

Jenny Poxon
Head of Planning Delivery and Conformity
01924 331601
jenny.poxon@yhassembly.gov.uk

Our ref: General/40b – Planning Conformity/Richmondshire/ Final responses/CS I&O May 07

23 May 2007

David Elliott
Head of Policy and Performance
Richmondshire District Council
Swale House
Frenchgate
Richmond
North Yorkshire
DL10 4JE

Dear David

**Richmondshire Local Development Framework – Core Strategy Issues
and Options Discussion Paper - April 2007**

The Yorkshire and Humber Assembly welcomes the opportunity to comment on the above. The comments offered in this letter are intended to be within the spirit of our continued and productive joint working to produce a sustainable, coherent spatial strategy for the region.

The Assembly's response to the Discussion Paper is a set of informal officer comments. When the Core Strategy is submitted to the Secretary of State a formal Assembly view on its general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) will need to be given.

Given the nature of the Discussion Paper I have limited my comments to the overall messages emerging from the document and some thoughts about how this work might feed into the next stage of developing the Core Strategy.

The Assembly recognises that Richmondshire District Council perhaps finds itself with a unique set of circumstances as it needs to plan for the future of the District whilst there is continued uncertainty over the possible expansion of Catterick Garrison that could be of a scale that has significant economic, social and environmental implications.

Given this context, the Discussion Paper is very helpful in setting out what the different levels of expansion could mean and how different assumptions about the types of accommodation needed, and its knock on impacts, will need to be considered. I understand that more work on housing market assessments will soon be complete and this will be another important set of information to be fed into the further development of the Core Strategy.

The Discussion Paper suggests that if there were to be 'no growth' (CG1), 'limited expansion' (CG2) or 'incremental growth and cumulative change' (CG5), the objectives of the RSS (and presumably those proposed for the Core Strategy set out in the Issues and Options document of 2005) would not be met. I think this poses an interesting challenge for the next stage in developing the Core Strategy.

Given the continued uncertainty that will surround the development of Catterick Garrison, is it not essential to plan for the future of the District to ensure that the objectives of the RSS and LDF *are* met whatever decisions are taken on the expansion of the Garrison? This would mean the next stage in the development of the Core Strategy would be to consider how Core Strategy policies might differ depending on the level (and nature) of expansion and then ensuring that the final Core Strategy is flexible enough to deal with the continued uncertainty.

In preparing the Yorkshire and Humber Plan it was assumed that some expansion of Catterick Garrison would go ahead and therefore that it should be identified as a Principal Service Centre – linked with Richmond. The Panel Report of the Examination in Public of the Yorkshire and Humber Plan has continued this assumption and I assume it is now the role of the LDF to explore how the implications of this expansion – of whatever scale – can be translated into a plan for the sustainable spatial development of the District that meets regional and local objectives.

I trust that the above comments are helpful to you as you continue to prepare your Core Strategy. Clearly we wish to see the Core Strategy developing in general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy and I would be happy to discuss any issues with you further if it would help this process.

We look forward to working with you further on your Core Strategy and to commenting on the Preferred Options document in due course.

Regards



Jenny Poxon
Head of Planning Delivery and Conformity