

Detailed assessment of NPPF against North York Moors Local Development Framework

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
Introduction			
1 – 5. Background information and role of the NPPF	n/a	n/a	None
Achieving sustainable development			
6. Whole of NPPF is definition of sustainable development	Core Policy A of the LDF defines sustainable development in the context of the North York Moors National Park. It is considered that this represents an appropriate balance between facilitating development and meeting statutory National Park purposes. The remainder of this table considers the consistency of the LDF with the NPPF.	Varying degrees of significance	None
7 – 8. Sustainable development description	Core Policy A of the LDF sets out what is meant by sustainable development in a National Park context, at the strategic level this is consistent with the broad sustainable development principles in the NPPF.	None	None
9. Strategic aims of sustainable development.	See paragraphs 7-8	See paragraphs 7-8	None
10. Sustainable development taking account of local circumstances	See paragraph 15	See paragraph 15	See paragraph 15
The presumption in favour of sustainable development			
11 - 13. Primacy of development plan, NPPF as guidance and material consideration	The implications of the NPPF as a material consideration are considered throughout this table.	Varying degrees of significance	None
14. (and footnote) Presumption in favour of sustainable development and local plans should meet objectively assessed needs unless specific	<p>There is no statement or policy within the LDF that there is a 'presumption' in favour of sustainable development.</p> <p>However, the principles of sustainable development are key drivers for the overall strategy in Core Policies A and B – within a National Park context. The spatial strategy allows for some limited development of new services and</p>	Low significance	Continue to emphasise that the LDF represents sustainable development in the context of the

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
<p>policies indicate development should be restricted. Approve development that accords with the development plan, and grant permission where policies are absent, silent or out of date unless specific policies indicate development should be restricted.</p>	<p>facilities, housing and employment development within settlements according to their designation within the settlement hierarchy with the overall aim of making local communities more self-sustaining and of providing opportunities for people to understand and enjoy the special qualities.</p> <p>In this respect the LDF is the definition of sustainable development in the North York Moors National Park. Development that complies with the criteria set out in the LDF policies will be permitted – a presumption in favour of sustainable development would not change this position. The presumption in favour of sustainable development is implicit rather than explicit in the LDF.</p> <p>Any ‘presumption’ which would favour levels of development beyond that established in the LDF is considered to be inappropriate in the National Park – the NPPF states that great weight should be given to conserving the landscape, scenic beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of National Parks. Paragraph 14 indicates that there are exceptions to the general principle that Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs – where specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted. This applies to protected landscapes including National Parks. The logical conclusion is therefore that development opportunities in the National Park will be more limited and not all needs will be met. This is supported by paragraph 115 of the NPPF which states that within National Parks great weight should be given to conserving the landscape, scenic beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage. This paragraph also contains a cross-reference to the National Parks Circular which states that the Government recognises that the Parks are not suitable locations for unrestricted housing and therefore does not provide general housing targets for them.</p> <p>Also see paragraph 15.</p>		<p>National Park.</p> <p>Include policy on the presumption in favour of sustainable development in any review of the LDF.</p>
<p>15. All plans should be based upon presumption in favour of sustainable</p>	<p>As outlined in relation to paragraph 14, the LDF as a whole is considered to represent the approach to sustainable development in the National Park. Nevertheless, paragraph 14 states that the presumption in favour of</p>	<p>Low significance</p>	<p>Include policy on the presumption in favour of</p>

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
development.	sustainable development in relation to meeting objectively assessed needs does not apply where specific policies in the NPPF indicate that development should be restricted, which includes within National Parks.		sustainable development in any review of LDF.
16. Neighbourhood plans should plan positively for local development.	The Authority is supporting the Neighbourhood Planning process through training for parish councils and has had discussions with a number of parishes on the process for preparing a plan. No parishes have come forward to prepare a plan at the time of writing.	n/a	None
Core planning principles			
17. Sets out 12 Core planning principles:			
Be plan-led and empower local people. Plans should be up to date and based on joint working and co-operation.	<p>The Local Development Framework was prepared in accordance with the Authority's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.</p> <p>Village Design Statements have been prepared in 2 communities – Hutton Buscel and Osmotherley – with support from the Authority.</p> <p>The Authority will be providing training to help communities to consider whether they wish to prepare a Neighbourhood Development Plan or Neighbourhood Development Order, however at the time of writing none have expressed an interest in doing so. It is anticipated that the number of communities coming forward to prepare Neighbourhood Plans will be limited given the low levels of development anticipated in the Park and there is likely to be greater interest in preparing more informal parish or community plans.</p> <p>Where the LDF is based upon policy established through the RSS, this reflects joint working between planning authorities and other organisations across the region. Outside of the RSS process the Authority works closely with adjoining and other authorities in the sub-region on strategic planning matters, and with other organisations whose remits cover the National Park.</p>	Low significance	Continual documentation on way in which Duty to Co-operate is being met
Drive and support	The LDF aims to support the rural economy where it promotes the purposes	Low significance	Assessment of

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
<p>sustainable economic development, taking account of needs of residential and business communities.</p>	<p>of the National Park designation. The National Park Authority does not have an economic development function but is committed to working more closely with the constituent Local Authorities on this area of work to support economic development within the context of National Park purposes. As there has historically been no employment land figure to work towards in the National Park there has been no assessment of the Park's employment land supply. The LDF does not identify nor aim to meet all business needs within the Park, but sets out a positive strategy in relation to supporting businesses which are appropriate within the context of a National Park and which will support the rural economy. The exception to this is at Whitby Business Park (which is split between the National Park and Scarborough Borough) where the Authority is working with Scarborough Borough Council to improve the Business Park and allocate additional employment land. Maintaining the landscape and environment of the Park, and protecting it from inappropriate developments, is important for the local economy, particularly tourism.</p> <p>The LDF supports housing development largely to meet local needs and needs for affordable housing, as supported by the National Parks Circular. Open market housing is only supported within the largest settlements with the aim of securing an element of affordable housing alongside this. The Authority works in partnership with its constituent Housing Authorities to respond to the affordable housing needs of the Park identified through Housing Market Assessments, although it is acknowledged that all affordable housing needs cannot be met without harming the National Park's landscape. The main way that this is achieved is through the rural Exception site policy which has resulted in the construction of 77 affordable units in the Park over the last five years. The Authority is working with Ryedale District Council to allocate housing sites in Helmsley to meet Ryedale's housing figure (as Helmsley is split between the two planning authorities).</p> <p>The overall strategy set out in Core Policy B of the LDF recognises that the development opportunities in the Park will be limited but will be steered</p>		<p>business and housing needs would need to be undertaken as part of any future review of LDF.</p>

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
	<p>towards the development of new services and facilities, housing and employment development to improve the sustainability of local communities. The LDF does not allocate land for any type of development but includes positively worded criteria based policies against which development proposals are assessed. The exceptions to this approach are Helmsley and Whitby Business Park as explained above.</p> <p>The above approach is consistent with paragraph 14 of the NPPF which states that objectively assessed needs may not need to be met where specific policies in the Framework indicate that development should be restricted. Paragraph 115 of the NPPF states that great weight should be given to conserving the landscape, scenic beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of National Parks. The National Parks Circular (which is referenced in the NPPF) states that 'The Government recognises that the Parks are not suitable locations for unrestricted housing and therefore does not provide general housing targets for them.' The level, type and location of housing and employment development provided for by the LDF represents that which would support maintaining the landscape and environment of the National Park, this strategy was arrived at through much consultation and through consideration of the impact of previous levels and types of development, as well as reflecting the general position of the RSS in relation to National Parks.</p>		
Secure high quality design and good standard of amenity	The LDF sets out a number of policies to secure good design for all new development in the Park in order to ensure that its special qualities are safeguarded and enhanced. Further detailed design guidance has been adopted in the Authority's Design Guide Supplementary Planning Documents which cover a number of different types of development.	None	None
Take account of different roles and character of different areas	A Landscape Character Assessment was published in 2003 which identifies 9 different character types in the Park. Core Policy G of the LDF seeks to conserve and enhance the distinctive character of these areas and this is followed through in Part 1 of the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.	None	None

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
Support the transition to a low carbon future	Core Policy D of the LDF supports renewable energy which is appropriate to the National Park, Development Policy 3 aims to minimise energy use in new development and Development Policy 2 aims to direct development to areas of least flood risk. Core Policy D of the LDF seeks to reduce the use of energy and the need to use energy in the National Park. It also sets a requirement for 10% of predicted carbon emissions to be offset by energy generated on site from renewable sources in developments of 5 or more houses or other uses of 200sqm or more.	None (but see paragraph 95 in relation to Core Policy D requirements)	None
Conserve and enhance the natural environment	Conserving and enhancing the environment of the Park goes to the heart of the Park's purposes and is embedded throughout the LDF. Core Policy C requires new development to protect the natural environment.	None	None
Encourage the effective use of land by reusing previously developed land	There is little previously developed land in the Park. The most common form of re-use is the conversion of agricultural buildings to other uses, but this is not classed as previously developed land in the glossary of the NPPF. Due to the low amount of previously developed land in the National Park it is unlikely to undermine the strategy of the LDF.	Low significance	Consider incorporating support for reuse of previously developed land in any future review of LDF
Promote mixed use developments	The LDF does not contain a specific policy promoting mixed use developments, but this reflects the fact that new development in the National Park is generally relatively small scale and the communities and settlements themselves provide a mix of uses, and associated opportunities, within a relatively small geographic area.	Low significance	Consider incorporating specific support for mixed use developments in any future review of LDF
Conserve heritage assets	Conserving and enhancing historic assets forms a key part of the overall strategy of the LDF. Core Policy G seeks to conserve and enhance the landscape, historic assets and cultural heritage of the Park.	None	None
Make fullest use possible of public transport, walking and cycling	The generally restrictive approach to development in the Park reflects, as well as National Park purposes, the fact that larger settlements with a greater range of services and facilities, and which are therefore more suited to accommodating new homes and jobs, exist outside the Park. Nevertheless,	None	None

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
	the overarching strategy in Core Policy B, along with Development Policy 23, aims to ensure that development is located in places which can be accessed by public transport, walking and cycling where possible.		
Support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing.	Such development arising from local strategies is likely to be supported by existing policies in principle, but depends on the location and nature of any proposals. The LDF supports new community and cultural facilities but does not set out a proactive strategy to ensure provision is sufficient. The constituent district and borough councils and other bodies are responsible for producing such strategies. The NPA would work with these as part of any review of the LDF. See 70 and 73 below.	Low significance	Any future review of the LDF will need to consider any needs for community and cultural services to meet local needs.
Building a strong, competitive economy			
18. Overall aims for strong, competitive economy and meeting the challenges of global competition and a low carbon future.	Core Policy H promotes a range of opportunities to support the rural economy in the context of delivering National Park purposes. The principles of supporting a low carbon future are set out in Core Policy A and Core Policy D.	None	None
19. Planning system to support economic growth	The LDF policies support economic growth where it does not compromise National Park purposes. It is considered that these policies define appropriate economic growth within the National Park. This approach is consistent with paragraph 115 of the NPPF which states that great weight should be given to conserving the landscape, scenic beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of National Parks. See 17 above (point 2).	Low significance	None
20. Plan proactively to meet business needs	The LDF aims to support the rural economy where it promotes the purposes of the National Park designation. However, the LDF does not identify nor aim to meet all business needs. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that objectively assessed needs may not need to be met where specific policies in the Framework indicate that development should be restricted which includes within National Parks. It is considered that the level, type and location of economic development provided for by the LDF is consistent with maintaining the landscape and environment of the Park, which in turn is important to the economy, particularly tourism.	Low significance	Assessment of business needs would need to be undertaken as part of any future review of LDF.

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
	<p>As an exception to the above approach the Authority is proactively working on the Area Action Plan for Whitby Business Park (jointly with Scarborough Borough Council) and the Helmsley Plan (jointly with Ryedale District Council), which will allocate sites for employment land in order to meet the development needs of business in these locations.</p> <p>The National Park Authority does not have an economic development function but is committed to working more closely with the constituent Local Authorities on this area of work to support economic development within the context of National Park purposes. The Authority will work with the economic development departments of the constituent district and borough councils in assessing such needs to inform any future review of the LDF.</p>		
21. Address barriers to investment, set out economic strategy, identify sites	<p>The economic strategy in the LDF was informed by the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Economic Strategy. It is understood that the Local Enterprise Partnership are producing a strategy, this will provide the context in the future.</p> <p>As there is no figure for the provision of employment land in the Park, there has been no study of the need for employment land and its availability. No information has been collated on existing businesses operating in the National Park and with the exception of Helmsley and Whitby Business Park policies do not identify sites for economic development. Core Policies A, B and H and Development Policies 8, 10 and 11 seek to protect existing employment sites, support the re-use of existing buildings for employment purposes and allow for new buildings where there is no other suitable accommodation available in the locality. In open countryside, Core Policy B and Development Policies 8 and 10 allow for the conversion of traditional rural buildings to support economic uses and for the conversion of other existing buildings for employment use, subject to a number of criteria. This is considered to be an appropriate approach under paragraph 14 of the NPPF which indicates that development should be more restricted, in the context of</p>	Low significance	Assessment of business needs would need to be undertaken as part of any future review of LDF.

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
	<p>protecting the landscape and environment of the National Park in accordance with paragraph 115 of the NPPF.</p> <p>In relation to Whitby Business Park, the Scarborough Employment Land Review provides evidence of the need for new allocations for employment land in Whitby. As the land for expansion on the edge of the existing Business Park is within the National Park, a joint Area Action Plan is being developed which will allocate land for around a further 14 hectares of employment and commercial floorspace. The Ryedale Employment Land Review is the evidence which supports the allocation of up to 2ha of employment land in Helmsley.</p> <p>In the locations where the Authority is allocating land for employment development – Helmsley and Whitby Business Park – the barriers to investment include existing infrastructure problems and the need for investment in improvements are being identified and costed. At Whitby Business Park, inward investment connected to the Dogger Bank Wind Farm is being targeted and a feasibility study has been produced to assess the costs of the infrastructure improvements needed to unlock the adjacent land for development. This forms part of the evidence base for an Area Action Plan which is being produced jointly by Scarborough Borough Council and the National Park Authority.</p>		
22. Not protect employment allocations which are not needed	There are no employment allocations in the LDF. An Area Action Plan is being prepared for Whitby Business Park which will review the allocations made under the former North York Moors Local Plan which have not yet been developed.	None	None
Ensuring the vitality of town centres			
23. Support town centres	The NPPF states that the extent of town centres should be defined and suitable sites should be allocated to meet the scale and type of need. The sequential test will apply to applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre but this should not be applied to applications for	Low significance	In any review of LDF may need to define 'town centres', identify

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
	<p>small scale rural offices or other small scale rural development. The NPPF says that references to town centres apply to local centres and therefore uses should include retail development, leisure, entertainment facilities, offices and arts, culture and tourism development.</p> <p>The LDF Proposals Map does not identify any Town Centres within the Park however it does identify the defined commercial areas in Helmsley, Hutton le Hole and Thornton le Dale. These areas were specifically identified as they were under particular pressure for new commercial activity, which could have a negative impact on the character of these settlements and on the residential amenity of local residents. It was therefore a means to resist development as opposed to accommodating new uses. The definitions in former PPS4 described these settlements as Local Centres as they comprise a small number of shops of a local nature and serve a small catchment area.</p> <p>The LDF is supportive of new retail development or financial and professional services which are located within the main built up area of villages. In the absence of a specific policy, where there are development proposals for other town centre uses they will need to be assessed against the sequential test unless they are for small scale rural offices or other small scale rural development. Under this approach the NPPF allows for out of centre if there are no suitable town centre or edge of centre sites.</p> <p>No assessment of the need/capacity for these types of uses has been carried out. Land has not been allocated to accommodate identified needs. Primary and secondary shopping uses have not been identified.</p> <p>The 'town centre' of Helmsley will be identified via the Helmsley Plan.</p>		needs for town centre uses and refine DP18 to incorporate all types of development expected in town centres.
24. Sequential approach for town centre uses	The scale of retail development in the National Park is small and there are no policies relating to the sequential approach. The only locations where this might need to be applied are Helmsley and Whitby Business Park and the plans being prepared for these locations will refer to the need for a sequential	None	None

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
	approach in considering such uses.		
25. Do not apply sequential test to small rural development	Existing LDF policies do not refer to the sequential test for small scale retail development in the Park.	None	None
26. Impact assessment for retail, leisure and office development over certain threshold and not in accordance with Local Plan	There are no policies relating to this scale of development in the LDF. It is unlikely that applications above the NPPF threshold of 2,500sqm would be received.	Low significance	Consider setting thresholds as part of any future review of LDF
27. Refuse if doesn't satisfy sequential test	See 24 above	See 24 above	None
Supporting a prosperous rural economy			
28. Support economic growth in rural areas	<p>The LDF policies and in particular Core Policies A and B seek to improve the sustainability of communities in the National Park and encourage the continuation of living, working communities where this is compatible with Park purposes. Core Policy H and the associated Development Policies support development to meet the needs of farming, forestry, recreation, tourism and other rural enterprises.</p> <p>Core Policy H sets out overall support for development which will support the economy and employment. Core Policy B and Development Policy 10 allow for new developments to provide employment opportunities within the settlements listed in the settlement hierarchy. Within the open countryside this is limited to the re-use of existing buildings. This approach is consistent with paragraph 115 of the NPPF which gives great weight to the landscape, scenic beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of National Parks. However, paragraph 28 supports 'well designed new buildings' in 'rural areas'. However it is considered that the approach adopted in the LDF is the correct approach for a National Park, and represents a balance between paragraphs 28 and 115 of the NPPF.</p>	High significance in relation to support for new building in 'rural areas'	Continue to apply Development Policy 10 on the basis it represents a balanced approach between paragraphs 115 and 28 of the NPPF.

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
	Core Policy B of the LDF seeks to improve the sustainability of local communities by supporting, improving and consolidating existing services and facilities. This is taken forward in Core Policy I which seeks to resist the loss of community facilities and permit new health, sport, education and other community facilities. The loss of existing tourist and recreation facilities is resisted in Development Policy 15 unless there is robust evidence to demonstrate that the business is no longer viable.		
Promoting sustainable transport			
29 – 30. Support and facilitate sustainable transport	<p>The LDF recognises that in a remote rural area the car will continue to be an important means of transport. However the overall Spatial Strategy in Core Policy B of the LDF seeks to locate development where there are opportunities to access services and facilities by alternative modes of transport to the private car, including walking, cycling and public transport.</p> <p>The low amount of development in the Park reflects, as well as National Park purposes, the wider strategy established through the RSS to direct development towards the larger settlements in the region.</p>	None	None
31. Develop strategies for transport infrastructure	<p>The National Park Authority has a close working relationship with the Highways Authorities covering the Park (North Yorkshire County Council and Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council) and has provided input to the preparation of the NYCC Local Transport Plan 3. The Local Development Framework policies take forward the priorities identified in the Local Transport Plans current at the time the LDF was adopted (2008). These were to seek a reduction in travel demand and a shift to modes of travel with lower environmental impact.</p> <p>The largest transport project that is planned in the Park is a Park and Ride site at Whitby which will be developed by North Yorkshire County Council. Development Policy 24 deals with the provision of infrastructure for new transport developments including park and ride schemes and public car parks.</p>	None	None

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
	<p>Core Policy M aims to improve accessibility to services and facilities within and beyond the Park through strong and effective partnerships with other transport providers.</p> <p>New transport development in the National Park will be limited in scale and it is not anticipated that any transport strategies will be needed for the foreseeable future. A bid to the Local Sustainable Transport Fund has been successful and this will generate specific projects relating to tourist services which will be co-ordinated by the County Council.</p>		
32. Transport assessment for developments that generate significant amounts of movement, and ensuring safe access and sustainable transport.	<p>Development Policy 23 of the LDF sets out the locations where new development will be permitted in relation to the availability of transport, impact on the road network and highway safety and the need for road improvements to respect the rural nature of the National Park.</p> <p>No policies in the LDF require transport assessments – but these may be required by the highways authorities (North Yorkshire County Council and Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council) in relation to larger developments.</p>	None	Consider need to include transport assessments as a requirement in any review of the LDF
33. Ports, airports and airfields	It is not anticipated that there will be any port, airport or airfield development in the National Park over the lifetime of the Local Development Framework.	None	None
34. Minimise need to travel from developments that generate large amount of movements	The overall Spatial Strategy of the LDF seeks to locate new development where there are opportunities to access services and facilities by alternative modes of transport to the private car. The overall spatial strategy in Core Policy B seeks to locate the larger housing developments in the villages with a greater range of facilities, thus minimising the need to travel. The LDF recognises that the potential for alternative forms of transport in a sparse area may be limited.	None	None
35. Design development to ensure safe and efficient movements	Development Policy 23 of the LDF sets out the locations where new development will be permitted in relation to the availability of transport, impact on the road network and highway safety and the need for road improvements to respect the rural nature of the National Park.	None	None
36. Travel Plan required for developments which	The supporting text to Core Policy M states that a Green Travel Plan will be required for proposals which have significant transport implications.	None	None

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
generate significant amount of movements			
37. Balance of land uses to minimise journey lengths	The National Park is not a location for large scale development with the mix of land uses normally found in town and city centre locations. The exception to this is at Helmsley, where the Authority is producing a joint Plan for the town which will allocate land for housing and employment development. The proximity of sites to the town centre and ease of access will be important considerations in selecting the most suitable sites for development.	None	None
38. Promote a mix of uses for larger scale residential developments	With the exception of Helmsley, it is unlikely that large scale residential developments will come forward within the Park (see paragraph 47). The LDF does not contain a specific policy to promote mixed use developments, but this reflects the fact that new development in the National Park is generally relatively small scale and the communities and settlements themselves provide a mix of uses, and associated opportunities, within a relatively small geographic area.	Low significance	None
39. Requirements to follow if setting local parking standards	There are no local parking standards in the LDF. North Yorkshire County Council has adopted parking standards. Although these have not been formally adopted by the Authority, they are used to assess and determine the appropriate level of parking provision to serve new development. There are no plans to formally adopt the standards.	None	None
40. Parking in town centres	Not relevant in NP as whole and not planning issues.	None	None
41. Identify and protect sites and routes for widening transport choice	The LDF does not identify and protect sites and routes for developing transport infrastructure, consideration would need to be given to any such issues if they arise through planning applications.	Low significance	Consider the need to identify and protect any sites for transport infrastructure as part of any future review of the LDF
Supporting high quality communications infrastructure			
42. Background re	n/a	n/a	n/a

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
communications			
43. Telecommunications infrastructure	<p>Development Policy 25 of the LDF is supportive of infrastructure and information technology where it is of a scale and design appropriate to the National Park and will meet the needs of communities. The policy was found to be sound in 2008 and on the basis that the NPPF does not change the requirements, it is considered to be consistent with the provisions of the NPPF.</p> <p>High speed broadband is being rolled out across North Yorkshire including more remote communities in the County. This is a new development since the adoption of the LDF. The main planning implications are whether permission/listed building consent is required for installations on individual buildings and advice on this is being given on a case by case basis. Where permission is required, the normal development management policies in the LDF will be used to assess proposals.</p>	None	None
44. Not impose wide bans / restrictions on telecommunications development	See above. The LDF policies do not impose a ban or restrictions on telecommunications development. Development Policy 25 does not set out considerations in relation to interference.	None	Any review of the LDF would need to consider whether to include considerations relating to interference
45. Information to support applications for telecommunications development	Dealt with through normal development management process.	None	None
46. Determine applications on planning grounds	Applications for telecommunications developments would be considered against the planning policies in the LDF, primarily Development Policy 25.	None	None
Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes			
47. Meet housing needs, identify sites for five years	The NP does not have a 5 year rolling supply of sites as the RSS stated that all new housing in the National Parks was to meet local needs only. The	Low significance	May need to carry out a SHMA and

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
<p>housing supply, provide a housing trajectory and implementation strategy, local approach to housing density</p>	<p>National Park Circular, which is identified in the NPPF as a source of further guidance, states that the Government recognises that National Parks are not suitable for unrestricted housing and does not therefore provide general housing targets for them. The Circular goes on to say that the expectation is that new housing will be focused on meeting affordable housing requirements. Most housing in the North York Moors will be delivered through the rural housing enabler programme and the delivery will be dependent upon the specific needs of Parishes. This approach to rural exception sites has been extremely successful in the NP and has resulted in the completion of 77 units over the last 5 years. Paragraph 47 is clear that needs should be met 'as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the Framework (NPPF)' and paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that housing needs may not need to be met where 'specific policies in this Framework (NPPF) indicate that development should be restricted'. To meet all housing needs in the Park is likely to be inconsistent with paragraph 115 which states that great weight should be attached to conserving the landscape, scenic beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of National Parks.</p> <p>The LDF anticipates windfalls in the region of 26 units per year. A large proportion of historical housing delivery in the NP has been through the conversion of agricultural buildings, which are not considered to be previously developed land in the NPPF or previously in PPS3. Apart from the development of farm buildings there are few brownfield sites in the National Park and therefore it was very difficult to achieve the previous target contained in PPS3. For these reasons the removal of the target is unlikely to have a significant impact on housing land supply.</p> <p>The scale of development in the National Park is small scale and tends to be of low density in order to complement the character of the rural settlements and there is no policy in the LDF which sets a housing density figure for new development. However the Helmsley Plan will include a policy on density as the development in the town will be on a much larger scale. A policy setting</p>		<p>SHLAA to inform any future review of LDF</p> <p>Consider providing an explanation to the approach to housing density in any future review of the LDF.</p>

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
	out housing density is not considered appropriate due to the scale of future development. The density of development will largely be dependent on the character of the area and therefore will need to be assessed on a case by case basis.		
48. Realistic allowance for windfall sites	For the reasons set out in paragraph 47 above all new housing delivery will be windfall. Based on past completion rates this is anticipated to be in the region of 26 units per year.	Low significance	None
49. Presumption in favour of sustainable development for housing applications	The approach for new housing development followed that of the previous RSS and that of the National Parks circular which states that all new housing development should be to meet local needs only. Open market housing however is supported in the larger more sustainable settlements and will be expected to contribute a proportion of affordable units. Development in the smaller villages is restricted to one unit on infill gaps as any more development is not considered sustainable in the context of conserving the cultural heritage and landscape of the National Park. This is consistent with paragraph 115 of the NPPF which states that great weight should be given to conserving the landscape, scenic beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage within National Parks. The policies in the LDF are considered to represent sustainable development for the North York Moors National Park and therefore the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the current approach.	Low significance	None
50. Provide for mix of housing	<p>It is considered that the LDF provides for a mix of housing whilst ensuring that levels of new housing development are appropriate within a National Park.</p> <p>Core Policy J allows for open market housing to be developed in the larger settlements and Local Occupancy housing to be constructed on infill gaps within the smaller villages. This approach allows for the provision of a mix of housing.</p> <p>All affordable housing on exception sites will be required to meet the needs of local people as identified in an up to date housing needs survey. Similarly any open market housing will need to reflect the needs identified. Where local</p>	Low significance	None

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
	<p>occupancy housing is proposed the need must be identified at the application stage.</p> <p>Core policy J sets out a requirement for 50% affordable housing provision on sites of 2 or more units in the Local Service Centre of Helmsley and the Service Villages. The threshold was set by the NP on the basis of historical completions rates and therefore the removal of the national minimum threshold is not applicable. Core Policy K is the main mechanism for the delivery of affordable housing through the use of exception sites. Evidence on housing needs has been provided through the NYSHMA which was carried out in 2011 and is therefore up to date. The study concluded that there was a need to deliver 135 affordable units each year. This level of development would need to be cross subsidised by open market housing and would thereby cause harm to the character of the NP. A more realistic approach is to deliver affordable housing through the exception site policy, the levels of which will be dependent on the outcomes of Parish housing needs surveys.</p> <p>An assessment carried out by NYCC has identified a need for an extra care facility to accommodate 40 units in Helmsley. This will be addressed jointly with Ryedale DC as part of the Helmsley Plan.</p>		
<p>51. Identify empty homes and bring back into use, favour change of use from commercial to residential unless strong economic reasons to suggest it would be inappropriate</p>	<p>The NPA is not the housing authority and therefore would only have a very limited role in dealing with Empty Homes, but the Authority is working with the constituent district and borough councils to identify the problem.</p> <p>DP11 and DP15 are supportive of change of use of existing employment and tourism buildings to residential use where it can be robustly demonstrated that they are no longer suitable or viable as they may also play an important role in the local economy. The Authority requires applicants to market the property appropriately to ensure there is no prospect of it continuing in economic use prior to granting permission for residential. This approach reflects the high residential values in the National Park and the desire to retain economic uses.</p>	<p>None in relation to empty homes</p> <p>High significance in relation to change of use</p>	<p>Include reference to empty homes in any review of the LDF.</p> <p>Continue to emphasise that the approach in DP11 and DP15 is appropriate for the National Park</p>

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
52. Consider best way to achieve large scale new residential development	Larger scale development is not considered appropriate in the context of a National Park, bearing in mind the requirements of paragraph 115 of the NPPF to give great weight to conserving the landscape, scenic beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of National Parks (see paragraph 47).	Low significance	None
53. Consider resisting inappropriate development in gardens	Core Policy J allows for the development of open market housing in the Local Service Centre and the Service Villages and in infill gaps in the Local Service Villages and Other Villages. The definition of a small infill gap is defined in paragraph 9.16 as a small gap within a continuously built up frontage within the main built up area of the settlement which can accommodate no more than one dwelling. Although this policy approach would allow for the development of large side gardens it would not allow for the redevelopment of the rear of large gardens or knocking down a large house and redeveloping with a number of smaller units. The redevelopment of gardens has not been an issue of concern in the NP and it is not considered necessary to address the issue through a specific policy.	None	None
54. Housing to reflect local needs in rural areas including rural exception sites, consider market housing to bring forward affordable housing	The overall aim of Core Policy J is to meet local housing needs as set out in the National Park Circular, through the delivery of a mix of open market housing, local needs housing and affordable housing. Core Policy K is a rural exception site policy and allows for the development of 100% affordable housing as an exception to normal policy. This approach to rural exception sites has been extremely successful in the NP and has resulted in the completion of 77 units over the last 5 years. Amending the current approach to allow some open market housing to facilitate affordable housing development is unlikely to deliver any more housing as it will make landowners less likely to sell the land at a reasonable cost to RPs and local communities are likely to be less supportive as it will involve the private gain of individuals. The success of the exception site policy has been that landlords have sold land to the RPs and not retained it for “hope” value, this would not be possible if there was the possibility of some open market housing on the land.	Low significance	None
55. Housing to support vitality of rural settlements,	Core Policy B sets out the spatial strategy of the LDF and this is replicated in the approach for housing as set out in Core Policy J. The NPPF says that	High significance	Produce Advice Note which clarifies

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
avoid isolated new homes unless in exceptions	<p>LPAs should avoid isolated new homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances, which includes the essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside. The term 'rural worker' in the NPPF is much wider than the LDF – Core Policy J refers to housing which is proven as essential for farming, forestry or other essential land management activities. The NPPF also removes the details of how these types of proposals should be considered, which were set out in Annex A of PPS7, including the financial test.</p> <p>In relation to the reuse of disused buildings the NPPF requires this to lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting. Development Policy 8 of the LDF supports reuse only of traditional buildings and in terms of housing this must be for local needs letting and tied to an existing residential use. It is considered that this is an appropriate approach for the National Park to enable traditional buildings to be retained without creating a domestic appearance within the landscape.</p>		<p>that part 3 of Core Policy J represents the NYMNPA's definition of a 'rural worker' and includes the details which had been in Annex A of PPS7.</p> <p>Continue to emphasise that the approach to reuse of rural buildings in the LDF is appropriate in the National Park context</p>
Requiring good design			
56. Aims for good design	<p>Core Policy G and Development Policy 3 of the LDF require high quality sustainable design for new development which conserves or enhances the landscape and settlements of the National Park. The Authority has also produced a Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>Both policies were found to be sound in 2008 and on the basis that the NPPF does not change the requirements for good design, it is considered that both policies are consistent with the provisions of the NPPF.</p>	None	None
57 - 58. Plan for high quality design	<p>See above in relation to paragraph 56.</p> <p>The LDF does not contain any requirements in relation to the provision of open space, however the policies are likely to support open space provision as part of new development should this form part of an application.</p>	None	Consider the inclusion of a policy on open space provision as part of any review of the LDF

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
59. Consider use of design codes but avoid unnecessary prescription	The Authority has produced a Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document which has been used by applicants and the Authority.	None	None
60. Not impose styles or stifle innovation, but reinforce local distinctiveness	Development Policy 3 requires development to contribute to the character and quality of the environment and be compatible with surrounding buildings. Further guidance is provided in the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, this does not impose styles but sets out the considerations that should be given in designing a development.	None	None
61. Design to address connections between people and places	The LDF does not specifically address connections between people and place in a design context, the focus is on the visual element of design.	None	Consider the connections between people and place as part of any future review of LDF
62. Should have local design review arrangements in place, and refer to national design review	This approach is followed.	None	None
63. Give great weight to outstanding or innovative designs	Innovative designs are supported by the LDF and the Design Guide SPD, but these should be considered within the context of National Park purposes. This approach is supported by paragraph 115 of the NPPF which attaches great weight to conserving the landscape, scenic beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of National Parks.	None	None
64. Refuse poor design	Development Policy 3 provides for this.	None	None
65. Not refuse development promoting high levels of sustainability due to incompatibility with townscape	Development Policy 3 and the Design Guide SPD support development with high levels of sustainability provided this is appropriate to its location. Core Policy G, Development Policy 3 and Development Policy 4 aim to ensure that the design of new development contributes positively to the existing built environment in visual terms. It is considered that to allow development which is incompatible with the townscape would be contrary to the aims of paragraph 115 of the NPPF which states that great weight should be given to	High significance	Continue to emphasise that the LDF policy approach to such development is appropriate in the context of a

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
	<p>conservation of the cultural heritage in National Parks. The NPPF does however apply further consideration to proposals in Conservation Areas.</p> <p>The built heritage of the National Park formed part of the reason for its designation as such with the 1947 Hobhouse Report noting in particular the Park's picturesque villages.</p>		National Park.
66. Applicants to work with community on design, these should be looked on more favourably	Applicants for larger developments do liaise with the community, however this process on its own would not usually inform the final decision which would be based upon consideration of the planning issues. Decisions on planning applications will continue to be made on planning considerations.	Low significance	None
67. Advertisements – control over amenity and public safety	Consistent with Development Policy 9	None	None
68. Area of Special Control Orders can be used where this will improve visual amenity	Process issue - consistent with LDF	None	None
Promoting healthy communities			
69. Create healthy, inclusive communities, involve all sections of the community and facilitate neighbourhood planning	<p>There is no LDF policy on some elements (mixed use development, active street frontages and public space), however there is nothing in the LDF that would not support the principle of such requirements.</p> <p>Core Policy B of the LDF aims to improve the sustainability of local communities through supporting services and facilities, housing and employment opportunities within existing settlements. The LDF does not contain a specific policy promoting mixed use developments, but this reflects the fact that new development in the National Park is generally relatively small scale and the communities and settlements themselves provide a mix of uses, and associated opportunities, within a relatively small geographic area.</p> <p>Development Policy 3 requires the design of new development to take</p>	Low significance	Policy to support mixed use developments, active street frontages and public open space would need to be considered in any future review of the LDF.

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
	<p>account of the safety, security and access needs of all potential users.</p> <p>Development Policy 23 requires that the external design and layout of new development takes account of the needs of all users.</p> <p>The LDF (including the Design Guide SPD) does not contain any requirement for public open space as part of new development, but Development Policy 3 stipulates that new development should not result in the loss of open space which contributes to the amenity, character and setting of a settlement.</p>		
<p>70. Support open space and community facilities, integrate housing and economic uses with community facilities</p>	<p>There is no LDF policy on provision of shared space or open space.</p> <p>Core Policy I supports the provision of new community facilities and protects existing ones. Core Policy I resists the loss of existing community facilities unless they are no longer needed.</p> <p>Core Policy B aims to improve the sustainability of local communities through supporting services and facilities, housing and employment opportunities within existing settlements.</p> <p>Core Policy I specifically relates to new community facilities but would not prevent existing ones from developing or modernising, provided other policies in the Plan are met (such as design). Likewise, Development Policy 18 relates to proposals for new retail development, but the same would apply.</p> <p>Core Policy J supports new open market housing in the Local Service Centre of Helmsley and in the Service Villages, local needs housing in Local Service Villages and Other Villages and affordable housing within or adjacent to all settlements above. This ensures that new housing is directed primarily towards locations which have the greatest range of services and facilities. Under Core Policy H and Development Policy 10 employment uses are also directed towards the villages within the settlement hierarchy. The limited amount of new housing which is supported in the National Park reflects the</p>	<p>Low significance</p>	<p>Policy on provision of shared space and on enabling community uses to develop and modernise would need to be considered in any future review of the LDF.</p>

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
	fact that (as well as reflecting statutory National Park purposes) places outside the Park can offer a far wider range of facilities and services. Core Policy I directs community facilities towards places where people live and work.		
71. Positive approach to Community Right to Build Orders	Not relevant to LDF. Will need to consider the implications of any Orders individually.	Significance depends on the nature of any Community Right to Build Orders	None
72. Great weight to school developments	Core Policy I supports new community facilities within Helmsley, the Service Villages and the Local Service Villages. Proposals to expand or alter existing schools are likely to be considered in the same terms under the spirit of the policy. The NPPF attaches greater weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools, but it is considered that any proposals relating to schools would nevertheless need to be considered within the context of the National Park.	Low significance	Policies on school development would need to be considered in any future review of the LDF.
73. Base policies on assessment of need for open space, sports and recreation facilities	The LDF has not been informed by an assessment of the needs for, deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreation facilities. There is no requirement within the policies to provide for open space, sports and recreational facilities, and therefore no locally derived standards. Without undertaking an assessment of need for open space, sports and recreation facilities it is not clear how the NPPF requirements of paragraph 70 can be delivered in terms of provision of shared space and sports venues. The need for an assessment has been acknowledged and the Authority is working with Scarborough Borough Council on their Playing Pitch Strategy which will cover that part of the Park.	None	Continue to work on assessment of open space and recreation facilities
74. Avoid loss of open space, sports and recreational buildings.	Core Policy I resists the loss of community facilities.	None	Any future review of the LDF may need to include more detail relating to the specific points in paragraph 74.

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
75. Protect and enhance public rights of way and access	Development Policy 23 protects existing public rights of way, linear routes and other access routes for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. Whilst there is no policy specifically seeking enhancements to these, Development Policy 23 also requires the layout and surfacing of development to take account of the needs of cyclists, walkers and horse riders. The Design Guide SPD identifies that there may be opportunities to provide new links from new developments to existing public rights of way.	None	In any future review of the LDF guidance on enhancing rights of way could be written into policy.
76 - 78. Designation of Local Green Space where this is special to the local community. Policy should be consistent with Green Belt policy.	There is no policy in the LDF which would specifically protect Local Green Spaces but Development Policy 3 stipulates that new development should not result in the loss of open space which contributes to the amenity, character and setting of a settlement. As the NPPF states that Local Green Space should only be designated when a plan is prepared or reviewed, it is considered that the lack of a policy in the current LDF will not be an issue.	None	Any future review of LDF would need to involve local communities in designating Local Green Space.
Protecting Green Belt land			
79 – 92. Green Belt	n/a	n/a	n/a
Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change			
93 – 94. Proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change	Core Policy D relates to mitigating climate change and Development Policy 2 relates to taking flood risk into account. Consideration has not been given to coastal change and water supply and demand. Core Policy D of the LDF facilitates coastal protection works but does not contain a policy relating to the relocation of development. Any such development would need to be considered against the broader locational policies in the LDF, balanced against the support for relocating development at risk from coastal change.	Low significance	Any future review of the LDF would need to be informed by these considerations. Water supply and demand likely to be assessed as part of CIL.
95. Plan for new development to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and support energy efficiency.	The spatial strategy outlined in Core Policy B is based upon an assessment of the level of service provision within a settlement and public transport provision to/from settlements within the Park to jobs and services (mostly outside of the Park), enabling car use associated with new development to be minimised as far as is realistic in a rural area. The limited amount of new	Low significance	Review approach to securing on-site renewable energy as part of any future review of the

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
	<p>development which is supported in the National Park reflects the fact that (as well as reflecting statutory National Park purposes) less-rural places outside the Park can offer better opportunities to reduce car use.</p> <p>Whilst there is no policy which specifically supports the installation of energy efficiency measures in existing buildings, Core Policy D supports reducing energy use and this would be taken into account alongside the other policies relating to, for example, listed buildings or design. The Renewable Energy SPD encourages the use of energy efficiency measures before considering renewable energy.</p> <p>The third bullet point in paragraph 95 is interpreted as meaning that a local authority is not required to set local requirements for sustainable buildings, but relates to how it should be done should a local authority choose to do this. The requirement for renewable energy in Core Policy D was considered appropriate to complement rather than duplicate requirements which were to be set via the Building Regulations. Whilst the requirements of Core Policy D represent an approach to securing on-site renewable energy which was advocated through the RSS, the policy does not adopt nationally described standards. Nevertheless, this is not considered to be a major conflict and would not undermine the overall strategy of the LDF.</p>		LDF
96. New development should meet local requirements and minimise energy consumption through location and design.	<p>See 95 above in relation to Core Policy D requirements.</p> <p>The Design Guide SPD contains guidance on minimising energy use through design.</p> <p>The NPPF retains the requirement to consider the impact on the National Park of wind energy development outside the National Park through the inclusion of footnote 17 which states that planning authorities should follow the approach set out in the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy and Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy Infrastructure.</p>	Low significance	Review approach to securing on-site renewable energy as part of any future review of LDF
97. Promote renewable	Core Policy D supports the generation of energy from renewable sources	None	Any future review

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
and low carbon energy, consider identifying suitable areas for this, support community led initiatives, identify opportunities for development to obtain energy from decentralised systems	<p>where these are appropriate to the National Park.</p> <p>Identifying areas for renewable and low carbon energy is not something that was considered as part of the production of the LDF and Development Policies.</p> <p>The LDF does not identify opportunities where development can draw its energy supply from decentralised, renewable or low carbon energy supply systems and for co-locating potential heat customers and suppliers. However, it is likely that such opportunities are limited bearing in mind the sparse and relatively undeveloped nature of the Park and the low levels of development that are likely to come forward.</p> <p>The LDF specifically supports renewable energy developments that are for communities within the Park.</p>		of the LDF would need to consider whether suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy could be identified, and any potential to co-locate heat customers and suppliers.
98. Not require applicants to demonstrate need for renewable energy, outside identified areas development should meet same criteria	LDF policies do not require need to be demonstrated and is therefore consistent with the NPPF. Areas have not been identified, therefore part 2 does not apply to the LDF.	None	None
99. Ensure development not at risk from effects of climate change	Core Policy D requires development to be located away from areas at risk of flooding but does not consider water supply issues, coastal change and changes to biodiversity and landscape, or require development to minimise its vulnerability to climate change.	Low significance	Any review of LDF would need to consider water supply and coastal change issues, and design considerations for development in vulnerable areas including green infrastructure.

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
100. Avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding, apply sequential approach and Exception Test, relocate development which may become at risk of flooding	<p>No land is allocated in the Core Strategy and Development Policies. Flood risk will form part of the consideration in allocating land in Helmsley, including consideration of the sequential test. Development Policy 2 requires development to comply with the sequential approach set out in Planning Policy Statement 25, which is now contained within the Technical Guidance to the NPPF. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken which will help to inform the allocation of any land for development in Helmsley.</p> <p>The LDF does not contain any policies to facilitate the relocation of development away from flood risk areas. It is considered that to move a large proportion of homes at risk of flooding could potentially harm the National Park's special qualities. Whilst there is nothing in current LDF policies, such development may be supported where it does not harm the special qualities and does not undermine the wider strategy of the LDF.</p>	Low significance	Consider safeguarding land that is required for future flood management as part of any future review of the LDF.
101. Not allocate or permit development if there are alternative sites at lower risk of flooding.	Development Policy 2 requires development to comply with the sequential approach and refers to PPS25 (following the publication of the NPPF guidance is now in the Technical Guidance to NPPF). Flood risk will form part of the consideration of allocating land in Helmsley and at Whitby Business Park.	None	Any future review of LDF would need to incorporate details of sequential approach or cross-ref to Technical Guidance
102. Application of the Exception Test	Development Policy 2 refers to PPS25 which contained guidance on the Exception Test. Guidance is now in the NPPF and its Technical Guidance.	None	Any future review of LDF would need to incorporate details of Exception Test or cross-ref to Technical Guidance
103. Measures where development is to be located in area at risk of	Development Policy 2 requires development to not lead to an increase in flood risk elsewhere. The LDF refers to PPS25 which aims to ensure that the most vulnerable uses are located in the lowest flood risk areas. The Design	None	Any future review of the LDF would need to incorporate

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
flooding	Guide SPD contains guidance on sustainable drainage systems.		these requirements or cross-ref to Technical Guidance
104. Sequential and Exception Tests don't apply for minor developments	This continues the approach of PPS25.	None	Any future review of the LDF would need to incorporate these requirements or cross-ref to Technical Guidance
105. Take account of UK Marine Policy Statement and apply Integrated Coastal Zone Management	The LDF pre-dates the publication of the UK Marine Policy Statement. No Marine Plans have yet been adopted, the first will be the East of England which is unlikely to have implications for the North York Moors National Park. Marine plans for the north east areas have not yet been started. It is considered that the MPS does not introduce any conflicts with the LDF but does raise new considerations, particularly seascape.	None (may change once marine plans for the north east are produced)	Any future review of the LDF would need to take the land-based implications of its aims and policies of marine plans.
106. Avoid development in vulnerable coastal areas and identify Coastal Change Management Area	The LDF does not identify places where the coast is likely to change and does not identify any Coastal Change Management Areas. However the principle behind facilitating development away from areas of coastal change may nevertheless apply.	Low significance	Any future review of LDF would need to identify areas of coastal change and policies relating to any development that needs to be relocated.
107 – 108. Criteria for assessing development in a Coastal Change Management Area	Only applies to Coastal Change Management Areas, none identified in NYMNP yet.	None	Any future review of the LDF would need to include criteria for considering development within

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
			a Coastal Change Management Area.
Conserving and enhancing the natural environment			
109. Protect and enhance the natural environment	<p>Core Policy A and Core Policy G (along with the general approach in the LDF) aim to protect and enhance the National Park's landscape. Geological assets are protected and enhanced through Core Policy C. Core Policy C aims to protect and enhance biodiversity and maintain and enhance ecological networks (recent mapping work has identified the main networks in the Park). Development Policy 1 aims to ensure that new development is not at risk from and doesn't contribute to pollution or land instability and indirectly provides for remediation and mitigation of contaminated land.</p> <p>Following the revocation of a number of PPSs and PPGs there is a gap in relation to detailed guidance on pollution and land stability but this may be addressed nationally through the forthcoming review of guidance (consultation on approach expected in autumn 2012).</p>	Low significance, in relation to lack of guidance	Consider any action following national review of guidance
110. Minimise pollution and allocate land of least environmental value	<p>Development Policy 1 of the LDF sets out policy in relation to minimising pollution. Requirements in relation to allocating land will be taken forward in the Helmsley and Whitby Business Park plans.</p> <p>Gap in guidance as in 109 above</p>	Low significance	Consider any action following national review of guidance
111. Encourage use of brownfield land	The LDF does not contain a requirement to re-use previously developed land, but requirement was in PSS3 and PPS4. There is little previously developed land in the Park. The most common form of re-use is the conversion of agricultural buildings to other uses, but this is not classed as previously developed land in the glossary of the NPPF. Considering the requirement for developing on brownfield land would not conflict directly with any part of the LDF.	Low significance	Any review of LDF will need to consider the case for setting local targets for use of brownfield land.
112. Take account of benefits of best agricultural land.	Development Policy 1 requires that development will not have an unacceptable adverse effect on agricultural land.	None	None
113. Set criteria based	Core Policy C refers to PPS9 and Circular 06/2005 as providing guidance on	None	Any future review

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
policies to judge effects on protected wildlife, geodiversity or landscape sites / areas.	assessing effects on designated sites, and contains a requirement to maintain and enhance ecological networks. The Circular is extant and therefore there is not a gap in policy.		of the LDF would need to consider inclusion of a detailed policy on protected sites and ecological networks.
114. Plan for biodiversity and green infrastructure networks and maintain the character of the coast.	The LDF does not contain a strategy to create, protect, enhance and manage networks of green infrastructure, although paragraph 6.10 recognises that the National Park itself could be considered to be green infrastructure. Core Policy C requires the maintenance and enhancement of ecological networks. There is no policy specifically relating to maintaining the character of the undeveloped coast in the LDF, but this would be covered by Core Policy C and related para 6.3 which relates to Heritage Coast.	None	Any future review of LDF would need to refer to areas of undeveloped coast.
115. Conserve landscape, scenic beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of National Parks.	Delivering National Park purposes forms the basis of the LDF. Core Policy A sets out the strategic approach to the LDF which essentially revolves around delivering National Park purposes, and supporting sustainable development within the context of the National Park.	None	None
116. Major development test	The three criteria of the Major Development Test are as were in PPS7 and MPS1. However specific reference to the need for the 'most rigorous examination' and to carrying out the development to high environmental standards has been removed. The requirement for a rigorous assessment does however remain in the National Parks Circular, and it is considered to be a process issue which should apply to such proposals as a matter of course. See paragraph 143 in relation to major minerals development.	None	Consider incorporating whole of Major Development Test in any future review of LDF
117. Map ecological networks, preserve and restore / recover priority habitats and species	There are no Nature Improvement Areas identified in the Park. The LDF does not identify and map local ecological networks. Core Policy C requires development to maintain and enhance conditions for priority habitats and species, but does not relate to ecological networks.	None	Any future review of the LDF would need to refer to and contain policies relating to the habitat

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
	Core Policy C requires development to maintain and enhance sites and features of geological interest.		connections map, and relate to national and local targets for priority species.
118. Refuse permission if significant effects on natural environment cannot be avoided, support development which will enhance biodiversity.	The NPPF is more specific about impacts on SSSIs from development outside of SSSIs, other requirements mostly as in PPS9. The NPPF states development proposals for conserving or enhancing biodiversity should be approved, there is no LDF policy and proposals may be contrary to other areas of LDF policy.	Low significance	Any future review of LDF would need to include more details on considering protected sites.
119. Presumption in favour of sustainable development doesn't apply when Appropriate Assessment required	This is consistent with LDF policies	None	None
120. Take account of effects of pollution and land instability	Gap in relation to detailed guidance on pollution and land stability, previously relied on PPG14 and PPS23. It may be that this is covered in the forthcoming national review of guidance.	Low significance	Consider any action following national review of guidance
121. Ensure site is suitable in terms of land instability, contamination	Gap in relation to detailed guidance on land stability and contaminated land, previously relied on PPG14 and PPS23. It may be that this is covered in the forthcoming national review of guidance.	Low significance	Consider any action following national review of guidance
122. Emissions controlled via other regimes	Process issue	None	None
123. Ensure no adverse effects from noise, identify	The LDF does not identify areas of tranquillity but Development Policy 1 states that development must not generate unacceptable levels of noise and	Low significance	Consider any action following

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
and protect areas of tranquillity	not have an adverse impact on health, safety and amenity. Noise covered by Development Policy 2, although loss of detail contained in former PPG24. It may be that this is covered in the forthcoming national review of guidance. NPPF sets out a requirement to not place restrictions on existing businesses wanting to develop due to land use changes since they established. Whilst this does not directly conflict with the LDF, it is considered that there may be instances where it is necessary to consider the impacts of increased noise.		national review of guidance Any future review of LDF will need to identify areas of tranquillity and policies for protecting these, and also an approach in relation to existing businesses wishing to expand where surrounding land uses have changed.
124. Development to comply with EU standards for pollution	Lack of detail for considering potential effects of pollution. It may be that this is covered in the forthcoming national review of guidance.	Low significance	Consider any action following national review of guidance
125. Limit the impacts of light pollution	Development Policy 1 requires that development will not generate unacceptable levels of light pollution.	None	None
Conserving and enhancing the historic environment			
126. Positive strategy for conserving and enhancing the historic environment	Core Policy G aims to conserve and enhance the landscape, historic assets and cultural heritage of the landscape character areas identified in the North York Moors Landscape Character Assessment. It also seeks to protect the character of Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Historic Parks and Gardens and Scheduled Monuments and other sites of archaeological importance. Core Policy G is taken forward in more detail through	None	Any review of the LDF would need to also set out a positive strategy for conserving and enhancing the

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
	<p>Development Policies 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of the LDF which deal with these aspects in more detail.</p> <p>All these policies were found to be sound in 2008 and on the basis that the NPPF does not change the requirements for good design, it is considered that the policies are consistent with the provisions of the NPPF.</p> <p>The LDF historic environment policies were prepared on the basis of advice in PPG15 which pre-dated PPS5 and the introduction of the term 'heritage asset'. Consequently there is no reference to 'heritage assets' in the policies. The NPPF also refers to non-designated heritage assets (para 135) and states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should also be taken into account.</p>		<p>historic environment.</p> <p>The policies would benefit from updating to take on board the issues of significance and heritage assets as part of any review of the LDF.</p>
127. Ensure conservation area status only granted for special architectural or historic interest	Not directly relevant to LDF	None	None
128. Applicant to describe significance of any assets affected	Part of consideration of planning applications – this was in PPS5	None	None
129. Planning authority to assess the significance of any historic asset to be affected	Policies in the LDF do not relate to an assessment of significance of an heritage asset, but instead relate to the considerations to be had depending upon the type of asset, such as Listed Building or Conservation Area. This approach was in PPS5 which was published after the LDF.	Low significance	None
130. State of historic asset due to neglect or damage should not be taken into account	Although not covered in the LDF this is a positive addition to policy. As in PPS5	None	None
131. Take account of significance and positive contribution of heritage assets	Core Policy G and Development Policies 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 relate to conserving and enhancing heritage assets. The supporting text to Development Policy 5 Listed Buildings recognises that new uses and change to Listed Buildings may be necessary to enable their continued upkeep. A	Low significance	In any review of LDF policies should be updated to refer to heritage

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
	<p>pragmatic approach is taken to the reuse of Listed Buildings, Development Policy 8 sets out criteria only in relation to the reuse of traditional unlisted buildings.</p> <p>Development Policy 3 and the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document require new development to take account of the existing character.</p>		assets and significance.
132. Great weight should be given to the conservation of historic assets, depending on importance of the asset	Core Policy G and Development Policies 4, 5, 6 and 7 provide the policy basis for such considerations. Policies in the LDF do not relate to an assessment of significance of an heritage asset, but instead relate to the considerations to be had depending upon the type of asset, such as Listed Building or Conservation Area.	Low significance	In any review of LDF policies should be updated to refer to heritage assets and significance.
133. Loss or substantial harm to a designated historic asset only in exceptional circumstances	Development Policies 5, 6 and 7 support the criteria in paragraph 133, although NPPF contains more detail.	None	Consider including additional detail in LDF as part of any future review
134. Less than substantial harm should be weighed against the public benefit	This is supported by Development Policies 5, 6 and 7 in LDF.	None	None
135. Balanced judgement where effects on non-designated heritage asset	Core Policy G and Development Policies 3, 4 and 8 enable the balanced judgement to be made	None	None
136. Not permit loss of heritage asset without ensuring new development will proceed	Supports policies in the LDF although not specifically contained in LDF.	None	None
137. Look for opportunities for new development to enhance Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites.	Development Policy 4 requires development to preserve or enhance Conservation Areas. More emphasis on looking favourably on developments that enhance Conservation Areas in NPPF.	None	None

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
138. Consideration of loss of an element of a Conservation Area or World Heritage Site depends on its significance	Bullet point 3 of Development Policy 4 relates to loss of features that make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area.	None	None
139. Non designated archaeological assets that have same significance as Scheduled Monuments should be considered as designated heritage assets	Same approach as PPS5. The first part of Development Policy 7 includes sites of national archaeological importance that are not designated. NPPF clearer on how to consider such assets.	None.	None
140. Consider whether development may be acceptable due to securing future conservation of an heritage asset	Former PPS5 contained criteria to assess whether enabling development was likely to be acceptable. It may be that this is addressed in the forthcoming national review of guidance.	Low significance	Consider any action following national review of guidance
141. Information on significance of historic environment, and developers' assessments of significance, to be publicly accessible	Process issue	None	None
Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals			
142. Background and strategic aims for minerals	Background text	None	None
143. Policies for extraction of locally and nationally important minerals, take account of contribution	The LDF does not contain policies relating to peat extraction (therefore consistent with NPPF). Core Policy E contains policy in relation to the extraction of minerals, and	High significance.	Consider any action following national review of guidance

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
<p>from substitute materials and waste, define Minerals Safeguarding Areas, safeguard transportation infrastructure and certain processing sites, encourage prior extraction where necessary, set out environmental criteria, policies for reclamation</p>	<p>supports the extraction of building stone for use in the Park and surrounding parishes.</p> <p>Core Policy E requires that there are no suitable sources of previously used materials prior to granting permission for building stone extraction.</p> <p>Minerals Safeguarding Areas were not identified as part of the LDF.</p> <p>New requirement to safeguard sites for concrete batching (this may have implications for Whitby Business Park) and other processing plants.</p> <p>The NPPF requires criteria based policies for assessing minerals developments. The LDF does not contain detailed criteria for assessing minerals applications as this was contained in MPS2. Such effects would need to be considered against Development Policy 1 Environmental Protection.</p> <p>The NPPF also requires policies relating to the reclamation of land to be included in local plans. The LDF does not contain such policies as these were included in MPG2. The Technical Guidance does contain some guidance in relation to reclamation.</p> <p>It may be that both of these gaps above are addressed through the forthcoming national review of guidance.</p> <p>The NPPF does not contain a specific presumption against major minerals development in National Parks (as was in MPS1), although Core Policy E defines which minerals developments will be considered under the Major Development Test and paragraph 116 of the NPPF states that planning permission should be refused for major developments in National Parks except in exceptional circumstances. Former MPS1 contained reference to 'national considerations of mineral supply' within the Major Development Test</p>		<p>Any future review of the LDF may need to involve the identification of Minerals Safeguarding Areas and associated policies for prior-extraction, guidance on application of the Major Development Test to minerals applications, criteria based policies for assessing applications and policies relating to the reclamation of land.</p>

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
	<p>for minerals developments. This has now been lost and replaced with the more general Major Development Test in the NPPF. The implications are that the issue of how far a proposed development will meet a national need for minerals, as opposed to any wider need, is now not a specific consideration under the Major Development Test. Nevertheless the more general phrase 'national considerations' remains within the Major Development Test and it is considered that minerals supply should be considered within this context.</p>		
<p>144. Give great weight to benefits of extraction, provide for non-energy mineral landbanks outside National Parks, ensure no adverse effects on the environment, restoration and aftercare, not permit development in Minerals Safeguarding Areas, consider small scale extraction for repair of heritage assets.</p>	<p>Giving great weight to the economic benefits is a new requirement. The economic considerations will in many cases be determined by the application of the Major Development Test. The NPPF, in paragraph 115, also requires great weight to be given to conserving the landscape, scenic beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of National Parks and it is considered that the approach in the LDF represents an appropriate balance between these two requirements.</p> <p>The requirement for non-energy minerals to be provided for outside of National Parks as far as practicable is supported by Core Policy E and the current policies of adjoining MPAs. The LDF does not provide for landbanks of minerals on the basis that the RSS apportionment of 0.8mt reflected the approach of seeking a progressive reduction in aggregate production in the region's National Parks. This requirement was reached and the two aggregates quarries have now closed. The current regional guidelines for aggregates have not yet been apportioned to the sub-regional/MPA level.</p> <p>Core Policy E and paragraph 6.32 provide for the extraction of building stone for the repair of historic assets.</p> <p>The NPPF states that bonds or financial guarantees should only be sought in exceptional circumstances, however it is considered that in the National Park there may be a need to use financial guarantees more commonly due to the potential for significant damage to a nationally protected landscape.</p>	<p>High significance -</p>	<p>Continue to emphasise approach to minerals development as set out in LDF represents an appropriate balance between facilitating minerals development and protecting the National Park environment and landscape.</p>

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
145. Prepare an annual Local Aggregate Assessment and assessment of supply options, participate in an Aggregate Working Party, allocate sites or areas of search, 7 year landbank for sand and gravel and 10 years for crushed rock	Officers are liaising with North Yorkshire County Council, the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority and the City of York Council on the production of a sub-regional Local Aggregate Assessment. The LDF does not provide for landbanks of minerals – the RSS apportionment of 0.8mt reflected the approach of seeking a progressive reduction in aggregate production in the region’s National Parks. This apportionment has been met and the two aggregates quarries have now closed. The current regional guidelines for aggregates have not yet been apportioned to the sub-regional/MPA level, it is not clear whether they will be or be determined through the preparation of individual minerals local plans. The approach in the LDF is consistent with NPPF paragraph 144 which states that landbanks for non-energy minerals should as far as practical be located outside National Parks.	Low significance	Liaising with NYCC, City of York and Yorkshire Dales NPA on producing a sub-regional Local Aggregate Assessment. Any review of LDF would need to be informed by liaison with adjoining and other MPAs
146. Plan for a steady and adequate supply of industrial minerals	The policy in the LDF was based around co-operation through production of the RSS. Approaches to future policy will be agreed through co-operation with NYCC and other Minerals Planning Authorities. It is considered that the policy approach in the LDF represents an appropriate balance between facilitating minerals development and protecting the landscape and environment of the National Park, supported by the second bullet point of paragraph 144 of the NPPF which states that landbanks for non-energy minerals should as far as practical be located outside National Parks.	Low significance	Any review of LDF would need to be informed by liaison with adjoining and other MPAs
147. Distinguish between 3 phases for oil and gas development, encourage underground gas and carbon storage	The LDF does not contain policies relating to oil and gas development as policies were contained in Annex 4 of former MPS1. There is now therefore a gap in terms of policies on oil and gas developments.	High significance	Consider how to put relevant policies in place
148. Safety of underground storage facilities	Considerations to be taken into account which do not feature in the LDF.	None	Could be incorporated in a review of LDF policy
149. Permission should	Whilst coal has not historically been mined in the Park and the Authority has	None	None

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
not be given for coal extraction unless environmentally acceptable or provides community benefits.	not in the past had planning policies relating specifically to coal, there are some coal resources around the Whitby area. MPG6 set out the major development test in relation to coal developments in National Parks. Core Policy E maintains that mineral development other than for building stone for local use would be major development, there is nothing in the NPPF that would conflict with this approach.		
Local Plans			
150. Planning decisions to be taken in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise	Process issue, no change	None	None
151. Local Plans must contribute to achievement of sustainable development and be consistent with the presumption in favour of sustainable development	<p>The principles of sustainable development are key drivers for the overall strategy in Core Policies A and B – within a National Park context. The spatial strategy allows for some limited development of new services and facilities, housing and employment development within settlements according to their designation within the settlement hierarchy with the overall aim of making local communities more self-sustaining and of providing opportunities for people to understand and enjoy the special qualities.</p> <p>In this respect the LDF is the definition of sustainable development in the North York Moors National Park. Development that complies with the criteria set out in the LDF policies will be permitted – a presumption in favour of sustainable development would not change this position. The presumption in favour of sustainable development is implicit rather than explicit in the LDF. Any presumption which favours development beyond that established in the LDF is considered to be inappropriate in a National Park where the NPPF acknowledges that development should be restricted.</p>	Low significance	Any future review of the LDF would need to incorporate a policy on the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
152. Achieve all three dimensions of sustainable development	Core Policy A sets out the overall approach towards achieving sustainable development in the National Park.	None	None

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
153. Local Plan for each local authority area, SPDs to help applicants or aid infrastructure delivery	<p>The North York Moors Local Development Scheme includes the preparation of two separate local plans, one for the town of Helmsley and the other for Whitby Business Park.</p> <p>The preparation of a separate local plan for Helmsley is justified because the National Park boundary runs through the middle of the town with Ryedale District Council the planning authority for the areas to the south and east of the town. The Ryedale Plan will contain housing and employment provision figures for Helmsley and a joint approach between the two authorities is needed to co-ordinate and plan for this development. For these reasons, the preparation of a separate local plan is considered to be justified.</p> <p>The National Park Authority has adopted Supplementary Planning Documents in relation to housing, renewable energy and a design guide, as well as village design statements and conservation area assessments for some villages. These provide guidance in relation to interpreting and applying the policies of the LDF.</p>	None	None
154. Local Plans should contain clear policies for what will or will not be permitted	Policies in the LDF did not include all considerations in decision making, as many issues were covered in national guidance at the time (PPSs, PPGs, MPSs and MPGs).	None	Any future review of the LDF could reinstate considerations which were omitted from the current LDF due to reliance on PPSs etc.
155. Collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations and businesses	The LDF is based upon consultation with local communities and organisations	None	None
156. Local Plan should	The LDF sets out the strategic priorities for the National Park which are based	None	Any future review

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
contain the strategic priorities for the area (para 178 requires duty to co-operate on the issues listed in 156)	around furthering National Park purposes. Paragraph 14 outlines the position in relation to providing the homes and jobs needed in the area.		of the LDF could more explicitly highlight 'strategic priorities'.
157. Plan positively, preferably have a 15 year time line, be based on co-operation, broad locations for strategic development, identify where development won't be appropriate	<p>The LDF has a timescale of 18 years (2008 to 2026) and is based on co-operation with neighbouring authorities and other organisations (although much of this was achieved through the RSS process).</p> <p>No assessment has been undertaken of the infrastructure required for the area, but this is proposed to be done as part of the work on the Community Infrastructure Levy.</p> <p>Site allocations at Whitby Business Park and Helmsley will be identified on proposals maps which will form part of these plans, and will also provide details on form, scale, access and quantum of development.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.14 refers to Article 4 Directions, no other areas have been identified for removal of permitted development rights.</p> <p>Land where development would be inappropriate has not been identified, but the policies as a whole define where development would not be appropriate.</p> <p>Whilst policies are supportive of enhancing the natural, built and historic environment, the LDF does not contain a strategy for their enhancement.</p>	None	Consideration can be given to identifying areas where development would not be appropriate and incorporating a strategy for enhancing the environment as part of any future review of the LDF
Using a proportionate evidence base			
158. Local Plan should be based on an adequate, up to date and relevant evidence base	Any future review of the LDF would need to be based upon a wider range of evidence than the current LDF, and would need to include assessments of all of the areas in the paragraphs below:	None	Various in relation to developing the evidence base
159. Prepare a Strategic Housing Market	Have not prepared specific Strategic Housing Market Assessment for the National Park as rely on evidence provided in District surveys and recent Sub	Low significance	Consider undertaking SHMA

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
Assessment and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment	Regional Survey. Delivery of levels of housing identified in these surveys would have adverse impact on National Park and therefore is not appropriate. No Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment has been carried out for the National Park.		and SHLAA as part of any future review of LDF.
160. Prepare evidence to understand business needs and future market changes	Have evidence to support Whitby Business Park Area Action Plan and the Helmsley Plan but have no other evidence on business needs across the wider Park. This is a result of the LDF not seeking to address all business needs on the basis that this would not be consistent with delivering National Park purposes and with paragraph 115 of the NPPF which gives great weight to protecting the environment of National Parks.	Low significance	Consider undertaking assessment of needs of businesses as part of any future review of LDF.
161. Use the above to assess need for land / floorspace and review land available.	No assessments have been carried out. However, existing policies will support business development where it is consistent with NP purposes. Whilst the Authority may assess the needs for land, accommodating that need may be contrary to other policies in the NPPF (see paragraph 14).	Low significance	Consider undertaking assessment of needs for employment land as part of any future review of LDF.
162. Assess quality and capacity of infrastructure	No assessments of infrastructure requirements have been carried out, this will be done as part of the Community Infrastructure Levy work. The Local Development Framework does not include provision for general housing or employment related development in the Park.	None	Continue work on CIL, including assessment of infrastructure requirements
163. Extent and location of mineral resources and projected demand for their use	The Authority is working with other Minerals Planning Authorities in the sub-region to produce a Local Aggregate Assessment which will address these issues.	Low significance	Continue to work with NYCC on Local Aggregate Assessment
164. Up to date information about defence and security from MoD, and information about	This evidence was not gathered as part of production of LDF, although MoD were consulted.	None	As part of any review of the LDF would need to liaise with MoD to

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
risks			obtain this information
165. Assessment of existing and potential ecological networks, SA as part of the Plan process	Sustainability Appraisal was undertaken as part of the production of the LDF. LDF reflects other environmental plans and policies which were in place at the time.	None	Any future review of LDF would need to be based upon assessment of ecological networks
166 – 168. HRA as part of the Plan process, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Shoreline Management Plans	Habitats Regulations Assessment was undertaken as part of LDF production. Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and the Shoreline Management Plan formed part of the evidence base.	None	None
169. Up to date evidence on the historic environment	The National Park Authority maintains an historic environment record although no assessment has been undertaken of the significance of heritage assets.	Low significance	Future review of the LDF may need to include an assessment of the significance of heritage assets.
170. Landscape Character Assessment integrated with assessment of historic landscape character	Landscape character assessment has been undertaken and informed the LDF but has not been integrated with historic landscape character assessment (although North Yorkshire County Council have undertaken historic landscape characterisation).	None	None
171. Work with health organisations to understand needs and expected future changes	No assessment of open space and recreation facilities has been carried out but the Authority is currently working with Scarborough Borough Council on a playing pitch strategy (see paragraph 73 above).	None	Continue to work with Scarborough Borough Council on playing pitch strategy, undertake assessments across the rest of the Park.

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
172. Up to date information on the location of major hazards	This information was not gathered as part of production of the LDF.	None	Any future review of the LDF would need to involve gathering this information
173. Ensure development is viable	<p>The Local Development Framework does not include provision for general housing or employment related development in the Park. With the exception of Helmsley and Whitby Business Park, there are no allocations for new development that would trigger a need for infrastructure improvements or developer contributions. Separate policy documents are being produced for Helmsley and Whitby Business Park which will identify the need for new infrastructure and set out how these will be delivered.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, it is acknowledged that some Park wide evidence about the capacity of existing infrastructure and the need for any improvements would be beneficial in the run up to the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy in 2014. Currently the only policies requiring developer contributions in the Local Development Framework are Core Policy J which requires a proportion of affordable housing to be delivered as part of open market developments in the larger villages in the Park and Core Policy D which sets out requirements for renewable energy. There may, however, be wider needs relating to local communities such as schools, roads and other utilities which could be supported through a CIL.</p> <p>The Authority is planning to work jointly with other North Yorkshire authorities to commission CIL Viability Testing to ensure that the introduction of a levy will not adversely affect the viability of new development.</p> <p>Core Policy J was not based on an assessment of viability, but an assessment has been undertaken subsequently and applications are being assessed in terms of their own individual viability. Costs to developers have not been taken into account in the Core Policy D requirement for renewable</p>	Low significance	<p>Ensure that any CIL levels introduced are considered to be viable</p> <p>Consider viability of any other requirements in any future review of LDF</p>

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
	energy, but in reality the requirement has proved generally to not affect the viability of development.		
174. Set out a policy for local standards	Policies in the LDF set out the requirements for affordable housing and renewable energy, see paragraph 173 regarding viability. No assessment has been undertaken of the cumulative impacts of all requirements placed on new development.	Low significance	<p>Consider cumulative impact of CIL requirements with existing requirements as part of CIL work</p> <p>Any future review of the LDF would need to include consideration of cumulative impacts of all requirements on viability.</p>
175. CIL should support and incentivise new development, place control over a proportion of the funds with the neighbourhood	The Authority is planning to work jointly with other North Yorkshire authorities in relation to introducing CIL requirements in the Park.	None	Continue to work on introducing CIL requirements
176. Need for safeguards should not unnecessarily inhibit development	This approach is taken	None	None
177. Planning infrastructure should be deliverable in a timely fashion, understand district-wide development costs.	Infrastructure requirements will need to be considered as part of the preparation of any future local plan, including Helmsley and Whitby Business Park plans.	None	Consider infrastructure requirements as part of any future review of LDF

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
Planning strategically across local boundaries			
178. Duty to cooperate on strategic issues, joint working	Joint working has taken place historically, including via the RSS process, and ongoing liaison will inform any future review of the LDF.	None	Continue to liaise with adjoining and other planning authorities, and document any joint working
179. Joint working to meet requirements that cannot be met within an authority's own area, joint planning policies and informal strategies	This approach will need to inform any future review of the LDF. This approach is being taken in the production of the Helmsley Plan which seeks to meet the needs for housing and employment land identified in Ryedale.	Low significance	Once the scale of need is known the Authority will need to work with adjoining authorities to investigate whether / how this can be met.
180. Take account of different geographic areas and work collaboratively with other bodies	The LDF was informed by consultation and collaboration with other bodies and evidence collated at relevant geographic scales.	None	Any future review of LDF will need to be informed by collaboration with other organisations, LEP etc, and evidence collated at the relevant geographic scale.
181. Demonstrate cooperation on cross-boundary issues	Issue for future examinations	None	Co-operation with others will need to be documented, and presented as part of any review of the LDF.

NPPF Paragraph Number (and summary of key points)	Assessment of NPPF against LDF	Level of potential significance for decision taking	Action needed (immediate action highlighted)
Examining local plans			
182. Soundness tests	<p>In relation to meeting housing and business requirements the caveat in paragraph 14 applies to National Parks and other protected landscapes and states that in these areas development may be more restricted. In relation to plan making and decision taking the logical conclusion is that the identification of development opportunities will be more limited and that objectively assessed needs will not all be met.</p> <p>The Authority is proactive, however, in the delivery of affordable housing. Specific needs for housing and employment have been identified for Helmsley through the emerging Ryedale Plan and the National Park Authority is working in partnership with Ryedale District Council to produce a joint Plan for the town which will allocate land for housing and employment development.</p>	None	None
Neighbourhood plans			
183 - 185. Neighbourhood Plans	Neighbourhood Plans should reflect strategic Local Plan policies and not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan. At the time of writing no communities in the Park have expressed an interest in producing a Neighbourhood Plan.	None	None
Decision taking			
186 – 207. Decision taking, procedural advice and enforcement	196 and 197 explain that the NPPF is a material consideration and that decisions should be made in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development.	Varying degrees of significance as set out in the table	None