North York Moors National Park

First Steps Consultation Report

October 2026

The Authority recently started a review of the North York Moors Local Plan.

The first stage involved early engagement with relevant organisations, businesses and members of the public to inform them that the review had commenced and to seek their initial views on the issues that should be addressed in the Local Plan.

We also invited submissions of sites that may be suitable for development. This 'Call for Sites' exercise is ongoing (closing date of 30 November 2026), and the results of this exercise will be reported separately.

We also published an initial 'Project Initiation Document' and asked for views. This sets out the timetable, resources and risks for the new Local Plan.

The main element of the First Steps engagement exercise was a document called 'Current Thinking' which set out some initial thoughts on four important areas which will be addressed in the Local Plan:

1. Nature recovery and climate action at a landscape scale.
2. Recreation, health and wellbeing.
3. How do we decide which villages are appropriate for new development?
4. Housing, including overall numbers, locations and tenure.

The Current Thinking Document also asked for views on a draft vision for the Local Plan.

Responses were received from members of the public, businesses, parish councils and other stakeholders. This page provides a brief summary of the responses received.

The Current Thinking consultation closed on 31 August 2026.

Overview of engagement

The website

Engagement was primarily through a set of web pages, badged as 'First Steps.' There were 649 views of the First Steps web pages over the course of the consultation period.

Emails were sent out to everyone included on the Local Plan database, which is made up of the statutory consultees and others that have been asked to be notified of progress on planning policies. There are around 260 organisations and individuals currently on the database.

The email directed recipients to the First Steps page, which included an embedded form that people could use to respond. The option to email or post responses was also provided.

Parish Council and Landowners Forums

A presentation and question and answer session was provided to the following forums:

- Estates Liaison Meeting - 23 July 2026
- Whitby Community Network - 27 June 2026
- Joint Parish Forum, Danby – 29 July 2026

Press and Social Media

The consultation was mainly advertised online, both on social media and through a press release on the websites of multiple local newspapers.

The consultation was advertised on the Authority's website, as well as social media channels. 4 posts were made on each of Facebook and LinkedIn, and 3 posts were made on X. Our four posts on Facebook were viewed (likes, comments, shares and clicks) a total of **34,374** times, and **1,362** accounts engaged with our posts. Our four posts on LinkedIn were viewed a total of **1,522** times.

A press release was placed on the Authority's website and sent to following newspapers which advertised the consultation on their websites - Yorkshire Post, York Press, Northern Echo, Scarborough News, Gazette and Herald, Darlington and Stockton Times. The total traditional media audience reach, based on the daily readership statistics of these newspapers, is estimated to be around **235,500**.

Overview of responses

A total of **68** responses were received. **34** responses were submitted by individuals, whilst **34** responses were submitted on behalf of organisations. 29 individuals and 21 organisations answered at least one of the numbered questions; the rest used the open comments box or submitted a letter. Organisation comments are the focus of this summary, with those that question the suggested approach or offer new ideas or examples drawn out. Individuals are summarised separately and not named. Comments have not been included where they do not relate to any issues the Local Plan is able to influence.

Headline messages

- Nature recovery is welcomed, but with a “do not weaken” message. Yorkshire Wildlife Trust (WT), the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE North and East Yorkshire) and the National Trust back explicit nature recovery policy; The Home

Builders Federation (HBF) argues the Plan should not duplicate national requirements.

- Principal residence is the clearest dividing line. Most parish councils and community bodies support extending it, and several want it to replace local occupancy conditions. Landowners, the HBF warn of viability and deliverability problems with a blanket approach; the National Trust says affordability matters more than occupancy.
- The settlement hierarchy is contested in both directions. The HBF and Botton want all settlements included and read the new NPPF as supporting that; Spaunton PM and several individuals oppose any widening; The North York Moors Association (NYMA) proposes adding small hamlets. North Yorkshire Council supports redesignation in principle subject to evidence.
- Infrastructure capacity is repeatedly raised as a constraint on housing: sewerage (West Ayton, Sleights Parish Councils), spring and borehole water supply (Chop Gate, individual responses), roads, grid capacity and bus services.
- Cross-boundary working is requested by North Yorkshire Council, and is implicit in comments on Helmsley, West Ayton and Sleights, which straddle the boundary.
- Many practical new ideas came from parish councils and the National Trust, notably on visitor dispersal, Park and Ride, campervan provision, multigenerational housing and a Tees to Topping green corridor.

A summary of consultation responses received to the ten questions is set out below.

Conversation 1: Nature recovery and climate action at a landscape scale

Q1: How do you think the Local Plan can be improved to meet the challenges of climate change?

Many respondents mentioned the need to reduce the number of private vehicle journeys, as well as the need for better public transport within the National Park. Whilst the Local Plan does not control the location and frequency of public transport, it can direct development to sustainable locations in a manner which reduces the need for private vehicle travel, and this will be under consideration when preparing a draft Local Plan.

Many respondents supported a more permissive approach to small scale renewable energy development such as solar panels and heat pumps. Whilst the Authority's first statutory purpose prioritises conservation of the special qualities of the landscape, our approach to such development will be reviewed when preparing a draft Local Plan.

Some respondents referred to the increasing risk of wildfires. This is a key area of concern for the Authority and we will be assessing whether specific local policies requiring new development to mitigate wildfire risk should be included in the draft Local Plan.

Some respondents referred to the need to prioritise brownfield land (previously developed land) for development. Strategic Policy A of our current Local Plan refers

to using brownfield land where possible for new development, and we will consider whether our current position needs strengthening.

The North York Moors Association and **West Ayton Parish Council** specifically raised climate change as an issue. **The North York Moors Association** argue for stronger energy efficiency standards for residential and commercial buildings within the National Park, including exceeding standard energy regulations and setting net-zero carbon emission targets for new-builds and leading the way on the design and installation of water-management measures such as rainwater harvesting tanks. They also wish to see more sensitive retrofitting for historic buildings and a more permissive policy for domestic-level renewable energy installations.

The Home Builders Federation stated that local energy standards above the Future Homes Standard would create differing standards across authorities and add cost and complexity; any higher standard needs a robustly costed rationale (cites NPPF PM13). **CPRE North & East Yorkshire** by contrast, reads the NPPF as allowing local energy and water-efficiency standards above national ones where justified (PM13, CC1) and says renewable energy policies need review.

The National Trust note that at the time of adoption of the current Local Plan the precise effects of climate change were 'uncertain' and that clearly this is no longer the case. With recent dry summers and recent wildfires, 2026 is likely to be the hottest on record following the wettest of winters, and storms, it is now clear that we are experiencing direct effects of climate change rather than anticipating this change. A climate policy that can help frame tackling climate change challenges in the historic environment would be positive.

CPRE North and East Yorkshire state that policies in relation to renewable energy (onshore wind turbines and solar energy) will need to be reviewed in light of national policy changes. The publication of the new NPPF (Aug 26) requires Development Plans to take a proactive approach to mitigating climate change and supporting the transition to net zero; and adapting to climate change

The Camphill Village Trust (Botton) recommends that the new Local Plan should support estate-wide or community-wide climate and energy strategies, provide flexibility for renewable and low-carbon technologies where landscape

effects can be satisfactorily mitigated, positively support the adaptation and reuse of existing buildings, positively support the adaptation/need for new infrastructure that is required to support land-based businesses and recognise flood management, habitat restoration and regenerative land management as legitimate forms of development.

Some **individuals** want more small on-farm wind turbines and easier solar for off-grid farms and homes; three respondents raise this, one adding that there should be no wind or solar farms in the landscape. Several asked for an openness to more sustainable building materials and efficient designs as opposed to matching aesthetic of existing building styles. One states that currently any properties within a Conservation Area face challenges if wishing to switch to sustainable energy in the form of heat pumps & solar panels. There was strong support for using previously developed sites in the first instance and two people stated that swift bricks should be included in new development.

Q2: How can planning policies better enhance nature and biodiversity?

Some respondents emphasised the importance of development being required to offset their impact on biodiversity. Under National planning policy, development over a certain size is required to deliver biodiversity net gain (BNG), and the Authority will review our policies to ensure that all development includes some sort of biodiversity offset where possible. Specific habitat measures such as swift boxes were referred to and will be considered.

Answers to this question also referred to the need to prioritise brownfield land, and as set out above this will be considered.

Whilst many responses referred to land management and the Authority's own conservation work, this is largely outside the remit of the Local Plan as it does not involve development.

The Yorkshire Wildlife Trust put in a detailed response. YWT want a wetland-creation policy tied to the North Yorkshire LNRS, no renewables on deep peat or designated sites, and warns that existing policies must not be weakened.

The Home Builders Federation ask that the Plan should not repeat national nature policy (10% BNG is already statutory; cites PM6) but help applicants apply it locally. They support the intention to strengthen policies around renewable energy generation and prevention wildfires into future revisions of the Local Plan.

The North York Moors Association suggest a higher BNG threshold than currently targeted could be mandated in order to achieve more benefit from planning developments.

Helmsley Town Council asks for mandatory swift bricks and hedgehog highways in new development and to resist paving over front gardens.

The Forestry Commission seeks recognition of the White Rose Forest Plan 2050 (and the Tees Community Forest Plan once published) in the Local Plan (cites NPPF N2).

Camphill Village Trust (Botton) mention that ownership of land around Botton provides an opportunity to deliver nature recovery across a whole valley rather than through disconnected interventions by separate landowners . Its continuously managed landholding, woodland, watercourses and existing land-based activities provide a strong basis for linking biodiversity enhancement with sustainable farming, landscape stewardship, health and wellbeing, learning and meaningful occupation.

Conversation 2: Recreation, health and wellbeing

Q3: Where do you think recreational development in the National Park should be located and do you think the current levels are at the right scale? Do you have any views on the type of recreational and tourism infrastructure that is needed or is appropriate?

Responses emphasised that the accessibility of a site, especially by public transport and walking/cycling, should be given significant weight in locating new recreational development. Respondents also generally preferred development to be directed to existing larger settlements. Whilst the Authority does not control where and when public transport runs, it is agreed that choosing sustainable locations for new development is important. Regarding which kind of infrastructure is most needed, car parking was the most important to respondents.

The National Trust suggests dispersing visitors from honeypots and go beyond protecting rights of way by defining corridors where access links can be improved (Roseberry Topping alternative start points cited). Proposes the Local Plan identify a "Tees to Topping" green corridor between Roseberry Topping and the River Tees.

Eskdaleside cum Ugglebarnby Parish Council suggest a further National Park centre on the east side near the coast, combined with Park and Ride.

Rosedale Parish Council suggest peripheral parking linked to better bus services; secure lockers in farm buildings for walkers, cyclists and campervan users; small farm campsites as an alternative to roadside overnighting.

The Forestry Commission suggest use of recreational zoning and visitor carrying capacity: multi-functional woodlands can take higher recreational use and draw pressure from moorland, heathland and peat.

The Yorkshire Wildlife Trust stated that managing recreational impacts is also crucial and should be written into policy within the NYM Local Plan. Where visitors' numbers are consistently high or where growth is planned, the impact from visitors needs to be adequately addressed and ongoing management should be required.

CPRE North and East Yorkshire are of the opinion that small-scale tourism and recreational development in locations with little or no landscape impact should continue to be supported. However, there may be opportunities to strengthen links to the NP with larger settlements outside the boundary including Scarborough, Thirsk, areas in Teesside and the City of York which would support health and wellbeing.

Q4: Does there need to be more flexibility to allow low impact recreational uses in isolated or remoter farm buildings

Responses to this question were mixed. Whilst some had strong views against additional flexibility in isolated locations, there is also a level of support. Responses acknowledge the need for uses to be truly sustainable and not impact on landscape, ecology, parking and access.

The National Trust support making better use of redundant buildings promotes a sustainable use of vernacular buildings across the Park and in turn this helps to maintain the character of the area and viability of the countryside.

West Ayton Parish Council and the **North York Moors Association** want positive provision for campervans and wild camping pressure: small, seasonal, low-cost campsites with minimal facilities (West Ayton), camping barns/bothies, and designated provision in appropriate places (The North York Moors Association.)

Camphill Village Trust (Botton) suggest there is a significant opportunity to re-purpose some existing farm buildings in remote locations to provide a tourism offering.

Rosedale Parish Council supports a more proportionate approach to adapting suitable existing farm buildings for low-impact recreational purposes, including secure storage and lockers for walkers, cyclists, campers and campervan/motorhome users.

Eskdaleside cum Ugglebarnby Parish Council support, with some caveats.

Bilsdale Midcable Parish Council and Community First Yorkshire both find "low impact" recreational use unclear and ask for definitions or worked examples. Bilsdale Parish Council also asks for a Bransdale-style assessment for Bilsdale and a traffic counter on Carlton Bank.

15 members of the public supported this suggestion, 8 were opposed.

Conversation 3: How do we decide which villages may see some new development?

Q5: Do you think the current (settlement) hierarchy works well? Should other villages be included? What changes would you like to see?

Responses to this question were mixed. Some feel the hierarchy works well, whilst others wish for changes and cited individual villages/settlements as examples. The settlement hierarchy will be under review going forward.

Not all respondents were aware of the settlement hierarchy or its purpose. The Authority will consider options for clearer communication on this issue.

The Home Builders Federation suggest that the Plan should classify every settlement in the hierarchy (no open-countryside category); it supports Larger Village redesignation and wants a windfall policy permitting sustainable edge-of-settlement homes.

Camphill Village Trust (Botton) stated that there should be no exclusion of settlements which meet the criteria in the New Local Plan . Every settlement has an opportunity to deliver new and sustainable housing development. There should be no need to define 'larger village' in the new Local Plan.

Spaunton Parish Council suggest that evidence points to the existing settlement hierarchy not fulfilling its main purpose of directing new development to villages. It opposes including the village in the hierarchy.

West Ayton Parish Council suggest that the current hierarchy works well but there is scope for small scale development of principal residences in the smaller villages where appropriate.

Rosedale Parish Council stated that the hierarchy does not accommodate changing family needs: allow annexes and "bolt-on" accommodation for multigenerational living, and sensitive conversion of redundant pubs and hotels to mixed housing and visitor use.

Bilsdale Midcable Parish Council support Chop Gate remaining as a smaller settlement.

The North York Moors Association stated that there is an argument for including some of the smaller villages / hamlets which are not currently included in the 'Smaller Villages' tier of the hierarchy and allowing a limited amount of housing development in them. It supported the idea of principal residence and the conversion of existing buildings.

Yorkshire Wildlife Trust and **CPRE** support the current hierarchy

Community First Yorkshire support the current hierarchy but wish to see community-led exception sites in every tier of the hierarchy, combining small serviced self-build plots for first-time buyers with market homes; custom/self-build principal homes with maximum floor area and plot size, as in single-plot policies elsewhere in England.

One Egton **resident** says Egton should not be a Larger Village because holiday lets have eroded its services, and that existing stock should be better occupied rather than new homes built.

One **member of the public** stated that the settlement works well as it is and adding including settlements such as Littlebeck and Ugglebarnby in the list as possible settlements to be upgraded shows very little awareness of the geography of this part of Yorkshire. Another considered that Littlebeck should not be included.

Q6: Should some villages close to larger urban settlements outside the National Park be designated as Larger Villages, reflecting their sustainable location and access to services?

Responses to this question were split. Residents in favour of maintaining the existing arrangement suggested that despite their proximity to larger settlements, smaller villages have distinct character and often lack infrastructure and services.

Responses in favour of designating certain settlements as larger villages referred to the opportunity to provide affordable housing to support economic and social benefits, and the access to employment opportunities which the location of these villages provides.

Yorkshire Wildlife Trust stated that if villages closer to larger settlements are suitably facilitated to accommodate a larger number of homes and not located in ecologically sensitive areas the scope for this is acceptable.

The Home Builders Federation, Community First Yorkshire, Mulgrave Estate and **North Yorkshire Council** support this suggestion.

Spaunton Parish Council do not support this suggestion.

Most **individuals** who answered did not support an increase in the number of Larger Villages.

Conversation 4: Housing, including overall numbers, locations and tenure

Q7: As long as policies fully support landscape protection do you agree that we need to build more homes in the National Park to help meet the needs of local communities?

With some exceptions, respondents generally emphasised that new housing would need to be affordable for local people and not used as second homes.

Although some respondents objected to this idea, responses generally indicated support for some new housing development to meet the needs of local communities, provided that landscape and ecological protections are in place. In general, there is a preference for the reuse of brownfield sites to deliver housing.

Many organisations stated that there was a need for additional housing in the National Park to meet identified affordable housing need.

The Home Builders Federation consider that The HBF fully supports this approach. Whilst there is a clear requirement to protect the special qualities of the National Park, the NPA cannot ignore housing need. Indeed, in common with other National Parks around the country, the North York Moors National Park is likely to have an aging population and a declining working age population and this is primarily caused by the lack of suitable housing. This is because of the constrained approach to housing growth in the National Park over successive decades, creating an imbalance between the need and the supply of homes. The HBF considers that the NPA should be looking proactively at addressing housing need and to seek to reverse the current demographic trends.

National Highways cites the needs-assessment figure of up to 77 affordable homes a year (about 1,155 over 15 years) as potentially affecting the strategic road network; wants sites in sustainable locations and continued involvement once sites are known.

The North York Moors Association support this idea if the new dwellings 'help meet the needs of local communities' and are prevented from being sold on to become under-occupied second homes or holiday lets.

Yorkshire Wildlife Trust stated that The need for housing in the National Park is not in dispute, the current hierarchy is in place to protect the nature of the National Park whilst allowing for sustainable development to occur. Should more houses need to be built, then existing policies should be retained and strengthened to ensure that no negative impacts occur.

North Yorkshire Council supports the view that the emerging local plan should be "more ambitious" when it comes to building new homes in the National Park. In developing that approach, joint discussions should be held and evidence produced to understand the cumulative cross-boundary impact of any development opportunities that emerge.

Helmsley Town Council and Eskdaleside cum Ugglebarnby Parish Council support this, subject to tighter restrictions on occupancy, and with an emphasis on affordable and social housing, especially for rent for local people.

Community First Yorkshire support this, if it is affordable, accessible housing with secure, long-term access to local workers, but with restrictions applied.

CPRE North and East Yorkshire would support the NPA in being more ambitious to increase the delivery of affordable housing, especially given the evidenced need. This would need to be delivered in a way that would support the statutory purposes of the National Park whilst ensuring that any developments should be designed and constructed with climate mitigation in mind.

Mulgrave Estate support this approach and notes that landscape protection remains paramount, but protecting communities is equally important if the National Park is to remain a living place rather than becoming increasingly dependent on second homes and retirement migration.

Views from **members of the public** were mixed, with a majority supportive if adequate infrastructure was provided, the landscape was protected and new homes did not end up as holiday lets or second homes.

Q8: Should all new homes be required to be lived in as a main home and be subject to a principal residence condition across the whole National Park (removing the current local connection requirements in Smaller Villages?)

Most respondents are strongly in favour of using planning conditions to prevent the use of new homes as second homes, though respondents are split on whether the local occupancy condition should be retained. This topic will be under further review during the development of a draft local plan.

Despite the majority of responses being in favour of restrictions, some respondents opposed the idea that all new homes should have a principal residence requirement.

Camphill Village Trust (Botton) stated that principal residence restrictions on all new homes could be restrictive and stall development; and prefers continuing local occupancy conditions (excluding Botton, where specialist supported housing is needed).

The **National Trust** says affordability matters more than occupancy.

Mulgrave Estate opposes a blanket principal residence condition: larger, higher-value or bespoke schemes will never be affordable locally, so the condition would reduce viability and investment without helping affordability.

The Home Builders Association welcomes removing the local connection test but says a blanket principal residence condition affects viability, mortgage finance and occupants' rights; wants a balance of homes with and without it.

Most **individuals** who answered supported a principal residence condition. One stated that Homes and developments with local occupancy clauses remain unsold and absolutely conflict with all wellbeing and economic goals. The smaller settlement tier should not be linked with local occupancy clauses if the category remains as part of a hierarchy in the document.

Spaunton Parish Meeting; Bilsdale Midcable Parish Council; Helmsley Town Council; Rosedale Parish Council; West Ayton Parish Council; The North York Moors Association, CPRE North and East Yorkshire and Community First Yorkshire support principal residence conditions. Bilsdale Parish Council cites a derelict barn at Chop Gate that can be a holiday cottage or a local-occupancy dwelling. Helmsley Town Council want tight, enforceable conditions, exception sites with priority for people working in the parish, and more rented homes for single people and young families.

A couple of **individuals** stated that local occupancy conditions produce homes that stay unsold and are hard to mortgage; one owner of restricted properties says they could not be sold after three years on the market.

There was strong support from **members of the public** on this issue. Two disagreed and one argued that the current set of restrictions should be retained.

Q9: What are your thoughts about identifying housing sites on the edges of villages?

Respondents generally said that housing should be built where villages have services and infrastructure to support new housing. The importance of preventing new

housing stock being used as AirBnBs and second homes was emphasised by some respondents.

Some respondents stated that housing development should be prioritised on brownfield land and were therefore opposed to a more permissive approach to development on village edges.

The Home Builders Federation considers that it is sensible to identify housing sites on the edges of villages which are sustainable and are able to address key matters such as landscape impact. In addition to this, the HBF would also advocate a similar approach in the form of a windfall policy which not only facilitates the development of new homes on sustainable sites within the built-up area of the NPA's settlements but can permit the development of new homes on the edge of a settlement providing they are commensurate to the scale of the settlement, in a sustainable location and can address any associated impacts (including landscape).

Camphill Village Trust stated that the new NPPF provides significant support for such development in Policies S3-S5, both inside and outside of settlement boundaries that are well related to an existing settlement. Every settlement has an opportunity to deliver new and sustainable housing development.

The North York Moors Association stated that where there are opportunities for converting redundant farm and other buildings this could work well (for instance former schools, places of worship, commercial premises), and also possibly for infill, including the conversion of redundant and deteriorating buildings within villages.

Yorkshire Wildlife Trust stated that it is important that any settlement edges where new housing allocations are planned are done so in accordance with the North York Moors National Park Management Plan. Site specific assessment should inform any new allocations.

Helmsley Town Council support exception sites for affordable housing with as tight as possible local occupancy restrictions and provide more accommodation for single people and young families.

Community First Yorkshire support sites on the edge of settlements which should be identified in response to an understanding of local need. Sites could be community-led exception sites which could combine small, serviced plots to be made available for first time buyers to self-build, whilst also incorporating opportunities for market homes too.

CPRE North and East Yorkshire. The ageing population, decline of working age population and high levels of second homes and high housing costs (above local income) suggests that the NPA should prioritise the provision of affordable housing rather than traditional 'market' housing. CPRENEY acknowledge the difficulties of finding available sites within existing settlements and therefore, appropriately scaled sites on the edge of settlements, which conform with policies set out in the Framework may be appropriate.

North Yorkshire Council stated that Where NYC and NYMNP share settlements, consideration of the cumulative impact should be taken into consideration, for example, landscape, infrastructure, settlement form and character.

Mulgrave Estate stated that there is merit in considering well-designed edge-of-village sites where they represent a logical extension to an existing settlement and

can be accommodated without adverse landscape impacts. A blanket restriction against edge-of-village development may unnecessarily limit opportunities to meet local housing needs. Site selection should focus on landscape sensitivity, design quality, accessibility and community benefit.

Answers from **members of the public** were more mixed, with no clear line on whether this should happen or not emerging.

Q10: Do you have any views on whether we should look to find land for an exemplar project that can demonstrate how best to build green or 'eco' homes, or how we can best encourage self-build housing?

In principle there is some support for this idea, though some respondents think it should not be a priority. There are various ideas for where this could be delivered, from farmland to brownfield sites. Again, some respondents emphasised that new homes should not be occupied as second homes.

Spaunton Parish Meeting; The North York Moors Association (NYMA). Both name Spaunton Quarry as a possible exemplar site. Spaunton PM points to the existing woodland chalet permission as a basis for timber self-build with renewable energy (while noting a service-centre site would be more sustainable); The North York Moors Association (NYMA) suggests a mandatory share of self-build to set environmental criteria. **Helmsley Town Council** cites Goldsmith Street, Norwich (RIBA Stirling Prize 2019) as a social housing exemplar.

Mulgrave Estate mentions that schemes should be replicable and inform future policy rather than being one-off showcases.

Home Builders Federation and a parish council (unnamed) doubts self-build demand justifies allocating sites and prefers a positively worded policy. The parish council says this work is already happening across the UK and need not be repeated.

Camphill Village Trust stated that the New Local Plan should include a dedicated Custom and Self-Build housing related policy to provide support for housing of this specific type in suitable locations and to meet the local demand. Furthermore, provision should be made either within a dedicated policy or within a specialist housing policy for specialist care housing and meeting a local need.

CPRE North and East Yorkshire considers that this would be an interesting idea and one which could help raise the profile of the NP in this regard. A local plan policy to encourage innovative self-building proposals which would seek to go beyond national standards could be justified in accordance with Policy PM13 and CC1 of the NPPF.

Rosedale Parish Council said the emphasis should be on genuinely sustainable homes rather than simply creating an exemplar development carrying an 'eco' label. Sustainability should include energy performance, infrastructure demand, location and suitability for the household expected to occupy the property.

Eskdaleside cum Ugglebarnby Parish Council supports innovation in sustainable design where developments are sympathetic to the landscape of the National Park and affected communities and can demonstrate genuine environmental benefit.

One **member of the public** stated that for the National Park Authority should not promote exemplar projects or prioritise promoting self-building. Looking for exemplars and promoting single initiatives routinely involves expensive

consultations/frameworks and the NYMNPA simply does not have the funds for such projects without neglecting the core purpose of the National Park.

The Vision.

We also asked for views on a potential vision for the next Local Plan. There were few comments on this, and those that did respond were generally supportive. Other comments were:

Camphill Village Trust: The vision should make reference to the development of new homes and creating sustainable communities in the National Park. in order to align with the Government's aspiration to deliver new homes in sustainable locations on a significant scale.

The Home Builders Federation fed back that whilst it is considered that the Vision adequately covers the first two duties, the HBF considers that it could do more to address the third duty to promote the economic and social wellbeing of local communities. It is appreciated that given the special qualities of the National Park, there needs to be a balance between conserving and enhancing the North York Moors and addressing housing needs but given the demographic and economic pressures facing the area.

Historic England welcome the draft vision but suggest more proactive wording could be used in relation to the area's cultural heritage. As such, they suggest the following minor amendments to the vision "...that celebrates its cultural heritage..."

Other issues raised

Some of the topics raised in consultation responses are as follows:

- The provision of transport infrastructure
- The natural environment
- Water infrastructure and flooding
- Supporting agricultural businesses and rural diversification
- Energy and mining
- Views on individual development sites

Camphill Village Trust requested that the Authority should use the new Local Plan process to undertake a focused review of the existing Botton policy – C09 . An updated policy should:

- Recognise Botton's distinctive status, purpose and settlement form;
- Support an agreed long-term Vision and masterplan;
- Enable the renewal and growth of its supported living community;
- Support nature-based opportunities, community enterprises and appropriate visitor activity;
- Facilitate the reuse and rationalisation of underused assets;

- Allow necessary infrastructure and environmental improvements;
- Support modern, accessible and adaptable housing;
- Enable complementary activities that contribute to financial resilience; and
- Require development to conserve and enhance landscape character, biodiversity and heritage.

It seeks an integrated, landscape-scale approach: support for estate- or community-wide climate and energy strategies, flexibility for low-carbon technology where landscape effects can be mitigated, and flood management and habitat restoration treated as acceptable forms of development.

The North York Moors Association provided a considered and useful response. It asked that the Plan could establishing stronger energy efficiency standards including exceeding standard energy regulations and setting net-zero carbon emission targets for new builds and lead the way on the design and installation of water-management measures such as rainwater harvesting tanks. It also asked for sensitive retrofitting for historic buildings; and allowing a more permissive policy for domestic-level renewable energy installations and solar panels on modern building roofs and especially farm buildings should be encouraged. It also asked for additional peat restoration and woodland cover work and asked that dark skies policy to be further rolled out, as well as requesting that additional biodiversity net gain could be secured. It suggested a slight imbalance between the first and second purposes and raised the issue of camper vans. The Association also asks that the visual impact of the Woodsmith tower and Boulby mine head be addressed.

Lythe Parish Council stated that of their four villages, one, Sandsend, was mostly outside the National Park, and questioned the ramifications of this.

West Ayton Parish Council; Eskdaleside cum Ugglebarnby Parish Council cite infrastructure capacity. West Ayton: sewerage already inadequate, about 75 homes built on the NYC side with 30 more proposed (20 in the Park), no capacity for larger sites; also asks Government to require change of use for second homes and holiday lets. Sleights: 1930s combined sewer overloads in storms, A169 traffic; improvements should precede development.

Rosedale Parish Council stated that the term 'affordable housing' needs to be considered in the context of National Park communities. Affordability should be assessed against local wages and household incomes, including the circumstances of self-employed and seasonal workers, rather than simply wider market values. The Plan should also consider how homes intended to be affordable remain genuinely affordable on subsequent sale. The National Park is not simply a visitor destination; it is a living and working community, and policy should be designed accordingly. Sustainability should therefore be judged not only by the environmental impact of development, but by whether National Park communities remain viable, resilient and accessible throughout the year. A National Park that is environmentally protected but increasingly difficult for ordinary people to live and work in will not be socially sustainable.

Churchill Living / McCarthy & Stone asked for a reduced affordable housing requirement for older persons' housing.

The **Defence Infrastructure Organisation** requests a specific policy for RAF Fylingdales.

North Yorkshire Police stated that Strategic Policy C could be strengthened by including the following, or similar wording:“ Developments should seek to promote communities which are inclusive, safe and reduce the potential for crime and anti-social behaviour. The design and layout of new developments should follow national advice and where applicable, new development proposals will be required to demonstrate the appropriate application of ‘Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED).” In respect of point 8, this could be improved by including the below or similar wording: “All new developments will be required to consider the provision of secure cycle storage and where appropriate this should be within a secure building containing cycle anchorage points.

Paragraph 7.13 of Policy CO3 could be improved with the addition of: “The applicant has demonstrated how they have considered crime prevention and what measures are to be incorporated to reduce the risk of the facility suffering from crime or anti-social behaviour. Where appropriate the principles of the Safer Parking scheme should be adopted.”

Conclusion

Many other issues were also raised in response to this initial consultation. Where these relate to issues which fall under the remit of the Local Plan review, we will consider all responses raised and address these during the plan review process.

The next steps

Comments received during this initial consultation will be considered as we develop the vision, aims and objectives of the Local Plan. The next round of engagement on the proposed content of the plan will take place in May 2027.

We have put together a Project Plan setting out the definition and scope of the Local Plan review in greater detail. This document contains a plan timetable setting out key milestones for the Local Plan review.

Should you have any further questions about the Local Plan review process, please contact us at localplan@northyorkmoors.org.uk

List of responders

There were 34 individual comments received by members of the public, plus the following 34 organisations:

1. Spaunton Parish Meeting
2. Helmsley Town Council
3. Byland with Wass and Oldstead Parish Council
4. Community First Yorkshire
5. Natural England (Yorkshire and Northern Lincolnshire)
6. Camphill Village Trust

7. North York Moors Association
8. Lythe Parish Council
9. Bilsdale Midcable Parish Council
10. West Ayton Parish Council
11. Defence Infrastructure Organisation (National Armaments Director Group)
12. Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Strategy & Plans)
13. Ministry of Defence (Safeguarding)
14. Forestry Commission (Nature Recovery)
15. Environment Agency
16. Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
17. Anglo American
18. National Trust
19. Home Builders Federation
20. Whitby Community Network CIC
21. North Yorkshire Council (Planning Policy and Place)
22. Campaign to Protect Rural England (North and East Yorkshire)
23. National Grid Electricity Transmission
24. Historic England (North, East and Yorkshire)
25. Active Travel England
26. Marine Management Organisation
27. Rosedale Parish Council
28. Mulgrave Estate
29. Coal Authority
30. Eskdaleside cum Ugglebarnby Parish Council
31. National Highways
32. North Yorkshire Police
33. Canal & River Trust
34. Churchill Living and McCarthy & Stone

Appendix 2 - list of specific and general consultation bodies who we notified:

Regulation 22 of the 2026 Local Plan Regulations requires that this report sets out the specific and general consultation bodies notified of the Plan review.

Specific Consultation Bodies / Duty to Cooperate

- Canal & Rivers Trust - Yorkshire and Northeast Region
- Environment Agency
- Forestry Commission - North England
- Forestry Commission - Yorkshire & Humber
- Nature Recovery Strategy
- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
- Marine Management Organisation
- Marine Management Organisation - Northern
- Marine Management Organisation - Scarborough Office
- Natural England
- Natural England Sustainable Development and Marine
- Historic England
- Homes England
- NHS Humber and North Yorkshire Integrated Care Board (ICB)
- NHS North East and North Cumbria Integrated Care Board (ICB)
- NHS Property Services
- Civil Aviation Authority
- Coal Authority
- National Highways
- Office of Rail and Road
- Office of Rail Regulation
- National Grid
- Northern Powergrid
- Northern Gas Network (NGS)
- Network Rail - Yorkshire Region
- Office for Nuclear Regulation - Land Use

- Police - North Yorkshire Police
- Police - North Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner
- Police and Crime Commissioner for Cleveland
- Sport - Sport England
- Sport - Active Travel England
- NYC - Local Plan consultation inbox
- RCBC - Local Plan consultation inbox
- Tees Valley Combined Authority
- York and North Yorkshire Combined Authority
- Northumbrian Water
- Yorkshire Water
- British Telecommunications plc
- Quickline Communications Limited
- Gigaclear Limited
- Newby and Scalby Neighbourhood Plan
- Guisborough Neighbourhood Plan
- Nawton and Beadlam Neighbourhood Plan
- Ingleby Arncliffe Neighbourhood Plan
- Defence Infrastructure Organisation
- Age UK
- Cleveland Fire and Rescue Service
- Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Planning)
- Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Safeguarding)
- Home Builders Federation Ltd (North)
- Home Builders Federation Ltd (Northeast, Northwest and Yorkshire)
- Mobile UK
- National Trust
- North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service
- Whitby, Scarborough and Ryedale DAG

- Whitby Community Network CIC
- Minerals Products Association
- British Geological Survey
- British Marine Aggregate Producers Association
- Anglo-American

General Consultation Bodies

Parish Councils

Estate Representatives (internal forum)

Sent to approximately 72 estate representatives in and around the North York Moors.

Estates/Land Agents/Estate Agents

- Duncombe Park Estate
- Mexborough Estates
- Mulgrave Estate
- Nawton Tower Estate
- Kildale Estate
- Thimbleby Estate
- Duchy of Lancaster
- Ingleby Estate
- CLA North
- NFU North
- Stephensons Rural
- Lister Haigh
- Merit Estates
- Farmoor Services LLP
- Cundalls
- Cundalls RFAS
- Cooper Rural
- Country Land & Business Association

- Lichfields
- Hardcastle Rural Surveyors
- Knight Frank Rural
- GSC Grays
- Carter Jonas (York)
- Savills (York)
- Dacre Son & Hartley Rural
- George F White
- YoungsRPS
- Sanderson Weatherall
- Farmoor Services LLP
- Moorland Association
- Strutt and Parker LLP
- Fitzwilliam Malton Estate
- Carter Jonas

Other Consultees - Public

- Yorkshire Planning Consultants
- John Howlett Planning
- Northern Planners
- Camphill Village Trust
- Woodland Trust
- Brierley Homes
- NYMA (North Yorkshire Moors Association)
- CPRE North Yorkshire
- CPRE Katie Atkinson
- Caravan and Motorhome Group
- Rural Housing Enabler
- Steve Hesmondhalgh & Associates
- Edwardson Associates Ltd

- Prism Planning Ltd
- Ward Hadaway
- Ramblers' Association
- Howardian Hills AONB
- Pegasus Group
- John Howlett Planning
- Bell Snoxell Ltd
- DEB Town Planning and Development Ltd
- Forest Holidays
- John Long Planning
- BHD Partnership
- BHD Partnership
- A L Turner + Associates
- Alan Campbell Chartered Architects
- Peter Rayment Design Limited
- Home Group
- Campaign for National Parks
- Campaign for National Parks
- Repair and Restoration
- North York Moors Railway
- KVA Planning Consultancy
- Yorkshire Archaeological and Historical Society
- North Yorkshire Sport
- Design 4 Architecture
- Esk Valley Railway Development Company
- Local Access Forum
- Ocals Ltd
- North Yorkshire LAF
- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust

- Community First Yorkshire
- Council for British Archaeology
- Concept Town Planning
- Cheryl Ward Planning
- Fylingdales F&C Club
- North Yorkshire Moors Association
- Whitby Active Travel
- Rural Solutions
- Rural Solutions
- North York Moors Youth Voice
- The Planning Bureau Ltd
- ELG Planning
- Twentieth Century Society
- British Horse Society

Other Consultees – Private

A further 82 private individuals