

Martin Elliot, Planning Manager  
martin.elliott@lgyh.gov.uk

Our Ref: Planning Conformity\026- Ryedale\Local Development Frameworks\Final Responses\April 09 - March 10

31 July 2009

Charlotte Bogg  
Ryedale House  
Old Malton Road  
Malton  
North Yorkshire  
YO17 7HH

**By e-mail**

Dear Charlotte,

**Ryedale Local Development Framework – Summer Consultation 2009**

The Regional Planning Body (RPB) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Ryedale Core Strategy – Summer Consultation document and to continue its involvement in the development of a coherent spatial planning framework for the region. The comments offered in this letter are intended to be within the spirit of continued and productive joint working.

At this stage, the RPB's response to the consultation document is a set of comments aimed at highlighting where issues related to general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy might arise. When the DPD is published prior to being submitted to the Secretary of State a formal RPB view on its general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy will need to be requested (Regulation 29, 2008).

The following comments are made in relation to the current RSS – The Yorkshire and Humber Plan, which was issued by the Secretary of State in May 2008. The Yorkshire and Humber Plan aims to achieve a more sustainable pattern and form of development, investment and activity across the region, putting a greater emphasis on matching needs across the region with opportunities and managing the environment as a key resource. There is a particular emphasis on achieving the regeneration and renaissance of the region's city and town centres by making them the focus for housing, employment, shopping, leisure, education, health and cultural activities and facilities in the region.

## Previous Engagement

The RPB sent a number of officer comments in response to the Core Strategy that was submitted for Examination in 2006. In its formal response in January 2006 the Regional Planning Body was of the opinion that the Core Strategy was in general conformity with the RSS.

As you will be aware this opinion was made in relation to the then current Regional Spatial Strategy (based on the selective review of RPG12 issued in December 2004) and the draft Regional Spatial Strategy – the Yorkshire and Humber Plan (December 2005).

Following the Inspector's view that the submitted Core Strategy was unsound, we subsequently forwarded officer comments in relation to the Revised Core Strategy Initial Consultation in January 2009 where we set out how we envisaged the Ryedale LDF could best help to secure Adopted RSS outcomes.

We note also the meeting that was held between LGYH and Ryedale District Council officers in April where we discussed the emerging consultation document and focussed particularly on the spatial strategy and delivery of housing growth. We also noted that we were supportive in principle of a proposed approach to delivering affordable housing through community housing schemes.

This response will continue our joint working with Ryedale and set out officer comments in relation to the current RSS – The Yorkshire and Humber Plan, which was issued by the Secretary of State in May 2008.

## Key Points on the Core Strategy: Summer Consultation

Below is a summary of the main points the RPB wishes to raise with regards to the consultation document. **Annex A** provides further detail for each of these issues and specifically answers the questions in the document:

1. There is a need to highlight in future documents that you are now planning in a different economic context to the last Core Strategy and the impacts that you consider this may have on the ability to meet Ryedale's vision and objectives, especially in relation to the delivery of housing;
2. The vision is supported subject to evidence as to why minimising flood risk is not explicitly included as an objective. This is puzzling since the issue is given such high prominence in the site selection criteria;
3. Welcome reflection of the Government's household projections and the impacts that this may have on the Core Strategy through the plan period;
4. Welcome the approach to housing delivery in general but propose that future documents note that the RSS targets are not ceilings;
5. Welcome your attempts to deliver affordable housing through locally derived and potentially innovative means, but consider that more evidence is needed to support the proposal for Rural Ryedale Community Housing Sites so as to ensure that delivery of these schemes does not undermine the wider spatial strategy;
6. Welcome the spatial strategy and recognise that the results of the as yet unpublished SHLAA will need to underpin the emerging approach;
7. Welcome the emerging approach to employment land and recognise that this will be informed by the emerging Employment Land Review;

8. Advise that you consider how the approach to employment land could be improved so as to accord with the spirit of emerging PPS4 on planning for the economy;
9. Welcome the approach to Renewable Energy;
10. Advise that you consider the merits of explicitly planning for 'park homes' given the potential for this type of housing development to be at odds with the RSS and your own Spatial Approach to the location of development; and
11. Welcome the illustration of how the settlements in Ryedale may accommodate broad locations for development throughout the plan period. We advise that in the next stage of consultation you align such locations with evidence on infrastructure capacity.

I trust that the comments provided here, and expanded on in Annex A, are helpful to you as you continue to prepare the Core Strategy. Clearly we would wish to see you develop a sound Core Strategy, part of which requires that it is in general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy. Please do not hesitate to get in touch if anything is not clear. We look forward to working with you further on your Core Strategy and to commenting on the final document in due course.

Yours sincerely,

Martín - Elliot

Martin Elliot  
Planning Manager

**Please note: from 1 April 2009 officers supporting the work of the Joint Regional Board, the new Regional Planning Body, work in LGYH; please amend your contact databases accordingly.**

## Annex 1 – Detailed Responses to the Questions Posed in the Consultation

Reference	Comments
<b>Introduction</b>	Support the use of previous consultation activities and amendment to previous strategy.
<b>Introduction</b>	Under “what’s changed since the last consultation” you may wish to reflect on the state of the UK economy and downturn in the housing market. For further information on delivering in the economic downturn I suggest that you look at our Implementation Action Plan web-page on Delivering Housing. This is available <a href="#">here</a> or go to <a href="http://www.lgyh.gov.uk">www.lgyh.gov.uk</a> and follow the links for Our Work > Regional Planning > Implementation Action Plan > Current Priority Activities > Maintaining the delivery of housing.
<b>Strategic Context</b>	<p>The list of strengths, issues and challenges reflects the context within which you are planning for Ryedale’s future. However, it would be useful to understand how the list was developed e.g. from consultation, evidence or experience.</p> <p>We would have expected flood risk to appear as a particular challenge.</p> <p>More detail on infrastructure challenges, such as the junction improvements needed on the A64, are significant strategic challenges that you may consider raising at this early stage as they set a particular context for development potential in Malton/Norton.</p>
<b>SC1</b>	The Vision and Objectives are valid and are in line with the RSS. However, you should evidence why there is no objective in relation to minimising flood risk.
<b>SC2</b>	The four aims of ‘creating wealth’, ‘improving choice’, ‘meeting local needs’ and ‘protecting the environment’ are supported.
<b>SC3</b>	Our response to the previous Core Strategy supported the settlement hierarchy as being in line with the Draft RSS (2004). We consider that the revised proposed hierarchy is in line with the Adopted RSS (2008).
<b>SC4</b>	We welcome and support the approach taken with regard to the neighbouring authorities and National Park in dealing with settlements split by the administrative boundary.
<b>H1</b>	We welcome your reflection of the Government’s household projections as required by PPS3. We also welcome your proposal that RSS targets form the minimum level that Ryedale should be planning for.
<b>H2</b>	Whilst we support the nature of the question around what circumstances might result in delivering more than 200 homes per year and whether any excess should solely be for affordable housing you will need to show how you have had regard to Policy H2 of the RSS when preparing a policy. H2 B5 notes that LPAs should adopt a flexible approach to delivery by not treating housing targets as ceilings.
<b>H3</b>	The RSS seeks to prevent the dispersal of development to smaller settlements and open countryside. Dispersed development has been an evident trend across much of the Region over recent decades, as many villages have seen significant expansion; this trend has been replicated in Ryedale. At the same time we recognise that there is a need for affordable housing to be delivered in smaller settlements to meet local needs.

---

Whether the “Rural Ryedale Community Housing Sites” (RRCHS) are an effective means of delivering more affordable housing in the smaller local villages is not an issue which we would wish to comment on as this is a detailed local delivery matter. What would concern us is the potential impact that such a means is likely to have on the settlement hierarchy and the spatial approach.

It is not possible from the information provided at this stage of consultation to be clear as to what these impacts may be. We would welcome further detail provided on the following issues to ensure that we can take this into account when providing future views on general conformity:

- what level of housing delivery is anticipated under a RRCHS model?;
- what mechanism would be put in place to ‘turn off the tap’ if the model proved too popular? Have you thought about what level of development would be considered *inappropriate* in the local service villages to help you determine how you might limit supply?;
- would the model be employed at other levels of the hierarchy or just the local service villages?;
- how does the model work alongside exceptions sites? Do you think that Ryedale would be likely to see fewer exceptions sites in the face of the RRCHS?;
- how substantially will the RRCHS model coupled with the proposed settlement hierarchy amend business as usual delivery?;
- we would also expect an Inspector to question how this approach accords with para. 30 of PPS3 which clearly advises that rural exceptions sites should **ONLY** be used for affordable housing.

---

**H4** Welcome that the Core Strategy seeks to address the issue of Gypsy and Traveller accommodation. Need to confirm for how long the additional site would meet needs and potential need for additional sites later in plan period.

---

**H5** See response to H3 above. We are not clear as to why an additional level of the settlement hierarchy is necessary to ensure greater delivery of affordable housing in rural areas. The identified Service Villages should provide a local hub for housing, services and rural employment opportunities. You should evidence that an additional level would not detract from the ambitions of the Service Villages. It is not clear whether this additional level would be allocated a proportion of total housing development.

---

**H6** Notwithstanding the comments in H3 and H5 above, in determining the criteria for identifying “local service villages” you should ensure that you take account of RSS Policy YH7 which advocates a transport-oriented approach to development.

---

**H7** The levels set out broadly reflect the roles of the settlements. You should ensure that the approach taken reflects the individual needs and aspirations of towns and villages rather than seeking to distribute a gross figure.

---

<b>E1</b>	<p>RSS Policy YH5 on Principal Towns notes that they should be the main local focus for employment activities and facilities. YH5B3 also notes that they should be the main focus for employment development in rural areas in recognition of the fact that there is not a higher level of the settlement network where employment would be better located.</p> <p>Given this regional policy context and the proposal for over 50% of Ryedale's housing to be directed towards Malton and Norton we agree that the majority of new employment land and business space should be provided in the towns.</p>
<b>E2</b>	<p>The allocation of sites for specific business needs would be dependent on the results of the ELR and responses from consultees. You should note the direction of recently published Planning Policy Statement 4 in terms of planning for the whole economy.</p>
<b>E3</b>	<p>The proportion of employment land split is supported.</p>
<b>E4</b>	<p>While the issue of "park homes" is not considered to be of regional significance we would offer some words of caution in your attempts to plan for such provision. We would consider that "park homes" as a form of housing should be subject to the same spatial policies as other forms of housing. It will be for you to evidence why you consider there to be sufficient evidence to go against the RSS spatial approach (as set out in the Core Approach of RSS Policies YH1 and YH5-7 in particular) and your own emerging approach to the location of development if such homes were to be located in open countryside. It is not clear why you have included this issue within the employment section of the LDF given that as you state the development acts as a residential park.</p> <p>It is interesting to note that neither Hambleton nor Harrogate District Councils have similar policies within their LDFs. We advise that it would be useful to identify whether these authorities came under similar pressure and what their reasons were for not including a policy.</p>
<b>E5</b>	<p>The RSS notes in Policy E7 that plans should facilitate the development of rural businesses by facilitating the development of rural businesses and enterprises in a way that <i>inter alia</i> gives priority to the re-use of existing buildings in planning for the rural economy.</p>
<b>R1</b>	<p>The proposed retail hierarchy is well evidence and in line with RSS policies YH5, YH6 and E2.</p>
<b>R2</b>	<p>The proportions of development to be directed to Malton, Pickering and elsewhere for local needs are supported and in line with RSS policies YH5, YH6 and E2.</p>
<b>R3</b>	<p>The principle of expanding the commercial limits of Malton to support town centre uses is supported. We do not wish to comment on the detail of drawing up these limits.</p>
<b>NBE1</b>	<p>We welcome the fact that you are questioning the need for additional policy over and above Building Regulations on this matter. It is worth noting Harrogate's approach which explicitly requires development that meets BREEAM. Dover City Council (as referenced in the Regional Renewable Energy Toolkit) also follows this approach. It is important to be clear as to how the proposed policy approach supplements Building Regulations so as to avoid confusion.</p>
<b>NBE2</b>	<p>As the Regional Renewable Energy Toolkit notes, the issue over whether carbon savings in new development comes from renewable</p>

---

energy sources or other means will soon be superseded by tighter Building Regulations. These will in general necessitate on-site renewable energy generation as a means of securing carbon savings thus obviating the need for a general policy requirement in the LDF. However, it is worth making clear that the Government's ambitions for decentralised energy is not only about reducing carbon emissions, it is also about fuel poverty and energy security. To that end, we would expect the LDF to examine the potential for community based decentralised energy supply as part of the LDF. The Regional Renewable Energy Toolkit provides details of how this can be done. It is available on [www.lgyh.gov.uk](http://www.lgyh.gov.uk) and follow the links for Our Work > Regional Planning > Implementation Action Plan > Current Priority Activities > Renewable Energy.

---

**NBE3** Yes. A positively worded policy on renewable energy schemes will be necessary to help deliver Policy ENV5 of the RSS.

---

**NBE4** The type and location of major renewable schemes is a matter for you to evidence. The Toolkit provides some help on how you may go about this.

---

**NBE5-13** These issues are considered to be of a detailed local nature. We therefore do not wish to comment from a regional perspective.

---

**GT1-14** We welcome the initial options that are being put forward in order to accommodate development in Ryedale. We welcome the alignment between your approach and the provisions of Policy YH7 on the location of development. At the next stage we would expect more detail on the various "capacities" of the proposed expansion sites. We assume that your infrastructure delivery study and emerging plan will also enable you to give a picture as to the critical, transport, social and green infrastructure capacities of the options. This will help ensure that you meet the headline outcome of the RSS around maximising existing infrastructure.

---

**DM1** We do not wish to comment on the detailed development management policies in the LDF as these do not have a regional bearing.

---

**S1-2** In general the site selection criteria you propose are supported. We welcome the consideration being given at the initial stage to the settlement hierarchy and flood risk.

---

**S3** We do not wish to comment on detailed site proposals.

---