC Comment				
Noted, these have been received too late to be considered within the Publication of the Plan.				

Paragraph: 2.11

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo The Brewis Family/Halifax Estate	No		No	Yes
Comment				
Support of the comprehensive development of 134 hectares of land at Scarborough Road, Norton ("the site") on which circa 105 hectares of land is				

promoted for a mixed-use allocation in the Ryedale Local Plan Sites Document (“LPSD”). The site (660) lies to the North and South of Scarborough Road and to the west adjoins the defined settlement boundary of Norton. To the east the boundary is formed by the A64 which contains the settlement in this direction but provides accessible transport links with suitable and recently improved highway access. The site also adjoins the area identified in the LPSD with potential (sites 651 and 649) and the case was made that this could provide a robust urban extension site to the east of the settlement of sufficient size to plan comprehensively for mixed uses including housing, employment, associated infrastructure, community facilities and open space. This remains the case. Paragraph 2.11 - Objection - The lack of assessment of individual sites within this comprehensive development area for employment or residential uses; sites were also submitted in smaller components.

RDC Comment

The representation is not clear in its objective. Paragraph 2.11 explains that a range of sites had been submitted and from those the Local Planning Authority chose the most suitable sites- to deliver the requirements of the Local Plan Strategy, through the use of the Site Selection Methodology. This did not include the identification of Strategic Sites, in fact it consciously discounted such an approach within the Local Plan Strategy. A site of 105 ha is a strategic site. Other, smaller configurations of the site submissions were considered on their merits, and this was based on the use identified in the site submission made by the landowner (which was for employment land- not for residential in the case of 184). The sites of 655 (residential/mixed use) and 184 were also not submitted by the landowner in smaller sites configuration, it was the Local Planning Authority who identified/broke the sites down into components in order to consider the sites is sufficient detail due to their substantial size. The Local Planning Authority has identified the sites it considers meets the objectives of the Local Plan Strategy, and in doing so has duly considered these sites- as demonstrated through the Sustainability Appraisal and Site Selection Methodology.

Paragraphs: 2.12

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Persimmon Homes				
Comment				
<p>Paragraphs 2.12 and 2.15 Not sound and not legally compliant. The policies in a site allocations plan must be consistent with the adopted development plan, unless policy in the sites allocations plan is intended to supersede another policy. Reasoned justification of the policies contained within a development plan document. The Publication Plan states, at paragraph 2.12, that: ‘the ability of sites to address the objectives of the Ryedale Plan has also informed the selection of sites’ and this is continued at paragraph 2.15 (page 9), which adds: “The combination of sites identified at Pickering reflect objectives of the Ryedale Plan, to minimise the impact of development on historic medieval field patterns which are a characteristic feature of Ryedale’s northern Market Towns (and Pickering in particular) and a significant heritage asset”. It continues: ‘The sites at Whitby Road and Malton Road will ensure that further residential development can be accommodated at the Town without impacting upon the medieval strip field system. Both sites provide existing access to the existing road network’.</p> <p>It is contended that the plan is not legally compliant. The first is that the policies in the Publication Plan are not consistent with the RP-LPS which form the adopted development plan. The second is that a reasoned justification has not been provided for the policies in the Publication Plan. The selection of the two sites for residential allocations at Pickering does not conform to the principles outlined for the selection of sites which were set in the RP-LPS. Only one of these principles is referred to in the reasoned justification. However, for Pickering, a series of key principles for the allocation of sites were set at Policy</p>				

SP1 (General Location of Development and Settlement Hierarchy) and in the supporting text (the reasoned justification) for this policy. Policy SP1 states that in allocating sites in the locations identified (which includes Pickering which is recognised as a Local Service Centre) development will be guided to brownfield land first (though the

plan acknowledges that there is insufficient supply of brownfield land to meet the need for housing), and that development will be guided to the areas with lowest flood risk. The policy goes onto state that in the site selection process regard will be had to the ability of sites to deliver against the objectives, policies and standards set in the RP-LPS; and, Community Infrastructure

Levy (CIL) requirements. Sites will also need to be compatible with neighbouring land uses; avoid adverse impacts of interests of acknowledged importance; be accommodated without detriment to the character of the settlements and its setting; and, satisfactorily address highway capacity and safety. Following this policy, the supporting text includes a section titled 'Guiding Development at the Towns'

and this sets six principles for growth in Pickering:

- Retaining the compact and accessible Market Town feel;
- Preservation of surrounding historic strip field patterns;
- Safeguarding of views towards and across the town and into the Moors ;
- Ensure development is sensitive and responsive to the historic character and form of the town and its setting in the wider landscape;
- Avoid coalescence with Middleton; and,
- Controlling pressure for incremental urbanisation of the approach into Pickering along the Malton Road.

The justification provided in the Publication Plan at paragraph 2.15 refers to only one of these six principles and omits the remaining five principles. The justification is therefore not sufficiently reasoned in the selection of the proposed sites because it does not refer to all of the relevant considerations necessary to make a reasoned judgment formed logically. The Publication Plan is not consistent with the adopted development plan as it is required to be because Policy SD2 (Residential Land Allocations) selects sites (referenced previously as Site 200 and Site 347)

RDC Comment

The Sites document is in conformity with policies of the Local Plan Strategy. There is no inconsistency between the Local Plan Strategy and the Sites Document. The policies of the LPS have been used to inform the site selection process in a consistent way. The Site Selection Methodology was consulted on to ensure that it provided an appropriate framework for the selection of sites. The SSM is a key part of the sustainability appraisal. It brings together the strategic policies of the LPS, its vision, aims, objectives and local sustainability issues to inform fine grained site selection. The Sustainability Appraisal Scoping report provides the context from which the SA ,SSM and Plan Policies have been developed.

The District Council, through the application of the SSM, has identified the sites which it considers best meet the residual housing requirements. Inevitably , this involves a balancing of sustainability issues/objectives to ensure the most appropriate combination of sites. The sites proposed can be accommodated in the highway network and using existing school facilities, and would not involve the loss of important medieval strip field systems. The site at Malton Road is very well located to the centre of Pickering and key services and provides the opportunity to improve the appearance of that edge/

entrance of the town.

Paragraphs: 2.15

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Persimmon Homes				
Comment				

Paragraphs 2.12 and 2.15 Not sound and not legally compliant. The policies in a site allocations plan must be consistent with the adopted development plan, unless policy in the sites allocations plan is intended to supersede another policy. Reasoned justification of the policies contained within a development plan document. The Publication Plan states, at paragraph 2.12, that: 'the ability of sites to address the objectives of the Ryedale Plan has also informed the selection of sites' and this is continued at paragraph 2.15 (page 9), which adds: "The combination of sites identified at Pickering reflect objectives of the Ryedale Plan, to minimise the impact of development on historic medieval field patterns which are a characteristic feature of Ryedale's northern Market Towns (and Pickering in particular) and a significant heritage asset'. It continues: 'The sites at Whitby Road and Malton Road will ensure that further residential development can be accommodated at the Town without impacting upon the medieval strip field system. Both sites provide existing access to the existing road network'.

It is contended that the plan is not legally compliant. The first is that the policies in the Publication Plan are not consistent with the RP-LPS which form the adopted development plan. The second is that a reasoned justification has not been provided for the policies in the Publication Plan. The selection of the two sites for residential allocations at Pickering does not conform to the principles outlined for the selection of sites which were set in the RP-LPS. Only one of these principles is referred to in the reasoned justification. However, for Pickering, a series of key principles for the allocation of sites were set at Policy SP1 (General Location of Development and Settlement Hierarchy) and in the supporting text (the reasoned justification) for this policy. Policy SP1 states that in allocating sites in the locations identified (which includes Pickering which is recognised as a Local Service Centre) development will be guided to brownfield land first (though the

plan acknowledges that there is insufficient supply of brownfield land to meet the need for housing), and that development will be guided to the areas with lowest flood risk. The policy goes onto state that in the site selection process regard will be had to the ability of sites to deliver against the objectives, policies and standards set in the RP-LPS; and, Community Infrastructure

Levy (CIL) requirements. Sites will also need to be compatible with neighbouring land uses; avoid adverse impacts of interests of acknowledged importance; be accommodated without detriment to the character of the settlements and its setting; and, satisfactorily address highway capacity and safety. Following this policy, the supporting text includes a section titled 'Guiding Development at the Towns'

and this sets six principles for growth in Pickering:

- Retaining the compact and accessible Market Town feel;
- Preservation of surrounding historic strip field patterns;
- Safeguarding of views towards and across the town and into the Moors ;
- Ensure development is sensitive and responsive to the historic character and form of the town

and its setting in the wider landscape;

- Avoid coalescence with Middleton; and,
- Controlling pressure for incremental urbanisation of the approach into Pickering along the Malton Road.

The justification provided in the Publication Plan at paragraph 2.15 refers to only one of these six principles and omits the remaining five principles. The justification is therefore not sufficiently reasoned in the selection of the proposed sites because it does not refer to all of the relevant considerations necessary to make a reasoned judgment formed logically. The Publication Plan is not consistent with the adopted development plan as it is required to be because Policy SD2 (Residential Land Allocations) selects sites (referenced previously as Site 200 and Site 347

RDC Comment

The Sites document is in conformity with policies of the Local Plan Strategy. There is no inconsistency between the Local Plan Strategy and the Sites Document. The policies of the LPS have been used to inform the site selection process in a consistent way. The Site Selection Methodology was consulted on to ensure that it provided an appropriate framework for the selection of sites. The SSM is a key part of the sustainability appraisal. It brings together the strategic policies of the LPS, its vision, aims, objectives and local sustainability issues to inform fine grained site selection. The Sustainability Appraisal Scoping report provides the context from which the SA ,SSM and Plan Policies have been developed.

The District Council, through the application of the SSM, has identified the sites which it considers best meet the residual housing requirements. Inevitably , this is involves a balancing of sustainability issues/objectives to ensure the most appropriate combination of sites. The sites proposed can be accommodated in the highway network and using existing school facilities, and would not involve the loss of important medieval strip field systems. The site at Malton Road is very well located to the centre of Pickering and key services and provides the opportunity to improve the appearance of that edge/ entrance of the town.

Paragraphs: 2.16

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Maw Family				
Comment				
We reserve the right and opportunity to comment further in the light of evolving circumstances also associated with the progression of the committed housing site owned by Gladman Developments and how actual delivery of that site may progress (or not). This is an evolving context and the plan should appropriately reflect the need for flexibility and the positive benefits derived from development on our clients' land in delivering key objectives of the local authority.				
RDC Comment				
The identification of Westfields, a site which is 75% of the Plan requirement to Kirkbymoorside is an extant permission and is subject to a reserved matters application. The plan builds in a plan-led additional supply of housing land to ensure flexibility. Policy SP2 of the Local Plan Strategy provides a framework				

for the release of further sites in the event that commitments/ allocations fail to come forward. There is no requirement to allocate further land in advance of a review/roll forward of the plan.

Paragraph: 2.20

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo The Brewis Family/Halifax Estate	No		No	Yes
Comment				
Paragraph 2.20 - General comment - The treatment of the “buffer” within the overall housing requirement and the requirement to focus this buffer in line with the spatial requirements of SP2; Paragraph 2.2 of the LPSD-PV confirms that “Policy SP2 aims to direct the housing land required to meet housing requirements to these settlements which are expected to accommodate planned growth in the settlement hierarchy.” Policy SP2 confirms that most new development is to be directed towards the largest town of Malton/Norton with some 50% of the housing requirements to be directed to the principal Town.				
This is a figure of (approximately) 1500 dwellings over the Plan period to 2027. Policy also allows for an additional 20% (600 dwellings) as part of a further supply buffer and a Zone of Tolerance supply of an additional 25% (750 dwellings), and paragraph 2.4 confirms “this additional supply is identified at those settlements in the settlement hierarchy where the Plan directs housing growth.” This effectively gives a buffer range of 600 – 750 dwellings in addition to the global 3,000 figure. However, it is stated at paragraph 2.20 that “in allocating sites to provide for the supply buffer in addition to the residual planned housing requirement, the resulting proportional distribution does not follow precisely, the distribution established in SP2, although it continues to reflect the Plan’s strategic settlement hierarchy.” On a general point, it is important that the overall housing requirement and buffer is geographically focused in accordance with Policy SP2. Greater clarification is therefore required on this point.				
RDC Comment				
There is a misunderstanding in the operation of the zone of tolerance. The 20% land supply buffer was to be proportionally split across the settlement Hierarchy, but since there has been a range of planning permissions granted, the buffer is not strictly proportional. In delivering the allocations and the 20% buffer, due to the delivery of sites and identified commitments, the outstanding buffer is focused on the Principal Town. The Zone of Tolerance is a positive management of completions whereby up to 25% uplift from the 200 plan figure is not added into the following 5 year land supply position.				

Paragraph: 2.23

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
North Yorkshire County Council				
Comment				
NYCC health and adult services consider broadly reflects current provision and future requirements for extra care housing in Ryedale but would make the following points:				

Make reference to scheme at Pickering (not just that at Helmsley and Norton)

Malton is a priority location for Extra Care Housing and we are seeking new provision at Malton through the One Public Estate work in relation to Ryedale House and adjacent sites- as such should make reference to One Public Estate

Kirkbymoorside is identified as being a potential location for Extra Care provision. Requirements will be reviewed and on that basis, the reference to Kirkbymoorside is adequate.

RDC Comment

An update to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan reflects the current position. RDC will continue to work with NYCC to ensure requirements are provided for.

Paragraphs: 3.8

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
obo Maw Family				
Comment				
SD13 not sound. Contend that Site 259 remains an available, deliverable and achievable development site to meet arising housing needs while also providing the means to maintain economic opportunities in the area – either through facilitating relocation or redevelopment of the adjoining Sylatech site. Our clients land is proposed for allocation for expansion purposes and could be pursued on a mixed-use basis given previous comments submitted as part of the plan process, the underlying objective and past collaborative approach. Letter 23 November 2016 - Concerning Expansion Land for Existing Employers - conclusion premature to delete this designation, and that it should remain in place. Letters October 2016 and June 2017 - Set out delivery of housing on sites 259 and 454, and this would be phased to bring site 454 last. Allowing the Sylatech production to remain in operation through landscaping and boundary treatments. The development of site 259 with or without 454 will facilitate the delivery of site 650 at Pickering.				
RDC Comment				
It is not clear from the representation what the soundness issue is. The Local Planning Authority has retained the employment land expansion land, which is reflective of the letter sent by ELG for the retention of the designation. Sylatech has confirmed that they no longer have plans to relocate to Pickering and will remain at Kirkbymoorside. Sylatech have had a close relationship with the Maw family representative and the Local Planning Authority can only assume that in resolving to stay at Kirkbymoorside, that the company would be confident in the knowledge that expansion land would be available if required.				

Paragraph:

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
Highways England	No	Justified		
Comment				

Clarity is sought on how the figures (completions, commitments and outstanding requirements) fit together.

RDC Comment

The Role of the Local Plan Sites Document is to deliver the housing, employment and retail requirements of the Local Plan Strategy. The Local Plan Sites Document identifies this by: factoring in the number of completions since 2012 (The commencement of the Plan Period) and adding the yield of commitments which are sites subject to permission and which are of a significant size (i.e. over 10 dwellings), and are deemed to be deliverable (ATS site was excluded). This is done at the respective tiers of the Settlement Hierarchy. The residual number is then used to derive what is residual housing requirement at each settlement which is then used to inform the allocations.

The information is brought together in Appendix 2.

Section: SD16 - Visually Important Undeveloped Areas (VIUAs)

Representor	Sound?	Soundness Tests	Legal compliance	Duty to cooperate
M Seager				
Comment				
Support the proposed VIUA on the Land East of Welham Road. The Council is rightfully entitled to review and consider new sites fro the area, and new policies. The area of land provides a setting for the Grade II Listed Buildings, including historic racing stables, adjacent to the VIUA, and the footpath and bridleway that run adjacent to the VIUA afford superb views and are enjoyed by many local residents.				
RDC Comment				
Noted.				