Meeting: Development Plan Working Group Meeting

Venue: Committee Room, The National Park Office, The Old Vicarage, Bondgate, Helmsley

Date: Thursday 15 February 2018, 2.00 pm

Business

1. Apologies for absence

2. Public Minutes of the meeting held on 3 November 2017.

3. Members are reminded that it is their responsibility to declare the nature of any personal and prejudicial interests relating to any agenda item immediately prior to its consideration and are encouraged to complete a written declaration using the form provided.

4. Responses to Consultation – Current Thinking (Appendices 1 and 2)

5. Historic Environment Policies (Appendix 3)

6. Design Policy (Appendix 4)

7. Such other business as, in the opinion of the Chairman, should, by reason of special circumstances, be considered as a matter of urgency.

Andy Wilson
Chief Executive (National Park Officer)

Press Contact: Nina Beadle, Media and Communications Officer, 01439 772700
The Authority allows the recording and reporting of public meetings but asks that any party wishing to do so informs the Authority in advance of the meeting. Recording and reporting that disrupts the meeting is not allowed. Persons expressly refusing consent, children and vulnerable adults cannot be filmed or photographed.

The existing rules relating to confidential and exempt information, defamation, Data Protection and Public Order apply.

The Authority accepts no liability whatsoever for the recording and reporting carried out by other parties.

Members are reminded to turn all electronic equipment to silent mode, including mobile phones, laptop computers and tablets. Please note that only information that is available to Members during the Committee meeting should be accessed from a computer in the interests of sound decision making.

Tea and coffee will be available a quarter of an hour before the meeting.

Vanessa Burgess should be notified of any apologies.

Please ensure when parking in the car park that you have not caused an obstruction which could prevent emergency vehicles accessing the building.

This agenda is available on the website www.northyorkmoors.org.uk

This agenda is available in large print on request.
### Development Plan Working Group

#### Membership

Ex-Officio Members: The Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Authority and Chair of Planning Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Secretary Of State</th>
<th>Secretary Of State (Parish)</th>
<th>Unitary/District</th>
<th>NYCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Names</strong></td>
<td>Mr Walker</td>
<td>Mrs Dent</td>
<td>Mrs Frank</td>
<td>Mrs Patmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Fisher</td>
<td>Mr Atkinson</td>
<td>Mr Coulson</td>
<td>Mr Parsons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Jeffels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Of Members</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Membership</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quorum</strong></td>
<td>3 (includes at least one Secretary of State and one Local Authority Member)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Members were welcomed to Botton by Mr Mason, Botton Village General Manager. Other members of staff from Camphill Village Trust in attendance were Mr Bucur (Head of Community Development), Ms Wright (Director of Human Resources) and Mr James (Registered Manager). Mr Atkinson and Mr McGivern, interested third parties, were also present.

The meeting started with a short tour of Botton Village where Members saw the layout of the eight neighbourhoods and various buildings including the Church and Joan of Arc Hall. Points noted on the tour were:

- The land holding at Botton is approximately 650 acres including approximately 170 acres of woodland. Although originally a number of individual farms, the land is now managed as a single holding;
- The community was established in 1955 when Botton Hall was donated to the Camphill Village Trust charity by the MacMillan family;
- There are some empty properties at Botton. Numbers of residents have declined in recent years and there is at present a voluntary ban on new admissions to the community although it is hoped this will soon be lifted;
- The community at Botton is no longer a registered care home but provides supported living accommodation and facilities. Expectations in social care are changing with a trend towards more independent living and more people living in smaller units.
- The Joan of Arc Hall is the main community space at Botton and is used for various events and classes;
- Some of the more recently developed buildings do not have the anticipated lifespan of the older buildings.

Mr Bowes thanked CVT staff for the tour and confirmed that the purpose of the visit was for Members to see Botton and consider land use planning matters to be addressed in relation to the new Local Plan. No final decisions would be taken at this meeting and there would be consultations and discussion, with several opportunities to make comments, as part of the statutory process for preparing the Plan.

Mr Mason gave a short presentation, outlining the history of the community and some of the issues for the future. Botton is a land based community with a unique heritage and character
which offers a supportive environment for people with learning disabilities. It covers a large area and is looking to make use of its empty buildings in a way that is relevant to current social care thinking. As with all care providers, it is facing a reduction in income and a changing regulatory framework but it has a lot to offer especially considering the increasing care needs within the wider community. It needs to ensure that it remains sustainable and relevant into the future so that it can continue to offer care to those who need it. Botton would always be a home to the people who lived there – CVT was not interested in developing any visitor attractions but rather wanted more people to be able to benefit from the environment and care that it can provide.

The proposed new arrangements at Botton mean that there will be two providers delivering social care in the future. 13 of the 46 existing CVT dwellings will be rented out and care will be provided by Avalon through the Shared Lives scheme.

Mr Bowes offered the interested third parties the opportunity to make any comments. Mr McGivern considered that the change in the way care was provided at Botton – with co-workers who had often been part of the community for many years being replaced by employees – was detrimental. Mr Atkinson commented on the value of the Camphill ethos and said that the old way of delivering care had meant that care costs were 50% less. CVT representatives questioned the accuracy of these statements.

Mr Bowes thanked everyone for their contributions and confirmed that the nature of social care provision itself was not a matter for the National Park Authority, although the potential land use changes that may arise were needed to be taken into account when considering the direction of future policy.

Minutes of the meeting held on 21 September 2017

Resolved: That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 September 2017, having been printed and circulated, be taken as read and confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

Botton Village Background Paper

Mr Fellows presented the background paper that had been prepared prior to the meeting, commenting on the nature of the settlement at Botton, the fact that it is not currently in the Authority’s settlement hierarchy, the existing policy contained in Core Policy J, ‘Housing’ and the topics to be considered for the new Local Plan.

During the discussion by Members, the following points were made:

i. The National Park Authority had supported the excellent work carried out at Botton over many years and would continue to support the provision of social care at Botton.
ii. It was generally accepted that Botton was a unique community and it was appropriate to have a specific Botton policy in the new Local Plan.
iii. It was agreed that the policy should have a wider remit than just housing.
iv. The reference in the existing policy wording to the needs of the ‘existing community’ seemed rather static – it was important to recognise that changes were happening
and the community needed to move forward. That might mean people from the wider community outside Botton receiving care and support in future.

v. It would be useful for the Authority to know what future uses were envisaged for empty buildings. However, it was acknowledged that it would be for CVT to decide when specific proposals might be put forward.

vi. While understanding that the community at Botton may have specific policy requirements, the Authority needs to be mindful that Botton is a settlement within the National Park. There is a view that some of the buildings permitted at Botton would not have been approved in other places in the Park. It is important that a specific Botton policy designed to support the community should not upset the balance of the wider policies that apply elsewhere in the Park. There could be risks in opening the policy up too widely and there must be good reason for adopting an approach that is different from other locations.

vii. The Authority must consider the spatial context of a new policy for Botton. It is not ‘open countryside’ but its special function means that it is not logical for it to be included in the proposed general ‘villages’ category. Members agreed that Botton should be recognised as a special case within the Authority’s settlement hierarchy and placed in its own category as a dispersed settlement with a specific function.

Mr Bowes thanked everyone and the meeting closed at 12 noon.
North York Moors National Park Authority
Development Plan Working Group
15 February 2018, 2.00 pm.
Preparation of a New Local Plan for the National Park

1. **Purpose of the Report**

1.1 To outline matters for discussion at the Development Plan Working Group on 15 February.

2. **Introduction**

2.1 February’s Development Plan Working Group will:

- Receive feedback from the results of the ‘Current Thinking’ Consultation which ran from 4 October to 24 November last year. It focussed on three key areas of policy – settlement hierarchy, housing strategy and important undeveloped and community spaces. A report summarising responses for Members is attached at Appendix 1. The full report intended for consultation is at Appendix 2.

- Review potential policy relating to the historic environment. A report containing potential draft policies is attached at Appendix 3.

- Review potential policy relating to design. A paper including the draft policy is at Appendix 4.

3. **Financial and Staffing Implications**

3.1 None at present. Work has been carried out in house within existing budgets.

4. **Contribution to National Park Management Plan**

4.1 An up to date Local Plan supports a number of the priorities set out in the Management Plan and sets a framework for ensuring that the objectives can be delivered.

5. **Legal Implications**

5.1 None at present

6. **Recommendation**

6.1 That: Members note and comment on the content of the report and appendices.

Contact Officer:
Paul Fellows
Head of Strategic Policy
Tel No 01439 772700
North York Moors Local Plan

Summary of Responses to ‘Current Thinking’ Consultation

1. Introduction

1.1 This paper has been prepared to inform Development Plan Working Group of the outcome of the ‘Current Thinking’ consultation undertaken in the autumn of last year and to seek Members’ views on the future direction of the issues covered in the consultation.

1.2 Please note that the draft Local Plan will go through various stages of consultation and testing and the nothing in this background paper should be taken to represent a definite future direction of policy.

1.3 The full report, intended for publication has been sent alongside this Paper, which summarises the main points for Members.

2. What Did We Publish?

2.1 We published several documents for comment or feedback. The main ‘Current Thinking’ document was in published in October 2017 and was aimed at a general audience but was designed to prompt those with some planning policy knowledge or interest to provide views on particular issues. The document included thirteen questions together with an opportunity to provide additional comments focussed around the main three issues of the settlement hierarchy, housing strategy and community and important undeveloped spaces.

2.2 Three topic papers covering the three main issues were made available on line to provide further background to the issues together with maps showing all the proposed community spaces and important undeveloped spaces. Detailed written descriptions of each important open space were provided together with lists of the proposed community spaces.

2.3 The consultation ran for a seven week period from 6 October to 24 November 2017. The documents were sent out to all statutory consultees and to anyone registered on our local plan database. Paper and electronic copies of all documents, together with maps and posters were sent out to all Parish Councils within and adjoining the North York Moors National Park. All documents were made available on our website, which was publicised through press releases and social media. Responses were made via an on line survey, by submitting an e mail with a completed electronic questionnaire, by e mail or by hand.

2.4 A request for feedback was made through an article in the ‘Moors Messenger’ newspaper which was distributed to all homes in the National Park the first two weeks of November 2017.

2.5 We also attended 4 drop in events at village halls throughout the National Park from 12th October to 2 November 2017 in Hutton le Hole, Helmsley, Hinderwell and Carlton in Cleveland. Officers were also invited to attend a Parish Council meeting at Sneaton and a meeting was held with Osmotherley Parish Council at the National Park Office.
3. Who Provided Comments?

3.1 A total of 98 individual people, organisations or groups sent us comments. This is broken down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of respondent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members of the Public</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Councils/Meetings</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough/District/County Councils</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land/Planning Agents</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Groups</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies/Infrastructure Providers</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Out of the 38 members of the public who responded 24 lived within the National Park (or provided an address with the National Park), 3 lived close to the National Park (roughly within a 30 minute drive), and of the rest 2 lived in North Yorkshire or Teesside and 3 lived outside. Six did not provide an address.

3.3 Comments were provided by different departments within North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) and this was submitted as one response. Comments were also received from two different departments within Scarborough Borough Council (SBC) and this shows as two different responses. The above table appears to show 3 different Borough/District/County responses this relates only to NYCC and SBC.

4. What Views Were Expressed?

4.1 A full report of the comments made will be produced and a detailed list of the comments made will be produced as an Appendix to that document. Where individuals provided a general response rather than responding to specific questions these responses have been attributed to a question using a ‘best fit’ method to make sure all responses are logged and considered and it should be noted that not all respondents completed all of the questions in the questionnaire and in some cases their comments have been included in the ‘further comments’ section if their response did not naturally sit within a particular question.

4.2 The comments received were wide ranging and some very detailed points were made by a large number of different groups. The following points are a very précised resume of the comments received for each question together with a brief summary of the final ‘further comments’ section.

5. Summary of Responses

5.1 Q1. Question Q1 “Do you agree with the proposed 3-tier settlement hierarchy? If not, please give your reasons and tell us which alternative you would prefer.

Responses: 65

Main Points:

• Almost half of the respondents were in agreement with the proposed 3-tier settlement hierarchy, and a further 19 expressed views but did not clearly state whether they were in favour of the proposal or disagreed with it.
The remaining 12 respondents expressed disagreement with the proposal including North Yorkshire County Council and Scarborough Borough Council.

The most common reason for disagreeing with the proposed 3-tier settlement hierarchy was the desire to see larger service villages as distinct to other smaller villages when considering the potential for new development.

Some respondents provided an alternative hierarchy based on size of settlement and facilities (Option 3 - which includes Helmsley, Larger and Smaller villages, Open Countryside).

Several respondents, including NYCC commented that mixed communities, including new housing are required, where there is available infrastructure, to support and maintain vital services and to ensure sustainable villages.

Several respondents questioned whether the proposed hierarchy was too simplistic, including Scarborough Borough Council and would not align well with neighbouring authorities.

Some respondents considered that the merging of the tiers does not recognise that some villages within the National Park beyond Helmsley, hold a broader range of services which are worthy of protection and support.

It was also stated that the criterion of 35 address points for the identification of Villages is too crude a measure as the characteristics of these villages are not uniform and their individuality needs to be recognised and reflected in all aspects of the planning process.

Several respondents were concerned that the proposed approach risked being prescriptive or broad brush and would result in the further decline of services in the existing larger villages.

There was a general feeling that open market housing should be developed throughout the Park in place of the proposed policy of 100% affordable (except Helmsley).

Some of those who supported the proposal, or didn’t give a view either way, considered that that flexibility to assess opportunities for housing on an individual case by case basis was also important.

The proposed streamlining of the hierarchy was however seen as a general positive by some.

Q2. Question Q2 asked: “Do you agree with the overall approach to housing policy we are proposing? If not, please give your reasons and tell us what alternatives you would prefer.

Responses: 66

Main Points:

• 21 of the respondents positively agreed with the overall approach to housing being proposed. 12 respondents disagreed with the approach and many of those provided very detailed reasons to explain why they disagreed and suggested alternative approaches.

• Many respondents neither agreed nor disagreed but instead provided general comments on the approach to housing.
• Those who supported the proposed overall approach to housing agreed that the policy approach will meet local needs, support local employment opportunities and key services whilst conserving the existing landscape, character, uniqueness and tranquillity of the Park.

• Those that disagreed were concerned that the approach will lead to the decline of village populations and services and to ensure that there are thriving economic and sustainable communities, there needs to be growth and that the policy is too restrictive.

• Those who disagreed considered that a policy which allowed local needs housing across the Park particularly in the larger settlements would be more appropriate.

• There were concerns raised in relation to the number of second homes and concerns expressed that there is little provision made for first time buyers or the elderly.

Q3. Question Q3 asked: “Do you have any views on the amount of housing that we should be looking to allow in the coming years?”

Responses: 65

Main Points:

• Just over a third of the respondents agreed that the amount of housing being proposed by the proposed policy approach is appropriate ie 29 houses per year.

• NYCC comment that it is important to ensure that there is the appropriate provision of housing within the villages to help reduce further population decline and this should ensure that the balance and mix of housing meets the full needs of society.

• Just over a third of the respondents disagreed on the basis that this was a very low rigid figure and that it is wrong to settle on one figure for such a long time as circumstances change.

• Many of those who disagreed pointed out that if an average of 37 houses per annum have been successfully completed since 2008 and this has failed to halt, let alone reverse, the decline in population and the range of services available in the various settlements around the National Park, it is unlikely that a target figure of 29 housing completions per annum will do anything other than increase the tension between managing population growth and the retention of services that support sustainable communities. This will result in the decline of settlements as they become unviable and unsustainable.

• Scarborough Borough Council is concerned that there appears to be no potential housing near to the Scarborough Borough boundary and that this could put additional pressure on SBC Planning Area to pick up housing numbers.

• Some respondents questioned whether the Woodsmith Mine and the need for housing for the workforce had been taken into account.

• There were comments were also submitted in relation to the size of dwellings, the provision of smaller affordable homes, more flexibility in relation to
conversions, occupancy rates, the idea of primary residence and second homes.

Q4. Question Q4 asked: “Do you agree that new open market housing development should be limited to Helmsley and not permitted in any of the Villages? If not, please give your reasons and tell us what alternative you would prefer.”

Responses: 63

Main Points:

• Approximately 30% of the respondents agreed that open market housing should be limited to Helmsley and not be permitted in any of the villages on the basis that this approach will ensure that new housing will meet local needs and new open market housing should be concentrated in the place with good services and connections although some did point out that Helmsley should have better services to meet the demands of the new development and that there is a danger of Helmsley becoming over urbanised resulting in the loss of its character.

• Almost 40% of the respondents disagreed with the proposed policy approach and many of those who disagreed provided very detailed explanations.

• The general tone from those who disagreed was that the proposed policy approach is too restrictive as it curtails all open market housing outside Helmsley.

• It is considered by these respondents that open market development should instead be spread throughout all the villages in the Park although a high proportion of respondents including two of the large Estates in the Park consider it would be more appropriate to allow small scale market and affordable housing in the well serviced larger villages to in order to provide schemes that are viable and in order to provide support for the future vitality of these villages given the current ageing population within the NYMNP. Such schemes should include the ‘principle/primary residence’ condition to avoid the homes being used as second homes.

• There was a concern from NYCC and others who disagreed with the proposed approach, which prevents open market housing in locations other than Helmsley, that it could contribute to the loss of essential services within the villages and that what is needed instead is a more balanced approach which would support appropriate levels of housing within local villages where there is a need to maintain their sustainability and services and where it would not conflict with the overall statutory purpose and aspirations of the National Park.

• NYCC and those that disagree with the proposed approach state that this alternative approach should permit limited open market housing where there is an identified need with a proportion being allocated for local needs housing.

• NYCC also comment in this respect that if village schools are to survive then communities themselves must remain sustainable through a range of housing provision.

• Respondents also considered that the proposed approach may restrict the housing market overall resulting in an increase in house prices.
Q5. Question Q5 asked: “Do you agree that the existing affordable housing exception site policy should be continued? If not, please give your reasons and tell us what alternative you would prefer.”

Responses: 61

Main Points:

• Almost half of the respondents positively agreed with the existing affordable housing exceptions policy, and several of the respondents suggested changes to the way the current policy operates.

• Those who agreed considered that it is an important policy that ensures that local needs are met within the rural areas and small settlements and it is essential to support key sectors of the local economy.

• Other respondents who supported the policy suggested that exception sites should be restricted to larger villages which can support and service further development and one Parish Council stated that the Woodsmith mine should be taken into account.

• 10% of respondents strongly disagreed and considered that there should be the potential to provide mixed open market homes and affordable houses on these development sites.

• Scarborough Borough Council stated that that whatever method is taken forward it should accord with the NPPF and therefore allow some form of private development where scheme viability is an issue. Viability has become an increasing issue in the development of affordable housing; especially given rural housing tends to be more expensive to develop and taking into account that build costs have increased by approximately 30% in the last 4-5 years.

Q6. Question Q6 asked: “Do you have any views on whether we should apply local occupancy restrictions and if so on our suggested way forward? Please give your reasons or tell us what alternative you would prefer.”

Responses: 61

Main Points:

• 14 of the respondents agreed with the imposition of local occupancy conditions and the proposed amendments.

• 7 respondents disagreed with the principle of local occupancy conditions and therefore disagreed with the proposed amendments.

• Those who agreed with the imposition of local occupancy conditions, and with the proposed amendments, agreed on the basis of the cost of housing in relation to average household incomes and because of the high demand for second and holiday homes in the National Park. They consider that it is important that affordable housing is available for those who live and work in the area and that it is a good way to sustain local services.

• Several respondents including NYCC and Scarborough Borough Council agreed with the suggested amendments as this would enable a more flexible
approach that will assist the local labour force and more broadly support the well-being of local communities and would bring the Park more in line with adjacent Authorities.

• Some respondents however suggested different restrictions to either broaden the criteria or restrict it further and a number of respondents suggest the imposition of ‘primary residence’ in place of Local Occupancy as a way of achieving long term occupancy to support local services and communities.

• Those who disagreed did so largely on the basis that the National Park needs to attract new people and new businesses into the area as all communities benefit from an influx of new people at some time, and restrictions should not prevent increasing prosperity in the National Park.

• Some respondents stated that local occupancy criteria can create issues relating to the marketing and saleability of properties, including accessing mortgages, which can have implications for site’s viability and delivery.

Q7. Question Q7 asked: “Do you agree that there should be size restrictions for new local needs housing and that large extensions should be resisted? Do you agree with the proposed limits? If not, please give your reasons and tell us what alternative you would prefer.”

Responses: 59

Main Points:

• This question was answered either jointly, covering both issues, or respondents separated the two issues out.

• A third of respondents supported the proposal to restrict new local needs housing to a specific size (93sqm) but an almost equal number of respondents strongly disagreed with this policy approach.

• With regards to the proposal to restrict the size of new extensions 16 respondents agreed with this approach and 15 disagreed.

• Those who agreed with both proposals concluded that restricting the size of new local needs housing and extensions will help to ensure the availability of housing of an appropriate size to meet the identified needs.

• Those who disagreed or expressed concern with both proposals considered that more flexibility is required and that each application should be taken on its own merits, taking into account the character of the area, and that such a policy may impinge on lifestyles and choices and furthermore that larger extensions and larger houses will free up smaller homes as people move into them.

• With regards to the proposal to restrict the size of extensions there was a strong feeling that there is a need for extensions to be to be considered against the size and scale of the host building and applications should be determined on their own merits on a case by case basis. It is further considered that there is already control on extensions through the design guide and that larger extensions should be allowed to reflect changing family situations.
Q8. Question Q8 asked: “Do you agree that we should introduce some more flexibility to policy on conversion of rural buildings so that they don’t have to be historic and can be used for local occupancy housing? If not, please give your reasons and tell us what alternative you would prefer?”

Responses: 65

Main Points:

• Over half of the respondents positively supported the introduction of more flexibility in the conversion of redundant buildings for local occupancy (sale or rent) as they see this as a way of providing a use for a wider range of buildings.

• This is also seen as a way of bringing forward more homes for local people although some commented that this is still too restrictive and policy should allow for farm buildings, whether traditional or not, and irrespective of location, to be converted to new homes for sale or rent, without occupancy conditions and to tourism and business uses.

• NYCC welcomed a more flexible approach provided there is adequate infrastructure; provided the development supports the needs of the community, avoids impacts on local employment opportunities and makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.

• Some respondents were concerned to ensure that the policy should only relate to buildings of historic merit which make a positive contribution to the National Park and that proposals should only be allowed of the design and materials are appropriate so that the special qualities of the National Park are not harmed.

• Historic England commented that a robust set of criteria will need to be set out in order to minimise the potential harm to the special qualities of the National Park and regard should also be had to the cumulative impact of such conversions on the landscape character.

Q9. Question Q9 asked: “Do you agree with the approach to infill development that we are suggesting? If not, please give your reasons and tell us what alternative you would prefer.”

Responses: 61

Main Points:

• Almost half of the respondents had no objections or positively supported the amended approach to infill development mainly on the basis that it makes sense to have a more flexible policy and to make better use of some of the spaces available for infill. This approach would also result in a better mix of dwellings.

• Respondents pointed out that infill can make a positive contribution to achieving sustainable local communities and maintaining local services, facilities and economic activity.
• Some respondents who were supportive said care was needed to ensure that development should be appropriate in terms of scale; design and open spaces should be maintained.

• Historic England has commented that it will be necessary to set out a robust policy framework against which applications might be considered in order to ensure that this policy does not result in the loss of areas which ought to remain undeveloped.

• Many of those who were not supportive of the approach considered that infilling should not be restricted by what they saw as an arbitrary, artificial, unnecessary number and that the policy lacks flexibility.

• Each application should instead be determined on its own merits with the effects of the development being the key consideration.

• Some respondents consider that the designation of IUS would hinder any development opportunities on land which under any other circumstance, could help accommodate some future small scale residential development in sustainable locations throughout the Park. As such it has been suggested that these designations (IUS) and emerging housing policies are in direct conflict.

Q10. Question Q10 asked: “Are you aware of any sites that are either previously developed or ‘brownfield’ or where redevelopment would improve the character and appearance of the National Park?”

Responses: 53

Main Points:
• Respondents generally agreed with the Brownfield Land Register and the redevelopment of sites that are ‘eyesores’ and a number of sites were suggested which respondents considered could be used for a variety of uses.

Q11. Question Q11 asked “Do you agree with the types of land that we are proposing to identify as ‘Community Spaces? If not, are there any types that you would like to see added or removed?”

Responses: 68

Main Points:
• There was broad agreement for the identification of Community Spaces with 26 of the respondents stating their positive support for the approach and agreement for the types of land.

• Historic England supports the proposed approach and the criteria that will be used to identify Important Undeveloped Areas. The inclusion within the Local Plan of a policy framework to safeguard such areas will help to ensure that this element of the Park’s special character is not harmed.

• Natural England welcomes the criteria.

• Some requested that school playing fields, village halls, land adjacent to footpaths, registered common land, wooded areas adjacent to villages and the Cinder Track should also be included.
• Several Parish Councils requested the extra designations on specific sites.
• Some respondents requested that certain types of land be excluded including amongst others private gardens, school playing fields and agricultural land.
• There was strong opposition to the inclusion of private allotments and facilities that are available by private arrangement between a land owner and a sports club.

Q12. Question Q12 asked “Do you support the identification of Important Undeveloped Spaces? Do you have any views on the criteria we have used or whether others may be more suitable?

Responses: 77

Main Points:
• There was general support for the proposed policy with over 40% of the respondents supporting the approach and the spaces identified. Overall those who were in support thought that this policy will ensure that the Park’s special character is not harmed.
• Some respondents (11) however, including some individuals and land agents/planning agents strongly objected to the approach as they considered the approach will rule out most potential development sites and it is effectively a ‘blanket ban’ on any infill development.
• Those who objected stated that the designation seems inconsistent, arbitrary and open to interpretation and subjectivity and they consider that the current LDF approach where each application is considered on its own merits, is sufficient and there are enough current safeguards to manage inappropriate development.
• The approach could also result in pushing development further out to the edges of settlements and this was not thought to necessarily be the best option.
• Individual objections were submitted to specific IUS.

Q13. Question Q13 asked “Have we identified the right areas? Have we missed any?

Responses: 43

Main Points:
• 9 of the respondents confirmed that right spaces had been identified, 2 stated that the spaces were not right.
• There were several requests from individuals and Parish Councils for additional Important Undeveloped Spaces to be designated.

Further Comments

Responses: 54

• Respondents used this part of the questionnaire to reinforce their overall comments and provide further comments on a number of new topics including;
the consultation process,
the planning service,
fracking,
tourist accommodation,
Botton,
the Cinder Track,
further general housing comments,
The possible allocation of land in Swainby adjacent to the Caravan Park for housing,
the splitting of villages with the Park boundary,
other local issues.

6. Next Steps

6.1 The consultation responses have provided officers with a wide range of views on the topics covered by this consultation exercise. The results of the consultation have enabled officers to reconsider a number of aspects of the proposed housing policy with particular reference to the settlement hierarchy and Members' views on this will be sought.

6.2 The responses to the questions relating to Important Undeveloped Spaces and Community Spaces will also require officers to reconsider a number of specific sites with a view to either including or removing them from the Local Plan maps following specific comments from land owners/agents/Parish Councils. Member’s agreement to progressing that work is also sought.
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1. Why have we produced this paper?

1.1 We are now working on the new North York Moors Local Plan. This document will direct the amount and type of new development in the National Park to the year 2035. As part of this process, and following on from the ‘First Steps’ consultation exercise that took place from 2 September to 18 November 2016, the National Park Authority needs to make progress on the key issues which will guide decisions on the amount, type and location of new development in the National Park.

1.2 As part of the continuing Local Plan progress further consultation took place on a number of key issues so that an ‘early steer’ from anyone with an interest in the National Park could be sought. The exercise focussed on possible approaches to the settlement hierarchy, housing strategy, Community and Important Undeveloped Spaces and also asked if anyone knew of any ‘brownfield’ or unsightly sites where redevelopment may be of benefit to the National Park. We will now use this information to help us write our plan. Our thanks go to everyone who took the time to respond.

1.3 This consultation also helps fulfil our statutory requirements to ask for views under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

2. What did we publish?

2.1 We published several documents for comment or feedback. The main ‘Current Thinking’ document was in published in October 2017 and was aimed at a general audience but was designed to prompt those with some planning policy knowledge or interest to provide views on particular issues. The document included thirteen questions together with an opportunity to provide additional comments focussed around the main three issues of the settlement hierarchy, housing strategy and community and important undeveloped spaces.

2.2 Three topic papers covering the three main issues were made available on line to provide further background to the issues together with maps showing all the proposed community spaces and important undeveloped spaces. Detailed written descriptions of each important open space were provided together with lists of the proposed community spaces.

2.3 The consultation ran for a seven week period from 6 October to 24 November 2017. The documents were sent out to all statutory consultees and to anyone registered on our local plan database. Paper and electronic copies of all documents, together with maps and posters were sent out to all Parish Councils within and adjoining the North York Moors National Park. All documents were made available on our website, which was publicised through press releases and social media. Responses were made via an on line survey, by submitting an e mail with a completed electronic questionnaire, by e mail or by hand.
2.4 A request for feedback was made through an article in the ‘Moors Messenger’ newspaper which was distributed to all homes in the National Park the first two weeks of November 2017.

2.5 We also attended four drop in events at village halls throughout the National Park from 12th October to 2 November 2017 in Hutton le Hole, Helmsley, Hinderwell and Carlton in Cleveland. Officers were so invited to attend a Parish Council meeting in Sneaton, (6th December) and a meeting were held with Osmotherley Parish Council on 6th December.

3. Who Provided Comments?

3.1 A total of 98 individual people, organisations or groups sent us comments. This is broken down as follows:

Current Thinking Document

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of respondent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Councils/Meetings</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough/District Councils</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land/Planning Agents</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Groups</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies/Infrastructure Providers</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>98</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Out of the 38 members of the public who responded 24 lived within the National Park (or provided an address with the National Park), 3 lived close to the National Park (roughly within a 30 minute drive), and of the rest 2 lived in North Yorkshire or Teesside and 3 lived outside. Six did not provide an address.

3.3 Comments were provided by different departments within North Yorkshire County Council and this was submitted as one response. Comments were also received from two different departments within Scarborough Borough Council and this shows as two different responses. The above table appears to show 3 different Borough/District/County responses this relates only to NYCC and SBC.

**Location of Respondent – General Public**
3.4 Only 26 of those that completed the questionnaire stated their age and 72 of the respondents skipped this question. 42% of those that stated their age are in the 35 – 59 age range and 46% are in the 60 – 74 age range. 4% of respondents are 75 or over and 8% are in the 17 – 34 age range. With only 26 of respondents providing this information it is considered that there is insufficient data for this to be considered relevant.

4. What Views Were Expressed?

4.1 Appendix 1 gives a more detailed breakdown of the comments made against the 13 questions we asked in the ‘Current Thinking’ document and the further comments area. Where individuals provided a general response rather than responding to specific questions these responses have been attributed to a question using a ‘best fit’ method to make sure all responses are logged and considered and it should be noted that not all respondents completed all of the questions in the questionnaire and in some cases their comments have been included in the ‘further comments’ section if their response did not naturally sit within a particular question.

4.2 We have not generally included any comments referring to activity outside the remit of the Local Plan. The exception is that we have included numbers of comments opposed to hydraulic fracturing (fracking) as this issue generated several comments which are recorded in the ‘further comments’ section. A policy on fracking is being developed through the separate Minerals and Waste Joint Plan.

Summary of Responses

4.3 The following section summarises the main point of relevance, in the opinion of officers:

Q1. Question Q1 “Do you agree with the proposed 3-tier settlement hierarchy? If not, please give your reasons and tell us which alternative you would prefer.

Responses: 65

Main Points:

Almost half of the respondents were in agreement with the proposed 3-tier settlement hierarchy, and a further 19 expressed views but did not clearly state whether they were in favour of the proposal or disagreed with it. The remaining 12 respondents expressed clear disagreement with the proposal. The most common reason for disagreeing with the proposed 3-tier settlement hierarchy was the desire to see larger service villages as distinct to other smaller villages when considering the potential for new development. Some respondents considered that the merging of the tiers does not recognise that some villages within the National Park beyond Helmsley, hold a broader range of services which are worthy of protection and support. Some respondents provided an alternative hierarchy based on size of settlement and facilities (Option 3 - which includes Helmsley, Larger and Smaller villages and Open Countryside). Whether respondents were in favour or against the proposal, there was a general feeling that open market housing should be developed throughout the Park in place of the proposed policy of 100% affordable (except Helmsley). Some of those who supported the proposal, or didn’t give a view either way, felt that flexibility to assess opportunities for housing on an individual case by case basis was particularly important. While streamlining the hierarchy was seen as a general positive by some,
several respondents were concerned that the proposed approach risked being prescriptive or broad brush and several respondents also commented that mixed communities, including new housing, are required to support and maintain services and to ensure sustainable villages. Several respondents commented that the proposed hierarchy would result in the further decline of services in the existing larger villages.

Q2. Question Q2 asked: “Do you agree with the overall approach to housing policy we are proposing? If not, please give your reasons and tell us what alternatives you would prefer.

Responses: 66

Main Points:

21 of the respondents positively agreed with the overall approach to housing being proposed. 12 respondents disagreed with the approach and many of those provided very detailed reasons to explain why they disagreed and suggested alternative approaches. Many respondents neither agreed nor disagreed but instead provided general comments on the approach to housing. Those who supported the proposed overall approach to housing agreed that the policy approach will meet local needs, support local employment opportunities and key services whilst conserving the existing landscape, character, uniqueness and tranquillity of the Park. Those that disagreed were concerned that the approach will lead to the decline of village populations and services and to ensure that there are thriving economic and sustainable communities, there needs to be growth and that the policy is too restrictive. Those who disagreed considered that a policy which allowed local needs housing across the Park particularly in the larger settlements would be more appropriate. There were concerns raised in relation to the number of second homes and concerns expressed that there is little provision made for first time buyers or the elderly.

Q3. Question Q3 asked: “Do you have any views on the amount of housing that we should be looking to allow in the coming years?”

Responses: 65

Main Points:

Just over a third of the respondents agreed that the amount of housing being proposed by the proposed policy approach is appropriate i.e. 29 houses per year. Just over a third of the respondents however disagreed for a number of reasons. Generally those that disagreed considered that this was a very low rigid figure and that it is wrong to settle on one figure for such a long time as circumstances change. Many of those who disagreed pointed out that if an average of 37 houses per annum have been successfully completed since 2008 and this has failed to halt, let alone reverse, the decline in population and the range of services available in the various settlements around the National Park, it is unlikely that a target figure of 29 housing completions per annum will do anything other than increase the tension between managing population growth and the retention of services that support sustainable communities. This will result in the decline of settlements as they become unviable and unsustainable. There were comments submitted in relation to the size of dwellings, the provision of smaller affordable homes, more flexibility in relation to conversions, occupancy rates, the idea of primary residence and second homes. Some respondents questioned whether the Woodsmith Mine and the need for housing for the workforce had been taken into account.
Q4. Question Q4 asked: “Do you agree that new open market housing development should be limited to Helmsley and not permitted in any of the Villages? If not, please give your reasons and tell us what alternative you would prefer.”

Responses: 63

Main Points:

Approximately 30% of the respondents agreed that open market housing should be limited to Helmsley and not be permitted in any of the villages on the basis that this approach will ensure that new housing will meet local needs and new open market housing should be concentrated in the place with good services and connections although some did point out that Helmsley should have better services to meet the demands of the new development and that there is a danger of Helmsley becoming over urbanised resulting in the loss of its character. Almost 40% of the respondents disagreed with the proposed policy approach and many of those who disagreed provided very detailed explanations. The general tone was that the proposed policy approach is too restrictive and curtails all open market housing outside Helmsley. It is considered by these respondents that open market development should instead be spread throughout all the villages in the Park although a high proportion of respondents considered it would be more appropriate to allow open market housing in the larger villages to meet local and family needs and this would help to support local services and local schools keeping communities sustainable and vibrant. There was a concern that this approach could contribute to the loss of essential services, including schools, within the villages and that what is needed instead is a more balanced approach which would support appropriate levels of housing within local villages where there is a need to maintain their sustainability and services and where it would not conflict with the overall statutory purpose and aspirations of the National Park. Such an approach could seek to permit limited open market housing where there is an identified need with a proportion being allocated for local needs housing. Respondents also considered that the proposed approach may restrict the market resulting in increasing house prices.

Q5. Question Q5 asked: “Do you agree that the existing affordable housing exception site policy should be continued? If not, please give your reasons and tell us what alternative you would prefer.”

Responses: 61

Main Points:

Almost half of the respondents positively agreed with the existing affordable housing exceptions policy, and several of the respondents suggested changes to the way the current policy operates. Those who agreed considered that it was an important policy that is ensures that local needs are met within the rural areas and small settlements essential to support key sectors of the local economy. 10% of respondents strongly disagreed and considered that there should be the potential to provide mixed open market homes and affordable houses on these development sites.

Q6. Question Q6 asked: “Do you have any views on whether we should apply local occupancy restrictions and if so on our suggested way forward? Please give your reasons or tell us what alternative you would prefer.”

Responses: 61

Main Points:
14 of the respondents agreed with the imposition of local occupancy conditions and the proposed amendments. 7 respondents disagreed with the principle of local occupancy conditions and therefore disagreed with the proposed amendments. Those who agreed with the imposition of local occupancy conditions, and with the proposed amendments, agreed on the basis of the cost of housing in relation to average household incomes and because of the high demand for second and holiday homes in the National Park. They consider that it is important that affordable housing is available for those who live and work in the area and that it is a good way to sustain local services. Several respondents agreed with the suggested amendments as this would enable a more flexible approach and would bring the Park more in line with adjacent Authorities. Some respondents however suggested different restrictions to either broaden the criteria or restrict it further and a number of respondents suggest the imposition of ‘primary residence’ in place of Local Occupancy as a way of achieving long term occupancy to support local services and communities. Those who disagreed did so largely on the basis that the National Park needs to attract new people and new businesses into the area as all communities benefit from an influx of new people at some time, and restrictions should not prevent increasing prosperity in the National Park. Some stated that local occupancy criteria can create issues relating to the marketing and saleability of properties, including accessing mortgages, which can have implications for site’s viability and delivery.

Q7. Question Q7 asked: “Do you agree that there should be size restrictions for new local needs housing and that large extensions should be resisted? Do you agree with the proposed limits? If not, please give your reasons and tell us what alternative you would prefer.”

Responses: 59

Main Points:

This question was answered either jointly, covering both issues, or respondents separated the two issues out. A third of respondents supported the proposal to restrict new local needs housing to a specific size (93sqm) but an almost equal number of respondents strongly disagreed with this policy approach. With regards to the proposal to restrict the size of new extensions 16 respondents agreed with this approach and 15 disagreed. Those who agreed with both proposals concluded that restricting the size of new local needs housing and extensions will help to ensure the availability of housing of an appropriate size to meet the identified needs. Those who disagreed or expressed concern with both proposals considered that each application should be taken on its own merits, taking into account the character of the area, and that such a policy may impinge on lifestyles and choices and furthermore that larger extensions and larger houses will free up smaller homes as people move into them. With regards to the proposal to restrict the size of extensions there was a strong feeling that extensions should be determined on their own merits on a case by case basis, there is already control on extensions through the design guide and that extensions should be allowed to reflect changing family situations.

Q8. Question Q8 asked: “Do you agree that we should introduce some more flexibility to policy on conversion of rural buildings so that they don’t have to be historic and can be used for local occupancy housing? If not, please give your reasons and tell us what alternative you would prefer?”

Responses: 65

Main Points:
Over half of the respondents positively supported the introduction of more flexibility in the conversion of redundant buildings for local occupancy as they see this as a way of providing a use for a wider range of buildings and as a way of bringing forward more homes for local people although some commented that this is still too restrictive and policy should allow for farm buildings, whether traditional or not and irrespective of location to be converted to new homes for sale or rent, without occupancy conditions and to tourism and business uses. Some respondents were concerned to ensure that the policy should only relate to buildings of historic merit which make a positive contribution to the National Park and that proposals should only be allowed of the design and materials are appropriate so that the special qualities of the National Park are not harmed.

Q9. Question Q9 asked: “Do you agree with the approach to infill development that we are suggesting? If not, please give your reasons and tell us what alternative you would prefer.”

Responses: 61

Main Points:

Almost half of the respondents had no objections or positively supported the amended approach to infill development mainly on the basis that it makes sense to have a more flexible policy and to make better use of some of the spaces available for infill. This approach would also result in a better mix of dwellings. Some respondents who were supportive said care was needed to ensure that development should be appropriate in terms of scale; design and open spaces should be maintained. Respondents pointed out that infill can make a positive contribution to achieving sustainable local communities and maintaining local services, facilities and economic activity. Many of those who were not supportive of the approach considered that infilling should not be restricted by what they saw as an arbitrary, artificial, unnecessary number and the policy lacks flexibility. Each application should instead be determined on its own merits with the effects of the development being the key consideration.

Q10. Question Q10 asked: “Are you aware of any sites that are either previously developed or ‘brownfield’ or where redevelopment would improve the character and appearance of the National Park?”

Responses: 53

Main Points:

Respondents generally agreed with the Brownfield Land Register and the redevelopment of sites that are ‘eyesores’ and a number of sites were suggested which respondents considered could be used for a variety of uses.

Q11. Question Q11 asked “Do you agree with the types of land that we are proposing to identify as ‘Community Spaces? If not, are there any types that you would like to see added or removed?”

Responses: 68

Main Points:

There was broad agreement for the identification of Community Spaces with 26 of the respondents stating their positive support for the approach and agreement for the types of land. Some requested that school playing fields, village halls, land adjacent to
footpaths, registered common land, wooded areas adjacent to villages and the Cinder Track should also be included and several Parish Councils requested the extra designations on specific sites. Some respondents requested that certain types of land be excluded including amongst others private gardens, school playing fields and agricultural land.

Q12. Question Q12 asked “Do you support the identification of Important Undeveloped Spaces? Do you have any views on the criteria we have used or whether others may be more suitable?

Responses: 77

Main Points: There was general support for the proposed policy with over 40% of the respondents supporting the approach and the spaces identified. Overall those who were in support thought that this policy will ensure that the Park’s special character is not harmed. Some respondents (11) however, including some individuals and land agents/planning agents strongly objected to the approach as they considered the approach will rule out most potential development sites and it is effectively a ‘blanket ban’ on any infill development. Those who objected stated that the designation seems inconsistent, arbitrary and open to interpretation and subjectivity and they consider that the current LDF approach where each application is considered on its own merits, is sufficient and there are enough current safeguards to manage inappropriate development. The approach could also result in pushing development further out to the edges of settlements and this was not thought to necessarily be the best option. There were specific objections to individual IUS.

Q13. Question Q13 asked “Have we identified the right areas? Have we missed any?

Responses: 43

Main Points:

9 of the respondents confirmed that right spaces had been identified, 2 stated that the spaces were not right. There were several requests from individuals and Parish Councils for additional Important Undeveloped Spaces to be designated.

Further Comments

Responses: 54

Respondents used this part of the questionnaire to reinforce their overall comments and provide further comments on a number of new topics including; the consultation process, the planning service, fracking, tourist accommodation, Botton, the Cinder Track, further general housing comments, the possible allocation of land in Swainby adjacent to the Caravan Park for housing, the splitting of villages with the Park boundary and other local issues.
Appendix 1 – Detailed Breakdown of Comments Made

**Q1** Do you agree with the proposed 3-tier settlement hierarchy? If not, please give your reasons and tell us which alternative you would prefer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of respondent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish/Town Councils and Meetings</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough Councils/County Council</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land/Planning Agents</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest groups</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies (e.g. Natural England)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main Points**

26 of the respondents were in agreement with the proposed 3-tier settlement hierarchy, and a further 19 expressed views but did not clearly state whether they were in favour of the proposal or disagreed with it. The remaining 12 respondents expressed clear disagreement with the proposal and some of the main comments provided are set out below. The most common reason for disagreeing with the proposed 3-tier settlement hierarchy was the desire to see larger service villages as distinct to other smaller villages when considering the potential for new housing development. Whether respondents were in favour or against the proposal, there was a general feeling that open market housing should be developed throughout the Park in place of the proposed policy of 100% affordable (except Helmsley). Some of those who supported the proposal, or didn’t give a view either way, felt that flexibility to assess opportunities for housing on an individual case by case basis was particularly important. While streamlining the hierarchy was seen as a general positive by some, several respondents were concerned that the proposed approach risked being prescriptive or broad brush and several respondents also commented that mixed communities, including new housing, are required to support and maintain services and to ensure sustainable villages. Several respondents commented that the proposed hierarchy would result in the further decline of services in the existing larger villages. A numbers of respondents also commented that public transport should not be seen as a pre-determinant of service village status, since the primary mode of transport in the National Park is the private car.

- **NYCC** commented that that the use of a settlement hierarchy is beneficial in planning for the infrastructure and service needs of the Park’s communities. This is considered by NYCC to be particularly important when there are limited resources available that need to be prioritised. The approach taken within the settlement hierarchy, in combination with the Housing Strategy will significantly shape how the Park will evolve over the next 15 years. In adopting the proposed approach NYCC comment that care will need to be taken to ensure that the approach adopted does not result in a loss of vital services. It may be appropriate therefore to heighten the status of settlements where there is available infrastructure capacity or where growth is required to maintain services.

- **Scarborough Borough Council (SBC)** comments that there is no distinction in the proposed approach between the differing scales of villages, the services they have and the roles they play. In SBC’s opinion this does not align well with the stance of
neighbouring authorities and it is questioned whether this is too simplistic. At the very least SBC state that the Plan should recognise the service villages of neighbouring authorities where they cross boundaries. This would apply to areas such as Ayton and Sleights in Scarborough Borough and Thornton le Dale in Ryedale. The different take on Scalby is noted and its suburban setting, which encroaches into the NP, should not be expanded.

- The North Yorkshire Moors Association is concerned that removing the use of service provision in assessing a settlement’s suitability for new development could result in settlements with no services being developed while settlements with services fall into decline. The NYMA would prefer to see the hierarchy include the safeguarding of settlements with a history of services. Community First Yorkshire comments that the clustering of settlements should also take account of community buildings which communities have access to.

- York Diocesan Board of Finance acknowledge that Helmsley remains the National Park’s Main Service Centre, but that development (commensurate to the size of each settlement) should still take place in the smaller sustainable settlements throughout the National Park to meet identified needs and demand. York Diocesan Board of Finance considers that to be the hierarchy should be amended so that it is based on the size of the settlements and their associated services and facilities and therefore Option 3 is supported. A planning agent similarly states this view and that the justification for not identifying Service and Local Service Villages due to possible changes in the presence of key services is not considered a strong enough reason to remove a tier from the hierarchy and states that settlement reviews on a biannual basis can be carried out.

- A further planning agent states that the proposed settlement hierarchy would result in the merging of the Service Village, Local Service Village and Village tiers and that this does not recognise that some villages within the National Park beyond Helmsley, hold a broader range of services which are worthy of protection and support. The planning agent believes that the settlement hierarchy should be based on services rather than size or population, with settlements arranged in accordance with the level and range of services. This view is shared by a Parish Council who considers that the criterion of 35 addresses is too crude a measure as the characteristics of the second tier villages are not uniform and their individuality needs to be recognised and reflected in all aspects of the planning process. One resident states that Thornton le Dale is very different to the much smaller moorland villages of Lockton and Levisham and Goathland, a larger village is very different to Egton. This respondent acknowledges that it would not be possible for there to be a bespoke policy for each village neither does it seem appropriate than one planning position can be appropriate for so many very different villages. A planning agent in disagreeing with the proposed approach states that this ‘is seen as a backwards step’ which is not in accordance with the NPPF and a policy in favour of market housing in sustainable villages should be advocated instead. One resident and a Parish Council consider that the existing (LDF) hierarchy is preferable on the basis that services should be taken into account when deciding which villages should be developed. A further Parish Council states that the present (LDF) hierarchy is well understood and recognised whereas the proposal ‘for effectively no hierarchy is less immediately legible and understandable’.

- A further resident is concerned there is a vast difference between the level of services available within the most well provided 10 or so villages and the very limited or zero level of services available in the presently defined small villages. Therefore, the policies of restraint need to be more effective in the presently defined small village category and perhaps a little easier in the large village category.

- There was broad agreement that that Helmsley is a sustainable location for future development. However, some respondents believed that development should be
more equally spread across the Park. Helmsley Estate, in acknowledging that Helmsley is the main service centre for the Park notes that it is a long way from much of the Park and is not central to the Park area. In this respect the Estate consider that the availability of services in villages should not necessarily be the main driver for housing planning applications - people are much more mobile these days and whilst that is not necessarily sustainable it has to be acknowledged that most residents in the Park have cars and therefore do not rely on services within their immediate surroundings.

- A further Planning agent states that some villages are much more 'sustainable' than others and what additional residential accommodation they can potentially provide and who should be allowed to live in it should reflect that so as to avoid more unsustainable schemes/occupancy. He further comments that the less sustainable villages should only provide modest local needs infilling of one or two houses with the local occupancy criteria drawn very tightly to relate to the parish concerned. Larger settlements, especially those with reasonable public transport and some facilities/services so as to be more sustainable for meeting a wider geographical local need in the Park could do just that with the level of new development assessed on its merits and not limited to small scale infill. Some larger schemes, if appropriately located, could provide for the more general Park-wide local needs housing which will have been otherwise reduced by the more restrictive (limit to the Parish) approach taken in the less sustainable villages. He states that the larger settlements with potential to accommodate more than just one or two dwellings as infill could include: Helmsley, Sleights, West and East Ayton, Thornton le Dale, Castleton, Ampleforth, Glaisdale, Goathland, Robin Hood’s Bay, Egton, Osmotherley, Lealholm, Easington, Guisborough, Scalby, Fylingthorpe, Hinderwell, Osmotherley, Lythe, Runswick Bay, Staithes, Swainby. A further planning agent shares this view on the sustainability of services and their dependent communities and comments that placing ‘a straightjacket on opportunity’ through a restrictive application of policy relative to the proposed settlement hierarchy will serve neither to provide for local need nor guarantee the future of services and the settlements and communities of which they are a part. One resident cites Osmotherley as an example of this and states that consideration is required so that villages such as Osmotherley remain sustainable villages that attract visitors without killing the very thing that makes them attractive i.e. a living and sustainable community with a viable economy for sustaining services. A local councillor comments that development should be sustainable in terms of reducing the need to travel.

- Mulgrave Estate provides detailed comments on the proposed hierarchy and suggests changes to make it more acceptable. As currently presented the hierarchy is not supported, but could be with changes. The Estate accepts that Helmsley is the National Park’s largest settlement and is therefore suitable for accommodating major development. The Estate however, strongly suggest that villages should continue to have a very important role to play in accommodating sustainable growth, which is partially but not fully recognised in the proposed Settlement Hierarchy, including a more overt role in providing suitable ‘market’ housing sites, particularly in those villages at the Park’s periphery, such as Lythe which are close to other service centres outside of the Park and other settlements/clusters of settlements with a range of services and facilities. Some villages are more appropriate locations for market housing than others, the approach could be achieved within a three-tier hierarchy, alongside suitable criteria based policies on determining appropriate locations. The Settlement Hierarchy also needs to recognise that the main means of travel of any distance is the private car and this will remain so over the lifetime of the next Local Plan. The Park’s ‘open countryside’ should be protected for its own sake, and therefore only limited development is suitable, such as that needed in relation to agriculture, forestry, tourism, in exceptional circumstances affordable housing; and the conversion, re-use, adaptation and extension of existing buildings, including
those currently not in use. The Park should not seek to exclude small villages (i.e. those under 35 address points) from the definition of Village – they should not therefore, be treated as Open Countryside in Planning terms.

- Mulgrave Estate further considers that a hierarchy based on size of settlement and facilities (Option 3) is more a more suitable and sound approach and suggest that Helmsley remains as the Principle Service Centre. The next tier would be Rural Service Centres including larger villages i.e. Ampleforth, Goathland, Hinderwell, Lythe, Osmotherley, Sleights, Staithes, Thornton le Dale, West and East Ayton, plus Esk Valley Group (Castleton, Danby, Egton, Glaisdale, Lealholm). The next tier would then comprise Villages as set out in Option 3 with the final tier being Open Countryside. The Estate suggest that in the Rural Service Centres market and affordable housing, where it is of an appropriate scale, would be supported as would development on brownfield land together with other development to support the local economy and services. In Villages the Estate suggests that small scale development should be supported where it does not detract from the character of the village including a single infill dwelling for local needs or affordable housing or market housing under special circumstances, conversion of buildings for residential use under specific criteria, conversions for economic/tourism/community uses, replacement dwellings, local services and other economic development. In the Open countryside the Estate considers that conversion of buildings for residential and economic uses should be supported under specific criteria, together with replacement dwellings and other dwellings satisfying an essential need as well as other equine, recreation, community facilities and tourism development.

- Mulgrave Estate also state that should the Authority progress with the proposed 3 tier approach, the definition of ‘Village’ in the proposed Settlement Hierarchy should include all villages; and not seek to classify the 20 ‘small’ villages as Open Countryside.

- Two planning agents and a Parish Council also request more flexibility and state that individual sites should be looked at on their merits no matter where they are. In this respect there should be the possibility of small scale sensitive developments in all existing villages in order that services and community continue to exist in these places. This development will then assist with services, such as small schools, shops and pubs that will have a greater catchment.

- There are also a number of respondents including a Parish Council, two planning agents and residents who request that specific villages be re assessed in the proposed settlement hierarchy including East and West Barnby, Darnholm, Fryup, Fylingthorpe and Robin Hoods Bay, Goathland, Ingleby Arncliffe/Ingleby Cross, Kettleness, Thimbleby, Ugglebarnby.

- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust questions whether the proximity to European sites has been taken into account in the proposed hierarchy. YWT state that for example an increase in the amount of development close to Special Protection Areas (SPA) could increase pressure on breeding birds. Similarly Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) might be affected by increased nearby development.

Q2 Do you agree with the overall approach to housing policy we are proposing? If not, please give your reasons and tell us what alternatives you would prefer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of respondent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish/Town Councils and Meetings</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough/County Council</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land/Planning Agents</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest groups</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21 of the respondents positively agreed with the overall approach to housing being proposed. 12 respondents disagreed with the approach and many of those provided very detailed reasons to explain why they disagreed and suggested alternative approaches which will be précised below. Many respondents neither agreed nor disagreed but instead provided general comments on the approach to housing and these will be generally summarised below.

Those who supported the proposed overall approach to housing agreed that the policy approach will meet local needs, support local employment opportunities and key services whilst conserving the existing landscape, character, uniqueness and tranquillity of the Park.

- NYCC state that the provision for additional housing to meet local needs, avoid population decline, support local services and employment opportunities is welcome.
- Some of the respondents, including one Parish Council, a number of residents and one non-resident who were mainly supportive of the approach requested more scope for flexibility and more assistance to retain young local workers and families in villages. Respondents, including a planning agent and a resident commented that the overall numbers are acceptable but that housing should be spread out over the Park rather than concentrating on Helmsley or a reduced number of centres and a further resident pointed out that more housing may be needed to accommodate Woodsmith mine workers.
- Community First Yorkshire whilst agreeing overall stated that the policy misses the following points; the need for social housing - Multi-occupancy accommodation, housing people from across the age range, to ensure a mix of communities - New ways of funding social housing such as Community Housing Schemes, enabling communities to invest in housing for meeting local needs - Housing for essential workers, e.g. teachers and care workers, enabling people to live more closely to their work.
- One resident comments that it appears to be assumed that new house building is essential but no justification for this is provided. The first priority should instead be making better use of existing provision. The respondent states that some of the approved developments in the past have been totally inappropriate and have had a negative impact on settlements. One resident comments that the Authority appears to appreciate the fact that many National Park villages have an increasingly aged population with little or no opportunity for younger people to move in. The respondent states that previous planning policy has exacerbated this problem and has led to the decline of many rural services and amenities.
- One non-resident commented that this new approach should reduce the amount of empty homes and reduce the amount of luxury homes which pushes prices up and reduces the number of young people in the area.

Those that disagreed were concerned that the approach will lead to the decline of village populations and services and to ensure that there are thriving economic and sustainable communities, there needs to be growth and that the policy is too restrictive. Those who disagreed considered that a policy which allowed local needs housing across the Park particularly in the larger settlements would be more appropriate. Many respondents, including many residents in the Park and Parish Councils, highlighted their concerns about the number of second homes in the Park and some commented that these houses do little to support local services. One resident comments that the ‘danger is that we end up with a
village which looks attractive, but has actually ceased to function as a community and is nothing more than a holiday complex.' Many commented on the lack of suitable affordable provision for first time buyers and for elderly persons and one planning agent comments that there is no new purpose built accommodation for that age range and that bungalows are not recognised as being an attractive building design by the Authority and as a result two storey houses are supported.

- York Diocesan Board of Finance and a planning agent comment that whilst new housing in the Park during the Plan period is supported, it is essential that emerging plan policies do not impact on delivery. Attention they state should be paid to Paragraph 173 of the NPPF relating to the viability of schemes. The respondents therefore consider that housing polices within the Plan should not be overly restrictive as such they consider that market housing, local occupancy housing and affordable housing should all be supported as part of the emerging Local Plan.

- One planning agent considers that concentrating housing growth around one key settlement and preventing the opportunity for market housing in other locations runs the risk of narrowing choice across the National Park in such a way that sustainable settlements will become threatened with decline. The housing policy as suggested will prove inflexible and be incapable of responding to changing circumstances, with the result that settlements fail to retain or increase the critical mass of population necessary to sustain local services and facilities. In this respect the respondent suggests that more new housing should be allowed across the Park, subject to criteria that will ensure it is appropriate in terms of sustaining the viability and vitality of communities without harming the essential quality of the National Park. Without this broader view the respondent considers that the new Plan will not achieve the objective of fostering economic and social well-being by delivering housing of appropriate tenure which meets local needs and supports communities and services. In addition the respondent further comments that a combination of market and affordable housing throughout the Park should be the basis for future plans for sustainable growth and development. An additional Planning agent considers that three important areas of housing policy should be considered; the quality of the housing stock; the suitability of the housing stock for an ageing population; and the capacity for a good housing stock to support economic development and thereby the prosperity of those who live and work in the Park.

- Mulgrave Estate considers that the proposed approach is overly restrictive is not sound, not in line with the NPPF, and this approach will be to the detriment of the Park, its businesses and its local communities. It will stifle the ability of the Park, its business and communities to grow sustainably and maximise their potential to thrive and flourish. The Estate has difficulty in employing staff mainly due to being unable to find suitable accommodation and other businesses are facing these problems. The Local Plan should meet current and future housing needs and to help address the Park’s population decline, particularly amongst young working people. The current proposed approach will not do enough to ensure sufficient housing of the right type in the right place is provided at the right time. The Estate considers that 29 homes is insufficient for the reasons set out in question 3 below and that the Authority should recognise that household formation may change over the next Local Plan period and that contingency provisions will be needed to meet the need for more/different homes now and in the Local Plan. The Estate consider that policy contingency measures, for instance to have ‘reserve’ flexibility in housing policy to allow a less restrictive application of standards, occupancy and numbers etc., rather than requiring a formal full Local Plan review to address changes in housing need, during the next Local Plan period. In addition the Estate comment that the Park’s housing need should not take account of new homes derived from conversions, particularly as it is almost impossible to quantify the number of conversions that may come forward over the
next Local Plan period. The Estate also considers that the proposed restriction of infill sites to only two dwellings is artificial and arbitrary as there may be instances where appropriate infill of more than 2 homes will be deliverable without impacting on village character. The Estate considers that infill applications and what constitutes a suitable number should be done on case by case basis and that the proposed settlement hierarchy should be reconsidered as set out in question 1 above so that there is a more balanced distribution of market and affordable housing across the most sustainable settlements with the larger sites allocated in Helmsley. The Estate provides an alternative hierarchy based on size of settlement and facilities for consideration.

- One Parish Council considers that the policy does not provide protection for overzealous developers and it might encourage more speculative housing in the Park and deliver sustainable development.
- One Parish Council states that local needs housing should not be restricted to infill sites. Such sites are minimal in number and availability; they alone will not fully meet the needs of the existing population. Instead it is suggested that small undeveloped but available and deliverable sites within or on the edge of existing settlements should be considered for local needs housing.

Further comments:

- Highways England does not have any particular concerns as the total number of proposed dwellings (522 between 2016 and 2035 i.e. 29 homes each year) is a relatively low number when considering the vehicle trip generation from these dwellings in relation to the capacity of the Strategic Road Network that serves the National Park. Furthermore, the plan ensures that the dwellings are spatially distributed which minimises the traffic impact at any single location. Although half of these dwellings are proposed at Helmsley, from the anticipated vehicle trip generation from these and the distance from the first point of contact with the Strategic Road Network, this is not expected to be a significant issue for Highways England.
- Natural England has no specific comments to make regarding the overall approach however it is advised that the approach should be assessed in and informed by the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment. The plan area has significant landscape and biodiversity constraints which should be carefully considered in relation to the strategy for housing.
- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust comments that development in some villages could have more impact than in other villages, depending on proximity to European sites, SAC and SPA.
- NFU would like Local Planning Authorities to have a better understanding of farming and the functioning of a modern farm and state that there will still be a need for additional rural dwellings to be built to support farming businesses.

Q3 Do you have any views on the amount of housing that we should be looking to allow in the coming years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of respondent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish/Town Councils and Meetings</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough/County Council</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land/Planning Agents</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest groups</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22 of the respondents agreed that the amount of housing being proposed by the proposed policy approach is appropriate i.e. 29 houses per year. 24 of the respondents however disagreed for a number of reasons. Generally those that disagreed considered that this was a very low rigid figure and that it is wrong to settle on one figure for such a long time as circumstances change;

- The CNP agreed with the amount of housing and considered that this number will meet local need while taking account of the constraints on the amount of housing that can be delivered in the National Park.
- The NYM Association also support the proposal to deliver 29 homes per year which they consider will meet local need over the coming years while taking account of the qualities of both the built and open landscape the National Park.
- NYCC comment that it is important to ensure that there is the appropriate provision of housing within the villages to help reduce further population decline. Whilst it is recognised that there is a need for smaller housing of one and two bedrooms there is also a need to ensure that the balance and mix of housing meets the full needs of society.
- One Parish Council indicates that they would like to see a limited amount of all three types of housing noting that a balance of open market housing should recognise the fact that retired and professional people are generally very supportive of a community and bring money into the National Park and its businesses.
- One resident considers that the balance is just right and that the policy has come at a good time.
- Three residents, and one planning agent comment that housing provision should include some specific assessment of different areas of need, notably those arising from the increasing ageing population in the Park who may need to move to single storey accommodation to extend the time they can live in their own home. They consider that if such housing were to be limited to those with a local need (i.e.; those with at least three years residence in the Park) the provision of homes within the Park suitable for the retiring/older/less able would in effect release larger/family homes with the National Park so adding to housing supply.

Those that disagreed did so for the following reasons;

- Scarborough Borough Council is concerned that there appears to be no potential housing near to the Scarborough Borough boundary and that this could put additional pressure on SBC Planning Area to pick up housing numbers. (The Borough also notes that OAN does cover the NP but only in respect of the demographic element of the OAN.)
- One Planning agent stated that additional housing schemes should not be refused if the local plan target has been met, especially if a scheme would meet local needs housing.
- Some respondents, including Helmsley Estate considered that the figure was too low and that more housing is needed to prevent the population decline, to prevent an increasingly ageing population and to ensure future economic growth in the National Park.
- Helmsley Estate further considers that the Park should not only encourage new dwellings for local people but should adopt policies which positively encourage inomers to the area.
• Some respondents suggest that by building more retirement homes that this would assist in freeing up larger family homes which would in turn help to reverse these trends.

• Helmsley Town Council agrees that 29 homes is too low a figure when there is such a national shortage of homes.

• Several respondents including a Planning agent and York Diocesan Board of Finance noted that if an average of 37 houses per annum have been successfully completed since 2008 and this has failed to halt, let alone reverse, the decline in population and the range of services available in the various settlements around the National Park, it is unlikely that a target figure of 29 housing completions per annum will do anything other than increase the tension between managing population growth and the retention of services that support sustainable communities. This will result in the decline of settlements as they become unviable and unsustainable. In this respect the respondents suggested that Option 2, which continues to meet past delivery rates since 2008, should be adopted.

• Wharfdale Homes overall comment that they are supportive of this increase but are concerned that this approach does not sufficiently respond to the housing needs of the existing community of the National Park nor is sufficiently responsive to the wider strategic context to provide for a suitably sustainable strategy. They comment that the failure of the Local Plan to address these issues now could lead to significant social and economic issues which adversely affect some of the key characteristics which help to define the qualities of the National Park. It is further commented that it remains unclear how the proposed housing requirement of 29 dwellings per year relates to the planned Woodsmith Mine, and what effect if any a failure to respond to this will have on house prices in the area. Wharfdale Homes consider that an assessment of this should be carried out ahead of the preferred options stage and that there is likely to be justification for an increase in the housing requirement above 29 dwellings per year. The exact level of this increase should be based on a reassessment of need undertaken through an addendum of the SHMA to assess the housing need required to maintain the level of active working population and families within the National Park, and have regard to the Potash Investment.

• The House Builders Federation comment that it is important that the National Park retains its vitality and places due weight upon its duty to; ‘seek to foster the economic and social wellbeing of local communities’. The HBF also consider that consideration should be given to the viability of other housing scenarios, not covered in the 2016 SHMA, which seek to address this loss of working age population over the period of the plan and that a figure greater than 37dpa is required to stem population decline. The HBF conclude that the suggested figure of 29 will fail to foster the economic and social wellbeing of communities and condemn them to economic decline and to a lack of housing opportunities.

• Mulgrave Estate also agree that the figure is too low and point out that around half of the new homes are already accounted for, which does little for choice. It is further added that there is no proposed contingency should those identified/allocated sites not come forward as expected. This the Estate say could undermine the Authority’s overall housing strategy and result in housing needs not being met, which would be contrary to national planning policy. The Estate comments that additional sites should be spread between Helmsley and the villages to allow for choice. The Estate further point out that receipts derived from the sale of land/property for development/redevelopment will help to fund the maintenance and preservation of the Estate’s considerable number of important heritage assets. They further add that if the rate of delivery continues as it has done recently there will be very little new houses being built in the latter years of the Local Plan period, which will affect the pipeline of supply for local builders. A higher figure will help to address the population imbalance and should slow down the house and rental prices. The Estate favour
Option 2 with an increase to at least 36/37 homes per year and comment that if the Local Plan has more flexibility in terms of conversions there could be many more unused buildings that could be converted to address the need. The Estate also comment that they are interested to know if the Park and the adjoining Districts met the area’s OAN and whether the current assumption that adjoining districts continue to assume that none of their identified need will need to be delivered within the Park’s boundaries, is still valid as this may affect the amount of homes needed in the Local Plan.

- Helmsley Estate and a Parish Council comment that lack of employment in the Park is key to population decline and now that settlements such as Helmsley have fast broadband more opportunities should be provided for business space where working people can live and work in the area.
- Other respondents comment more generally that what is needed is smaller affordable homes for first time buyers.
- Several respondents commented that there should be more flexibility to convert redundant buildings to small dwellings for rent in preference to additional holiday lets and that better use of the existing housing stock should be considered.
- Some commented on the occupancy rates and considered that it is better to ensure that new houses are occupied as sole or primary residence as this should ensure that anyone wishing to live and work in the area can do so and some were concerned at the number of second homes in the Park.

Further comments;

- Highways England has no objection to the level of housing that is currently proposed, and has no preference for any particular type of housing as this does not affect the Strategic Road Network. If any deviations from this policy were to occur whereby a large volume of housing was proposed that could potentially generate traffic to such a level that compromises the operation or safety of the SRN, this would be of concern and an impact assessment would be required.
- Northumbrian Water recommend that the capacity of critical infrastructure, including water and sewerage services, is considered at the earliest possible stage as development proposals are considered, including consultation with infrastructure providers
- The NFU welcomes proposals to change the way local housing need is calculated, if this results in a more accurate assessment of rural housing need, and more joined-up working between local authorities. The NFU specifically asks for this process to include an assessment of the needs of the rural community, including farmer family and rural workers’ needs.

Q4 Do you agree that new open market housing development should be limited to Helmsley and not permitted in any of the Villages? If not, please give your reasons and tell us what alternative you would prefer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of respondent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish/Town Councils and Meetings</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough/County Council</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land/Planning Agents</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest groups</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies (e.g. Natural England)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20 of the respondents agreed that open market housing should be limited to Helmsley and not be permitted in any of the villages. 24 of the respondents disagreed with the proposed policy approach and many of those who disagreed provided very detailed explanations, which are précised below. Of those who agreed with the proposed policy approach 14 stated that they agreed with no further comments, this group included 3 Parish Council, 2 non-resident respondents and 9 residents. Of the remaining supporters additional comments were provided.

- Council for National Parks stated that this approach will ensure that new housing development in the villages is delivering affordable housing required to meet local needs.
- The North Yorkshire Moors Association supports the proposed approach and states that this will restrict new housing development in villages to the kind of housing which will meet local needs, provided that Helmsley can absorb this amount of development.
- One non-resident respondent agreed on the basis that development should be concentrated in places with good services and connections, to reduce travel by private vehicles.
- A Parish Council and one resident agreed but stated that if this is where open market housing is to be concentrated Helmsley should have better facilities, additional parking and a broad retail structure to match its growing population.
- A further resident commented that high quality accessible housing for older residents should be provided to free up existing open market housing stock.
- Wharfdale Homes support the Authority’s proposal to continue to allow for open market housing in Helmsley. This approach they indicate is supportive of the settlement’s scale and function within the National Park and wider area, and recognises the scope and capacity for further development at this location. Wharfdale Homes question the decision not to allow further allocations in Helmsley as this would serve to extend the plan period. They state that the existing Helmsley Plan provides for a plan period of 2012 to 2027. However, the National Park Local Plan will extend this to 2035. The failure to identify further sites in the settlement through this process means that the location of new development in the settlement from 2028 will be restricted to only infill and rural exceptions sites. Wharfdale Homes state that this places a significant restraint on development in Helmsley and the capacity of the settlement to meet housing needs. They further add that this would leave a Policy gap of around 8 years. The allocation of further housing land at Helmsley will provide certainty in securing the development of housing in response to evidenced housing need, especially affordable housing this may as a result place pressure on the development of land in less sustainable locations and could see the Local Plan fail to meet housing needs in full. Wharfdale Homes query the counting of housing in Ryedale and state that a site they are promoting on Carlton Road is available, suitable and deliverable for housing now, and if allocated through the Local Plan, would be completed prior to the end of the plan period in 2035.

Those who disagreed with the proposed approach to housing tended to disagree strongly and provided very detailed comments. The general tone was that the proposed policy approach is too restrictive and curtails all open market housing outside Helmsley. It is considered by these respondents that open market development should instead be spread throughout all the villages in the Park although a high proportion of respondents considered it would be more appropriate to allow open market housing in the larger villages to meet local and family needs and this would help to support local services keeping communities sustainable and vibrant. One Parish Council and a Planning Agent point out that this mixed
approach would also allow for the viable provision of discounted local needs housing encouraging land owners to release land for housing. Respondents considered that the proposed approach would restrict the market resulting in an increase in house prices and local people will not then be able to afford them. This approach could also result in the over urbanisation of Helmsley resulting in the loss of its present character. These views were shared by Helmsley Town Council, Walkers are Welcome, one other Parish Council, 6 residents, one non-resident and a Planning agent. A further Planning agent simply stated that ‘this is a recipe for stagnation’ and one resident stated that this approach seems to present the idea that ‘only Helmsley can be considered worth making sustainable.’

- NYCC commented that in adopting an approach which prevents open market housing in locations other than Helmsley there is the potential to contribute to the loss of essential services within the villages. The County Council would be supportive of a balanced approach which would support appropriate levels of housing within local villages where there is a need to maintain their sustainability and services and where it would not conflict with the overall statutory purpose and aspirations of the National Park. Such an approach could seek to permit limited open market housing where there is an identified need with a proportion being allocated for local needs housing. NYCC further commented in relation to school provision that the proposed hierarchy limits the opportunities for housing developments in the villages within the Park. Many of these villages have schools that are small and their finances are sensitive to reductions in pupil numbers. Falling rolls because of changing demography in rural areas, due partly to a lack of affordable housing for young families, means small schools face very tough financial challenges. For this reason the County Council also takes every opportunity to remind planning authorities like the National Parks and district councils that if village schools are to survive then communities themselves must remain sustainable through a range of housing provision.

- Helmsley Estate comments that open market housing should not be restricted to Helmsley alone. The policy should allow the opportunity to provide for open market housing where this would offer the potential to improve the vitality of settlements and the viability of the services which they contain. The Estate further comments that open market housing should be allowed in appropriate locations in villages, the Estate suggest that a policy whereby they were not permitted to be second homes could be introduced, so new housing was occupied. The Estate considers that local occupancy brings no new blood to an area and this results in communities with limited opportunities for new initiative or employment generating ideas. The Estate considers that the current LDF policy is accurately reflected by the declining population.

- A further resident similarly disagreed with the proposed policy approach and agreed that open market developments should be spread around the Park, but with a primary residence restriction. The respondent considers that this would help to keep villages economically viable. If no open market houses are allowed then the price differential between the Park and surrounding areas will only increase and this would not be a positive development as it will further distort the population of the Park.

- A Parish Council close to the Woodsmith Mine development points out that economic growth will stimulate the need for housing. Workers and their families should be encouraged to live in the National Park preferably near the mine and spend their money here, not commute from Teesside or West Yorkshire.

- York Diocesan Board of Finance and a local land owner similarly comment that in order to meet housing needs across the Park, it is essential that a variety of types and tenures of dwellings are supported during the Plan period. Restricting new homes in villages to affordable units only would limit new homes coming forward as landowners need a scheme to be viable to release land for development. York
Diocesan Board of Finance and the local land owner support a range of homes coming forward (including local occupancy dwellings) across the Park. Villages should not be restricted to affordable homes only, particularly to address the declining population since 2001 and the ever aging population present in the Park.

- A Planning agent comments that the fact that the majority of housing completed in recent years has been affordable or for local needs is seen as a successful outcome of recent planning policy, this does not however appear to have been effective in stemming the decline of local services such as schools, shops and public houses. The planning agent further comments that even though the policy of allowing cross-subsidy between open market and affordable housing is suggested to have been ineffective in promoting significant development, it should not be discarded as a tool to stimulate appropriate interest in particular locations or circumstances. It should be part of a spectrum of policies that will deliver housing creatively in locations that can accommodate development without harming the essential character of the Park.

- The House Builders Federation considers that in order to provide a balanced mix of opportunities and the potential to attract in-migrants to improve the economy and social wellbeing a more flexible approach to policy is required. Whilst the HBF considers that it appears reasonable to focus the majority of market and affordable provision within the larger settlements it is considered limited opportunities should also be provided within smaller settlements.

- Mulgrave Estate strongly disagrees with the suggested restriction of no open market housing in any of the Villages. The Estate considers that the Local Plan needs to provide choice and that the Option 2 or 3 should be adopted to allow for limited market homes in Villages, including ‘starter homes’ and ‘build to rent’ homes. The Estate comment that the Authority’s stance of not allowing starter homes because only 20% of people could afford them, is not a sufficient reason not to include them in the policy and believe that there are still 20% of people who would benefit from a starter home, and if more were to be provided they are likely to become more affordable. The Estate sees merit in some market homes being tied as ‘principle residence homes’, on schemes where market homes cross-subsidise affordable housing but suggests it does not need to be exclusive, and a policy of allowing some open market houses, as well as principle residence houses to cross-subsidise affordable housing should be included.

- Mulgrave Estate further considers that assessing Lythe as one of the 61 ‘villages’ is unsound and a list of the services/transport links/employment opportunities that it provides to a wide area is set out. The Estate suggests that the proposed approach is unsound and that this fundamentally undermines Lythe’s current role as an important rural service centre as a result it should be categorised as a Rural Service Village at least. To do otherwise will exert a significant harmful effect on the vitality and viability of the local community over the next Plan period. The Estate considers that the Local Plan should accommodate this need by allowing the allocation of small scale market and affordable housing development within the village. Furthermore the Estate adds that the Settlement Hierarchy and supporting Policy should not predetermine that there should be no market housing whatsoever in these key rural service centres. The Estate urges that more flexibility is given to allow small scale developments within well serviced villages such as Lythe in order to provide support for the future vitality of these villages given the current ageing population within the NYMNP. The Estate believes that this will support the vitality of settlements by accommodating new families and younger people, prevent migration and result in schemes that are viable, it will also help to improve the setting of heritage assets by enabling redundant farm buildings to be redeveloped. The Estate considers that current and proposed policy is sterilising development in otherwise well serviced villages such as Lythe and this should be reassessed.
Further comments

- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust comment that there may be some villages where larger developments will have less impact on wildlife and biodiversity and this should also be taken into account.

Q5 Do you agree that the existing affordable housing exception site policy should be continued? If not, please give your reasons and tell us what alternative you would prefer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of respondent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish/Town Councils and Meetings</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough/County Council</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land/Planning Agents</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest groups</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies (e.g. Natural England)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 of the respondents positively agreed with the existing affordable housing exceptions policy, 6 strongly disagreed and several of the respondents suggested changes to the way the current policy operates. Those who agreed

- The CNP and the North York Moors Association stated that if exception sites were to be used for general market housing it would drive up the price of land and limit the NPA’s ability to deliver the kind of affordable housing required to meet local needs and therefore supported the housing exception site policy.
- One Parish Council stated that affordable housing is critical for those poorly paid who are essential to the culture and economy of the area, support for them is important and the Authority should ensure that these needs are met.
- NYCC responded that the provision of affordable homes is a key issue across North Yorkshire and is essential in helping to support key sectors of the local economy. The new Local Plan can contribute to delivering the York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Housing Strategy, particularly by ensuring that local needs are met within the rural areas and small settlements. A significant proportion of affordable housing has been delivered through the affordable housing exception policy and the County Council would support it being taken forward in the new plan.
- The NFU states that establishing exceptions sites through the Local Plan can add certainty to the process and allow land owners to plan their businesses.
- One resident urged the construction of two storey affordable dwellings and refers the Authority to National Guidance which states that affordable homes should be the main focus, but not exclusively and that other issues such as conservation and sustainability are also key areas of concern.
- Other respondents who supported the policy suggested that exception sites should be restricted to larger villages which can support and service further development and one Parish Council stated that the Woodsmith mine should be taken into account.
- One Planning agent supported the policy but urged that occupancy should be strictly limited to local people (usually from within the Parish) and should not be to meet more general housing needs or make unsustainable provision for people with their family and social networks and employment well away from the dwelling.
A number of additional general comments were submitted relating to homes on exceptions sites:

- One Parish Council, speaking from their own experience and a separate resident agreed with the principle of exceptions sites but commented that sites on the edges of villages away from facilitates and amenities can create practical difficulties and can be more difficult to socially integrate with the community. (The same Parish Council also commented that some of the IUS in their area would conflict with the future delivery of housing.)
- Walkers are Welcome comment that affordable housing, either for rent or subsidised purchase, should not mean that it is less attractive or in a less suitable area and a mixed housing development is preferable.
- One resident responded that exceptions sites should be built alongside affordable housing to secure modest developments in the larger villages to help retain schools and the future economic viability of local services. This should be a truly mixed but modest development offset by a small element of open market housing and government grant.
- A further resident states that in small villages ‘affordable housing’ is met with opposition, it is suggested by the resident that the definition of ‘affordable housing’ should encompass the small private developer who is prepared to build small houses available to rent or buy at a discounted price. The respondent considers that such developments would be more likely to meet with acceptance in small villages. On a similar point a further resident states that the proposed 100% affordable on exceptions sites is too strict and further states that housing associations and builders are not interested in small sites and these sites should also include self-build houses.

Those who disagreed made the following comments:

- Mulgrave Estate do not agree with the proposal that just 100% affordable housing schemes are the only acceptable larger schemes outside of Helmsley and believe that the Authority’s reasoning for not including cross-subsidy schemes is flawed. The lack of schemes coming forward in the past should not be a reason for not including it as an option in the next Local Plan, which after all is intended to have an end date of 2036. The viability of cross-subsidised schemes could increase, if other policies in the next Local Plan are more flexible, for instance the occupancy condition policy. Furthermore the Estate comments that the next Local Plan cannot ignore the Government’s emerging definition of Affordable Housing. The Estate considers that the Local Plan should include a provision to enable market homes to help cross subsidise the delivery of affordable homes; and that the Local Plan should reflect the Government’s emerging definitions of Affordable Housing.

This is a key theme of several of the responses many believe that there should be the potential to provide mixed open market homes and affordable houses on these development sites.

- One planning agent agrees that affordable housing exception sites should be retained as part of a palette of policies aimed at stimulating housing provision. He further adds that it has clearly been successful in generating housing numbers but has not necessarily produced tangible benefits in terms of halting the decline of village services fundamental to the vitality and viability of settlements and communities. This viewpoint is shared by a further planning agent who believes that a better approach would be to build a range of housing types and condition and that these that these houses may not be used as the basis from which to build extensions.
and therefore larger homes, in this way people will have to move as their families grow.

- One resident comments that a balanced supply of housing is needed and the current policy is skewing that balance.
- One further planning agent supports the policy but commented that it should also incorporate an allowance for enabling development (open market housing) which secures the delivery of the affordable homes.
- Scarborough Borough Council also responded in a similar way and stated that that whatever method is taken forward it should accord with the NPPF and therefore allow some form of private development where scheme viability is an issue. Viability has become an increasing issue in the development of affordable housing; especially given rural housing tends to be more expensive to develop, in the first place, for a variety of reasons. In addition, build costs have increased by approximately 30% in the last 4-5 years. Whilst the Current Thinking paper states that the 100% affordable housing policy has been working in the delivery of affordable housing in the Park since 2008, this hasn't necessarily been the case in the last 2-3 years. RP's have stated that they are struggling to deliver small 100% affordable rural schemes recently and across the whole of the sub-region, the majority of affordable housing being delivered in rural areas in now through S106 schemes rather than 100% affordable schemes. As an example of the difficulties faced, a scheme at Aislaby for 6 affordable houses had to be abandoned 2 years ago, as it simply could not be made viable even with Borough Council putting in extra money from commuted sums to support it. If 1 or 2 open market homes had to be included in the scheme, it would probably have made the scheme viable and ensured the delivery of 4-5 affordable homes to meet local housing need.
- Helmsley Estate agree that the principle of exception sites is good but there needs to be more economic sense for landowners to promote land as there is currently little incentive to bring forward land for exceptions sites.

Q6 Do you have any views on whether we should apply local occupancy restrictions and if so on our suggested way forward? Please give your reasons or tell us what alternative you would prefer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of respondent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish/Town Councils and Meetings</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough/County Council</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land/Planning Agents</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest groups</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies (e.g. Natural England)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 of the respondents agreed with the imposition of local occupancy conditions and the suggested amendments. 7 respondents disagreed with the principle of local occupancy conditions and therefore disagreed with the proposed amendments.

Those who agreed with the imposition of local occupancy conditions include;

- The NYM Association and the CNP who consider that the restrictions are essential, with the amendments suggested, given the cost of housing in relation to average household incomes and the high demand for second and holiday homes in the
National Park. They consider that it is important that affordable housing is available for those who live and work in the area.

- One resident comments that the National Park does not need new unaffordable housing built to satisfy those who wish to retire here and a further respondent states that it should be a case of ‘local homes for local people’.
- Community First Yorkshire stated that if the occupancy conditions are in place this can help sustain other local services, the retention and attraction of young families in particular might mean that the local school, shop and clubs for young people are supported.
- One planning agent suggested that local occupancy should be applied in a more sustainable way differentiating between the smaller, less sustainable villages and the larger more sustainable ones.
- Two Parish Councils and two residents support the introduction of a Principle or Permanent Residence restriction, in place of occupancy conditions in order to get local people back into local housing.

There was general agreement from those who were supportive of the imposition of local occupancy conditions for the suggested amendments to the local occupancy criteria.

- NYCC consider that the amendments will enable a more flexible approach that will assist the local labour force and more broadly support the well-being of local communities.
- Scarborough Borough Council supports the reduction to 3 years as this aligns with their proposed criteria for local connection test for self-build.
- A planning agent and the York Diocese (Board of Finance) welcome the amendments as this they state would be more flexibility to live and move around the National Park and would be more in line with other Councils/Authorities across the County.
- A further Parish Council supports the amendments.

Whilst there was general agreement from those who were supportive of the imposition of local occupancy conditions there were a number of respondents who suggested either that the criteria should remain the same or suggested further amendments;

- Two residents suggested that the current 5 year restriction should be retained and not reduced.
- One Parish Council however considers that the definition of "local" needed to be narrower than simply "someone that lives in the National Park". They favoured changing the definition to local as being within a certain distance of the parish rather than being within the National Park boundary.
- A further Parish believes that local occupancy restriction should include those who are working in towns just outside, or as in Whitby’s case, totally surrounded by the National Park, who although they do not work in the National Park, they still serve the population of the Park, e.g. teachers at secondary schools in Whitby, hospital staff at Brotton and Guisborough. Those in the buffer zone should be included in the local occupancy criteria.
- A planning agent considers that the criteria discriminates against families who live in villages such as Scalby, Sinnington or Felixkirk close to the Park boundary who cannot be considered for new dwellings or conversions which might be in Hackness, Hutton le Hole or Bolby. At the same time, someone living in Osmotherley can be considered for a property in Hackness at the opposite end of the Park. He questions whether the definition of local should be within a certain distance of the property rather than within the Park boundary and further states that if occupancy conditions
are to be continued in to the Local Plan local should mean local in the true sense of the word.

- One resident considers that the criteria should be broadened to include those that have previously been employed in the National Park or those who own land together with those who have lived in the same District or County.
- Walkers are Welcome are concerned that the criteria do not encourage anyone to move into the area to meet employment needs unless they can afford the house prices on the open market and this creates an insular community. They state that if a person is working in the area surely they should be eligible.
- Mulgrave Estate acknowledge that the reduction to three years is preferable to the current criteria and state local occupancy conditions can be used as an alternative to economic reuse of redundant buildings in the open countryside or smaller villages but should not be necessary within their proposed Rural Service Centres as a blanket approach. Mulgrave Estate support the approach as a method of delivering housing for an identified local need outside of the Service Centres and larger settlements but do not believe it is necessary within the sustainable settlements as this is sterilising development and restricting the introduction of families and those wanting to live and work in the more sustainable villages such as Lythe. Mulgrave Estate generally supports the continued principle of Local Occupancy Condition in the right locations.

Those who are opposed to the imposition of local occupancy conditions disagree largely on the basis that the National Park needs to attract new people and new businesses into the area as all communities benefit from an influx of new people at some time, and restrictions should not prevent increasing prosperity in the National Park. The following comments were received;

- One resident pointed out that reviews of Local Occupancy in the UK National Parks and other places found that it did not achieve the objectives and that it restricted development and made mortgages difficult to obtain. In this regard the preferred way to reduce second homes was to adopt permanent residency or main residence which was not so unfair and restrictive of movement.
- The HBF state that the National Park is losing population and to stabilise this and maintain the vitality of the Park alternative methods of delivery are needed. They recommend that the eligibility criteria and ‘cascade’ allow for a flexible approach and that exceptions to local occupancy may be appropriate in certain circumstances. The HBF further state that inappropriate local occupancy criteria can create issues relating to the marketing and saleability of properties, including accessing mortgages, which inevitably have implications for site viability and delivery.
- Mulgrave Estate concur with this view and state that occupancy conditions are negatively impacting on the viability of some development schemes. The Estate further state that this approach is stifling sustainable development; and is part of the cause of some of the problems that Park is suffering from, namely the lack of lack of sufficient suitable homes particular for young people. This approach they state also makes conversions economically unviable. They consider that it should be replaced with a requirement that an appropriate proportion of new market housing should be for Primary Residences only. If retained it should not have an existing continual resident requirement and there should be no time requirement for employment i.e. those who have permanent seasonal jobs should not be excluded.

On a wider issue one Parish Council considers that local needs housing should not be restricted to infill sites. Such sites are minimal in number and availability; they alone will not fully meet the needs of the existing population. Small undeveloped but available and deliverable sites within or on the edge of existing settlements should be considered for local need housing.
Q7 Do you agree that there should be size restrictions for new local needs housing and that large extensions should be resisted? Do you agree with the proposed limits? If not, please give your reasons and tell us what alternative you would prefer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of respondent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish/Town Councils and Meetings</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough/County Council</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land/Planning Agents</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest groups</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies (e.g. Natural England)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question was answered either jointly, covering both issues, or respondents separated the two issues out. There were 20 who supported the proposal to restrict new local needs housing to a specific size (93sqm) but 19 respondents strongly disagreed with this policy approach. With regards to the proposal to restrict the size of new extensions 16 respondents agreed with this approach and 15 disagreed. Those who agreed with both proposals concluded that restricting the size of new local needs housing and extensions will help to ensure the availability of housing of an appropriate size to meet the identified needs.

- The North Yorkshire Moors Association agreed that it is important to have size restrictions and to meet the need for smaller homes giving a range of flexibility for affordable homes.

Those who disagreed or expressed concern with both proposals considered that each application should be taken on its own merits, taking into account the character of the area, and that such a policy may impinge on lifestyles and choices and furthermore that larger extensions and larger houses will free up smaller homes as people move into them.

- Scarborough Borough Council fear that such a policy may mean that expanding families may be pushed out of the National Park over time if they cannot find accommodation or extend their home. Scarborough Borough Council suggests that the status quo of considering on an individual basis is a better option.

- One resident comments that what is needed is flexibility to reflect changing population movements, work opportunities and demographic needs, and that the NYM should not be a ‘Museum’.

Specific comments were made in relation to the proposal to restrict the size of local needs dwellings.

- Wharfside Homes stated that the size of housing should not be restricted up front within the Local Plan but be based on up-to-date evidence or needs, and reflect site conditions and the character of the surrounding area.

- The Home Builders Federation commented that the Authority will need to ensure that the proposed limits do not limit the aspirations of local people, or limit the potential for new younger residents to provide or take up economic opportunities within the National Park, particularly in relation to appropriately sized family homes. It is
therefore recommended by HBF that if a policy is provided which restricts the size of local needs housing there should be some form of flexibility built in.

- Mulgrave Estate consider that the proposed policy should not be taken forward but if it is it should only be used alongside a primary residence policy in lieu of/instead of a local occupancy policy.
- One resident commented that the market needs as defined by a Parish Survey should set the size and mix to cater for families as well as young single people and older people too.
- One Parish Council did not agree with the small size of the restriction on affordable housing as this does not form an attractive settlement having all houses huddled together and this would be out of character with the settlement.
- Walkers are Welcome states that housing sizes should not be restricted and limiting the size of houses ‘leads to miserable lives, conflict, lack of hobbies and laziness.’

Turning to the proposed restriction on the size of extensions some strong views on this were received. There was a strong feeling that extensions should be determined on their own merits on a case by case basis. The following responses were received;

- One respondent states that in some cases this might mean no extension should be permitted; in other cases more than 30% might be acceptable.
- A further resident comments that large extensions to any property need to be considered against the size and scale of the host building. As such there may be nothing wrong with a large extension on a large farmhouse or detached dwelling but this would not be the case on a terraced cottage which will destroy the character of that host building. Planners should not actively seek to depress the local housing market by preventing owners from extending their properties. If there are insufficient properties of a particular size, more of them should be permitted for construction.
- York Diocesan Board of Finance and a Planning Agent conclude that it is important that the Park plans provide a mix of different sizes of dwellings in accordance with the needs identified in the SHMA and extensions can help to address the variety of need.
- Two Parish Councils comment that extensions should be flexible to allow changing family situations e.g. ‘Granny flats’ and other multi-generational needs.
- One Estate strongly disagrees and comments that design guide already controls the design of extensions successfully, and this would impose a double restriction again stating that each application should be taken on its own merits.
- One resident considers that there should be stronger restrictions.

Further comments;

- Natural England advises that design should be carefully considered for new dwellings and extensions in relation to landscape and visual impacts. The plan should set out clear policies on design in relation to landscape character.
- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust states that some areas may be less sensitive to larger developments than others due to proximity to sensitive sites.

Q8 Do you agree that we should introduce some more flexibility to policy on conversion of rural buildings so that they don’t have to be historic and can be used for local occupancy housing? If not, please give your reasons and tell us what alternative you would prefer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of respondent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37 of the respondents positively supported the introduction of more flexibility in the conversion of redundant buildings for local occupancy as they see this as a way of providing a use for a wider range of buildings and as a way of bringing forward more homes for local people. The following general comments were received;

- NYCC welcomed a more flexible approach provided there is adequate infrastructure; the development supports the needs of the community, avoids impacts on local employment opportunities and makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
- Campaign for National Parks urges that any conversion should contribute to the special qualities of the NP and that significant alterations/extensions which would have visual impacts should not be allowed. The priority they state should be for delivering affordable housing for local people and they support conversions for owner occupation.
- Several residents and one Parish Council considered that the tourism market was saturated and that as the holiday season is short this can lead to empty properties and that therefore allowing conversions for local people at a time when population figures are declining is a better way forward.
- One resident stated that conversion for local occupancy is better than for sale on the open market as it ensures long term use for local needs.
- Many including planning and land agents who generally supported the proposed policy stated that the housing should not just be for local occupancy and that the homes should be available for sale on the open market.
- One agent commented that the local occupancy criteria are in any case too restrictive.
- One agent agreed with the local occupancy criteria and said the homes should be for those in the same parish.
- Several respondents including the York Diocesan Board of Finance, NFU, land agents and residents commented that as the cost of conversions is higher than new build the imposition of local occupancy conditions will mean that some of these conversions may not go ahead without additional funding and the buildings will deteriorate further making future conversions even more unlikely. All conversions need to be viable in accordance with the NPPF.
- The NFU further commented that homes should be available for people with local connections and those seeking work in the locality they also commented that policy should also be in line with the new Historic England advice on the repair and re-use of historic buildings. They further confirmed that they are asking the Government to change PD rights to allow tourist accommodation to be changed to rural workers dwellings and requesting that farm houses should be able as PD to be divided these measures would in their opinion help to improve the supply of rural homes.
- Mulgrave Estate supports the proposed flexibility but feel the policy is still too onerous. The policy should allow for farm buildings, whether traditional or not and irrespective of location to be converted to new homes for sale or rent, without occupancy conditions and to tourism and business uses. It should also allow for greater flexibility in terms of openings/materials to allow them to be brought back into

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parish/Town Councils and Meetings</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough/County Council</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land/Planning Agents</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest groups</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies (e.g. Natural England)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
use. Unless more flexibility is allowed redundant buildings will be left to rot and go beyond the ability to be re used.

A number of respondents expressed concern about the proposed policy;

- Several residents, a planning agent, a parish council were of the opinion that conversions should be limited to buildings of historic merit which make a positive contribution to the National Park and that any proposal should only be allowed if the design is appropriate and traditional materials are used.
- One resident comments that conversions of Dutch barns are tantamount to rebuilding.
- One resident went further and said that this flexibility could be used to proliferate housing in the open countryside and change the character of farms and villages.
- One Parish Council commented that too much flexibility can lead to ‘planning creep’.

The following further comments were received;

- Historic England commented that a robust set of criteria will need to be set out in order to minimise the potential harm to the special qualities of the National Park and regard should also be had to the cumulative impact of such conversions on the landscape character. PD rights should also be removed to control the impact of the conversions on the landscape.
- The NYM Association commented that conversions should contribute to the special qualities of the National Park. In addition as long as priority is given to delivering affordable housing for local people they support conversions for owner occupation as well as renting.
- One resident commented that provision should be made for continued or alternative accommodation for bats, barn owls, swifts, swallows and all other wildlife.

Q9 Do you agree with the approach to infill development that we are suggesting? If not, please give your reasons and tell us what alternative you would prefer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of respondent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish/Town Councils and Meetings</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough/County Council</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land/Planning Agents</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest groups</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies (e.g. Natural England)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 of the respondents had no objections or positively supported the amended approach to infill development mainly on the basis that it makes sense to have a more flexible policy and to make better use of some of the spaces available for infill. This approach would also result in a better mix of dwellings. Some respondents who were supportive said care was needed to ensure that development should be appropriate in terms of scale; design and open spaces should be maintained. Respondents pointed out that infill can make a positive contribution to achieving sustainable local communities and maintaining local services, facilities and economic activity.

Many of those who were not supportive of the approach considered that infilling should not be restricted by what they saw as an arbitrary, artificial, unnecessary number. Each
application should instead be determined on its own merits with the effects of the
development being the key consideration. The following comments were received;

- One Estate commented that there will be instances where the infill of more than 2 homes will be appropriate and deliverable without impacting on the character of a village. In addition if the Authority is seeking to increase the amount of small homes coming forward in the Park, artificially restricting the ability of an infill site to deliver a maximum of only 2 homes may not make the best and most efficient use of available land; may render schemes unviable and may be counter-productive in terms of the aim to deliver more smaller homes. In this respect infill should be related to the size of the gap as opposed to the number of dwellings.

- A further Estate commented that there should be more potential in the larger/more sustainable settlements for a larger scheme as long as the new housing is for local needs only, these schemes should be judged on their own merits and should be developed in the most effective and efficient manner.

- The HBF concur and whilst the proposed approach is considered by them to be an improvement on the existing policy they consider that it still appears rather arbitrary and lacks the flexibility required to deal with the wide range of sites which may come forward and provide valuable sources of housing supply. The HBF further suggest that an amended definition of infill could be read ‘a small gap within a continuously built up frontage within the main built-up area of the settlement’. This definition would also be more in keeping with Policy H2 of the recently adopted Helmsley Local Plan.

- Some planning/land/agents and a Parish Council consider that the designation of IUS would hinder any development opportunities on land which under any other circumstance, could help accommodate some future small scale residential development in sustainable locations throughout the Park. As such it has been suggested that these designations (IUS) and emerging housing policies are in direct conflict.

With regards to the definition of ‘infill’ the following comments were received;

- Historic England has commented that it will be necessary to set out a robust policy framework against which applications might be considered in order to ensure that this policy does not result in the loss of areas which ought to remain undeveloped. In this respect they consider that further Conservation Area Appraisals will be needed to assist in providing context for development proposals.

- One Land Agent also commented that infilling should include development within clusters of buildings not within just established frontages and one planning agent suggested that there are some agricultural development/building complexes where the wider community would benefit from them being developed for housing.

- One Parish Council considers strongly that there is a need for infill sites to be developed in their village with open market housing as otherwise they will not be developed.

Q10 Are you aware of any sites that are either previously developed or ‘brownfield’ or where redevelopment would improve the character and appearance of the National Park?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of respondent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish/Town Councils and Meetings</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough/County Council</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land/Planning Agents</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents generally agreed with the Brownfield Land Register and the redevelopment of sites that are ‘eyesores’. The following comments were received:

- The NFU and Land agents request that consideration should be given to including redundant farmyards on the BLR and to the redevelopment of land adjacent to farmsteads for exceptions housing to increase opportunities for development in rural areas. They further state that many farmsteads are empty and not fit for modern agricultural purposes and whilst not aligning with the definition of brownfield land they are opportunities to improve the appearance of the National Park. The Local Plan needs more flexibility to allow the conversion of these buildings to housing (primary residence), tourism and business uses. Not all conversions can be for business use and some flexibility is needed.
- One Parish Council stated however that development of any ‘brownfield’ or agricultural building site must be appropriate.
- A further Parish Council requested that each Parish Council should be able to review its own housing needs to maintain a thriving community, development should be an important part of this whether brownfield or greenfield land.
- One Parish Council suggested that the time limit for commencement of development on planning permissions should be reduced to 2 years and then reduced to one year then be totally removed.
- A separate Parish Council commented that some of the potential redevelopment sites have been identified as Important Undeveloped Spaces without consultation and the knowledge of the land owners.
- Specific sites/land has been identified by Parish Councils, individuals and land agents identified as brownfield land in the following locations; Osmotherley, Coxwold, Ingleby Arncliffe, Battersby, Castleton, Fylingthorpe, Faceby, Goldsborough, Boltby, Sneaton, Egton, Hinderwell, Glaisdale, Lealholm, Egton, Castleton all of which could be re used for housing, business uses, car parking or community uses.

Q11 Do you agree with the types of land that we are proposing to identify as ‘Community Spaces’? If not, are there any types that you would like to see added or removed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of respondent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish/Town Councils and Meetings</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough/County Council</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land/Planning Agents</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest groups</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies (e.g. Natural England)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was broad agreement for the identification of Community Spaces with 26 of the respondents stating their positive support for the approach and agreement for the types of
land. Some requested that school playing fields, village halls, land adjacent to footpaths, registered common land, wooded areas adjacent to villages and the Cinder Track should also be included. The following comments were received;

- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust commented that areas which are important for biodiversity should be included and an individual also requested that sites that act as community nature reserves should also be included.
- Natural England stated that the designation and protection is welcomed as green spaces are important and these areas could have multifunctional opportunities for recreation, preserving landscape character and biodiversity.
- Community First Yorkshire commented that narrow strips of land either side of public footpaths could be included within Community Spaces to retain ‘views’ and to widen access, create space for seating and for maintenance purposes, They further state that footpaths are part of Pathways to Health initiatives taking place across the county and an increase use of paths can be anticipated.
- NYCC confirmed that access to open space is important for public health and community well-being.
- Some Parish Councils and individuals requested the addition of extra designations on specific sites in Battersby Junction, Carlton in Cleveland, Cloughton, Coxwold, Egton, Ingleby Greenhow, Levisham, Osmotherley, Staithes, Thornton le Dale, Wass.
- Some respondents requested that the following types of land should not be included; private gardens, schools or school playing fields, agricultural land, land used as a pet cemetery.
- A Parish Council pointed out that some flexibility may be needed with playing fields as a sport facility may no longer be needed in the future.
- There was strong opposition to the inclusion of private allotments and facilities that are available by private arrangement between a land owner and a sports club.
- One respondent queried why spaces outside the National Park mentioned when these are beyond the control of the Authority.
- Sport England provided detailed comments on the need for the policy approach to protect, enhance and provide sports facilities based on need.
- A Land agent commented that care should be taken as landowners may be reluctant to offer other sites in the future for community uses if the land is to become sterilised in the future for any other purpose.
- One individual considered that some of the sites could be redeveloped to enhance the character and appearance of the National Park and that some of the spaces identified could be redeveloped and good design and landscaping could enhance their appearance. Car parks for residents and visitors could be created in these areas. Protecting all the spaces within villages means that the only way a village can developed is through an extension beyond its limits which is less desirable. These areas should not be a ‘no go’ for development and a neighbourhood plan is needed with gradual release of sites and this should not be restricted by designation.

Q12 Do you support the identification of Important Undeveloped Spaces? Do you have any views on the criteria we have used or whether others may be more suitable?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of respondent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish/Town Councils and Meetings</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough/County Council</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land/Planning Agents</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was general support for the proposed policy with 33 of the respondents supporting the approach and the spaces identified. Overall those who were in support thought that this policy will ensure that the Park’s special character is not harmed. The following comments were received;

- Historic England supports the proposed approach and the criteria that will be used to identify Important Undeveloped Areas. The inclusion within the Local Plan of a policy framework to safeguard such areas will help to ensure that this element of the Park’s special character is not harmed.
- Natural England welcomes the criteria.
- Several respondents made the point that open spaces are an important aspect of any built environment and that this policy will help to ensure that these areas are properly defined and relevant to the community.
- One Parish Council requested that consideration be given to an additional space being designated as an IUS or CS.
- One individual commented however that care must be taken so as to avoid a presumption that land undesignedated as Important Undeveloped Spaces has less protection from development.
- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust stated that an additional criterion could be added if the space is important for providing connectivity for wildlife and Green Infrastructure in the settlement.

Some respondents (11) however, including some individuals and land agents/planning agents strongly objected to the approach as they considered the approach will rule out most potential development sites and it is effectively a ‘blanket ban’ on any infill development. The following general comments were received;

- The designation seems inconsistent, arbitrary and open to interpretation and subjectivity.
- The current Local Development Framework approach, where each application is considered on its own merits, is sufficient and there are enough current safeguards to manage inappropriate development.
- Individuals and land/planning agents considered that protecting spaces for their openness alone runs the risk of eliminating opportunities to positively enhance the character of settlements and maintaining thriving communities with affordable housing.
- The approach could also result in pushing development further out to the edges of settlements and this was not thought to necessarily be the best option.
- A number of respondents considered that some of the spaces identified should be developed carefully with appropriate landscaping and creative design and that this would have a more positive impact than the retention of an open space.
- Scarborough Borough Council and a Parish Council considered that some of the IU Spaces should be developed for affordable housing.
- The NFU indicated that some land owners are concerned about the impact of designations on their businesses.
- Several respondents, including several Parish Councils strongly requested that consultation should have taken place with land owners before spaces were identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest groups</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies (e.g. Natural England)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specific objections were received from Land agents/Borough Council/Parish Councils and individuals to IUS in Carlton in Cleveland, Castleton, Egton, Fylingthorpe, Ingleby Greenhow, Helmsley, Lockton, Lythe, Sneaton.

Q13 Have we identified the right areas? Have we missed any?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of respondent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish/Town Councils and Meetings</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough/County Council</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land/Planning Agents</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest groups</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies (e.g. Natural England)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 of the respondents confirmed that right spaces had been identified, 2 stated that the spaces were not right.

- There were several requests from individuals and Parish Councils for additional Important Undeveloped Spaces to be designated in Egton, Coxwold, Oswaldkirk, Eskdaleside cum Ugglebarnby, Aislaby, Ravenscar, Lastingham.
- Two members of the public, three including the one in question 12 above considered that the Cinder Track should be identified as an IUS so that its natural beauty and recreational value is protected from development.
- One respondent stated that wider views over the Park should be included like the views from Sutton Bank. One Parish Council requested that Village Halls should be included as Community Spaces.

Further Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of respondent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish/Town Councils and Meetings</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough/County Council</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land/Planning Agents</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest groups</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies (e.g. Natural England)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents used this part of the questionnaire to reinforce their overall comments and provide further comments on a number of new topics and the following comments were made;

- The Coal Authority states that at this early stage they have no specific comments to make but wish to continue to be consulted. Highways England states that it has no particular concerns regarding the proposed housing policies as the total number of dwellings proposed is a relatively low number when considering the vehicle trip generation from these dwellings in relation to the capacity of the Strategic Road Network that serves the National Park and their spatial distribution will minimise traffic implications at a single location. Even taking into account the number of dwellings in Helmsley due to the anticipated vehicle trip generation from these and
the distance from the first point of contact with the Strategic Road Network, it is anticipated that this will not be a significant issue for Highways England. Should any changes to this policy be proposed which would potentially generate traffic to such a level that compromises the operation or safety of the SRN, this would be of concern and an impact assessment would be required.

- NYCC (Strategic Policy and Economic Growth) refer to the Council Plan 2017-21 which sets out the key ambition that ‘North Yorkshire is a place with a strong economy and a commitment to sustainable growth that enables our citizens to fulfil their ambitions and aspirations.’ NYCC set out their priorities which include;
  - Creating high quality places and increased housing provision – in partnership with District Councils, National Parks, Local Enterprise Partnership and Local Nature Partnership – by supporting the delivery and development of housing and employment sites, and the regeneration of town centres;
  - Enhancing the environment and developing tourism and the green economy – by promoting and improving the county’s environmental, ecological and heritage assets to deliver a high quality natural and built environment, and by supporting low carbon energy generation and the development of economically, socially and environmentally sustainable local communities.

NYCC state that the National Park is a key asset for North Yorkshire not only in terms of the environment and natural capital but for the contribution it makes to the local economy through tourism, recreation and leisure. NYCC also comment that working on a catchment basis enables natural capital solutions to be delivered within the Park which have the potential to mitigate flooding issues and increase resilience of places, communities and economies further downstream. NYCC look forward to further opportunities to engage as the Plan progresses.

- Community First Yorkshire (CFY) request that that the Local Plan should take account of a number of changes and opportunities across the Park and give examples of the use of ICT in health and wellbeing support and installation of ICT communication in homes and communities, measures to help sustain and bring services to settlements, enterprise growth and home working opportunities. CFY also state that the consultation makes no reference to meeting the needs of older people, climate change, rural deprivation and the extra costs of living in a rural area. CFY also comment that the 3 tier hierarchy should be a basis for sustaining and developing the integration of services, and the National Park should consider what steps and procedures the National Park can take, working with local authorities and town and parish councils, to work with providers of facilities in ‘local service centres’ to ensure they are retained and sustained. The National Park is asked to Rural Proof the plans in accordance with the Government’s Rural Proofing policy paper.

New topics raised by respondents related to the nature of the consultation process, the planning service, fracking, tourist accommodation, Botton, the Cinder Track, further general housing comments, the possible allocation of land in Swainby adjacent to the Caravan Park for housing, the splitting of villages with the Park boundary and other local issues. The following very briefly summarizes these issues;

- Consultation process – Two residents and one Parish Council considered that there was insufficient time given to read and respond to the consultation particularly given the length of the on line documents, one resident considered that some of the documents were biased in terms of the focus on affordable housing and two residents considered that the document was not published widely enough. One Parish Council felt that the questions were difficult to address and they were not able to reach a consensus as such individual councillors were asked to respond individually. One Parish Council considers that the proposed policies are a subtle relaxation of planning regulations and that the consultation exercise is being used as
a rubber stamp to justify the predetermined positions of the NYMNPA. One resident wished to congratulate the Park on the quality of the documentation.

- Planning service – The NFU asks that the Authority ensures that planning departments and statutory consultee services are sufficiently resourced to promptly deal with planning applications and offer quality pre-application advice. The NFU would recommend that pre-application fees should be deducted from a future planning application cost to encourage this to inform the planning application process.

- Fracking – A number of respondents stated that fracking is the biggest threat to the Park’s economy, flora and fauna and should be dealt with robustly. Respondents stated that it should not be allowed in the Park or in the surrounding area. FFR look forward to the opportunity to comment further in the following stages of consultation.

- Tourist Accommodation – One resident/business owner comments that there should be no more caravans/log cabins and prefab homes allowed as these are not sustainable have a limited lifespan and are detrimental to the landscape. Any new buildings should be of traditional materials. The respondent considers that there should be more housing attractive for the full spectrum of buyers and this would be better for the local economy.

- Botton – One resident responded that Botton is not specifically mentioned and assumes that it is to be considered as ‘Open Countryside’. Given recent changes the respondent considers the lack of any special policy consideration to be appropriate.

- The Cinder Track – One non-resident requests that the Cinder Track be included in the Plan so that its potential as a recreation, educational and environmental resource may be realised.

- General housing comments - A number of respondents reaffirmed the need for housing for the elderly, stressed the importance of maintaining the viability of rural communities, and requested measures to reduce second homes, increase opportunities for generating employment in the larger settlements and to create spaces for people to work at home with increased use of ICT and the digital economy thereby reducing the need to travel. One resident states that permanent residency is preferred by mortgage companies in preference to local occupancy.

- Land at Swainby adjacent to the Caravan Park – One planning agent requests that an area of land adjacent to the Caravan Park in Swainby be considered suitable for housing development as in his opinion the land appears to be in accordance with housing objectives being relatively affordable, having minimal impact on the character of the village/National Park and it would specifically contribute to the supply of a much needed form of housing for occupancy by the over 45/50s at a time when there is a great need to increase the supply of such properties. The Planning agent states that there should be acknowledgment of residential mobile homes by way of Clause 124 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 which recognises such units as having a role in contributing towards the supply of housing.

- Additional localised comments – One resident questions why some villages are split with the National Park boundary, meaning that different policies apply. Villages should be either in or out the National Park. One resident comments that Sleights’ butchers and bakers have been missed from the list of facilities. One Parish Council questions whether an IUS should be within the Conservation Area and a further Parish Council query the correct name for a dwelling in the village. One resident expressed concerns regarding increased traffic and increased commercialisation of shooting in the Park.
If you would like further information, please contact us:

Planning Policy – policy@northyorkmoors.org.uk
Development Management – planning@northyorkmoors.org.uk

01439 772700

northyorkmoorsnationalpark
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North York Moors Local Plan
Discussion Paper
Draft Policies on the Historic Environment

1. Introduction

1.1. This paper has been prepared to seek the Development Plan Working Group Members' views on the proposed Historic Environment policies which will form part of the emerging Local Plan. The issues for consideration in developing this area of policy are discussed and the draft policies wording and explanatory text are set out in Annex A.

1.2. Please note that the draft Local Plan will go through various stages of consultation and testing and therefore nothing in this background paper should be taken to represent a definitive future direction of policy.

2. Existing policy

2.1. The Authority's existing policies relating to the historic environment are contained in Section 7 of the Local Development Framework and are outlined in full in Appendix B. These policies consist of an over-arching core policy (Core Policy H: Landscape, Design and Historic Assets) and 4 subsequent development policies:

- Development Policy 4: Conservation Areas;
- Development Policy 5: Listed Buildings;
- Development Policy 6: Historic Parks and Gardens; and
- Development Policy 7: Archaeological Assets

2.2. There are several other policies within this section, namely Development Policy 3: Design; Development Policy 8: Conversion of Traditional Unlisted Rural Buildings; and Development Policy 9: Advertisements which will be replicated in the emerging Local Plan but do not form part of this particular discussion.

3. Aims for a revised policy in the new Local Plan

3.1. The current policies have been working well, as can be seen in tables 1 and 2 below which outline the use of these policies in planning application and appeal decisions, and therefore it is important that this trend continues.

3.2. However, since the Core Strategy was adopted in November 2008 the NPPF takes a different, single approach to the conservation of heritage assets and the assessment
of their significance, regardless of the type of asset being considered and the planning consent being sought. In short, this means that the assessment of proposals relating to heritage assets is the same regardless of the type of asset being affected (e.g. whether proposals relate to conservation areas, listed buildings or archaeological assets). The draft planning policies below have been prepared on this same approach in order to be consistent with the NPPF.

Table 1: Use of historic environment policies in the decision making process, since the adoption of the Core Strategy and Development Plan policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>No. Approved</th>
<th>No. Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPG: Landscape, Design and Historic Assets</td>
<td>1,073 (91%)</td>
<td>102 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP4: Conservation Areas</td>
<td>1,132 (93%)</td>
<td>85 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP5: Listed Buildings</td>
<td>908 (94%)</td>
<td>61 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP6: Historic Parks and Gardens</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP7: Archaeological Assets</td>
<td>27 (82%)</td>
<td>6 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL AVERAGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,143 (93%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>254 (7%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information taken from November 2008 to 31/03/2017

Table 2: Use of historic environment policies in the appeals process, since adoption of the Core Strategy and Development Plan policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>No. of appeals dismissed</th>
<th>No. of appeals allowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPG: Landscape, Design and Historic Assets</td>
<td>26 (84%)</td>
<td>5 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP4: Conservation Areas</td>
<td>19 (90%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP5: Listed Buildings</td>
<td>12 (80%)</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP6: Historic Parks and Gardens</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP7: Archaeological Assets</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL AVERAGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>57 (84%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>11 (16%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information taken from November 2008 to 31/03/2017

3.3. The NPPF also introduces non-designated heritage assets which are locally significant buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions but which are not formally designated heritage assets. As the vast majority of assets within the National Park will be non-designated heritage assets this area of the historic environment will need covering in our new policies.

3.4. There is also a need in the Plan as a whole to cover the Heritage Coast and therefore consideration has been given to the inclusion of a specific policy to cover the historic elements on the coast.

4. Draft policy and explanatory text

4.1. A set of potential policies and supporting text is included at Annex A.
5. Possible alternative approaches

5.1. The next key stage of the Local Plan process is the ‘preferred options’ stage where draft policies are published for consultation along with an explanation of why the preferred policy approach has been chosen over alternative options. In the case of the proposed heritage policies, officers consider that there are generally two other options available;

1. Maintain the same approach as identified in the Local Development Framework and have separate policies for the different heritage assets types. The assessment criteria and consideration of impact on the significance of the asset would however be the same and therefore there would be a substantial amount of text duplication across the policies.

2. Alternatively have a ‘designated heritage asset’ policy and a 'non-designated heritage asset' policy. However again, the assessment criteria and consideration of impact on the significance of the asset would be the same – the only difference being that where non-designated assets are involved, a balanced judgement is required having regard to the scale of harm and the significance of the asset.

5.2. We consider that, as protectionist policies many of the policies have no realistic alternative in terms of their intent and hence we will not consult of alternative options on a policy by policy basis. Instead, policies will be subject to testing through sustainability appraisal to see if any improvements can be made.
Draft Historic Environment Section

Protecting and enhancing the historic environment is important to maintaining the distinctiveness and sense of place of the North York Moors. Local heritage contributes to the identity of the area and strengthens connections between people and places. We recognise the importance of the historic environment to the character of the area and to the quality of life of the people who live here. We also recognise that it is an economic asset to the area. We want to maintain and strengthen our commitment to protecting and making sustainable use of the historic environment.

Overview of the Policies:

- Spatial Policy – refers to the whole of the historic environment and identifies the 4 key areas of the historic environment for which there is an accompanying development policy.
  1. Historic Landscape Assets
  2. Archaeology
  3. Historic built environment
- Helping to reuse designated heritage assets at risk

Strategic Policy SPH: The Historic Environment

All development proposals affecting the historic environment should make a positive contribution to the cultural heritage and the local distinctiveness of the North York Moors by ensuring new development and changes of use do not individually or cumulatively erode the rural character and Special Qualities of the North York Moors or the special interest, integrity and significance of any heritage asset and/or its setting, whether designated or non-designated, including:

a) Features that contribute to the historic landscape character of the North York Moors National Park (Policy ENV8);

b) Archaeological sites and monuments, comprising both upstanding and below-ground assets including, Scheduled Monuments and regionally or locally important non-designated monuments (Policy ENV9);

c) The historic built environment including Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings and regionally or locally important non-designated structures and buildings (Policy ENV10);

All such proposals should be accompanied by a proportionate assessment of the significance of the assets and features which would be directly or indirectly affected by the proposal.

The impact of the proposed development on the significance of the asset will be taken into account in determining the application. Where development proposals are likely to cause substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets or other assets of national significance, development will not be permitted. The only exception to this is
where there is clear justification in terms of overriding, long term public benefit arising from the development which outweighs the harm caused, and which also meets the following requirements:

a) There is no less harmful viable option; and

b) The amount of harm has been reduced to the minimum possible.

Where non-designated heritage assets are affected, a balanced judgement will be taken having regard to the scale of any harm or loss on the significance of the asset and other material considerations.

Development proposals and changes of use which would individually or cumulatively erode the National Park’s local character or result in a gradual suburbanising effect within the National Park will not be permitted.

Explanation:

The North York Moors comprises a rich and varied landscape in which 10,000 years of human activity can be identified through, for example, a wealth of archaeological features, traditional vernacular buildings, historic features such as boundary stones and waymarkers, the fabric of settlements and associated field patterns, and relics of industry all of which contribute to the distinctive character of the North York Moors and which are identified among the National Park’s special qualities.

Cultural heritage was also cited in the 1947 Hobhouse Report as one of the reasons for the North York Moors’ designation as a National Park, commenting on the wealth of architectural interest and in particular noting the picturesque villages and monastic ruins.

The Authority recognises that as well as creating a clear identity for the area and strengthening the connection between people and places, the built environment is also a huge economic asset to the area as it helps bring in visitors to the National Park. The Authority will therefore place great weight on the need to protect and enhance the historic environment of the North York Moors National Park.

The purpose of Policy SPH is to set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment across the whole of the National Park, including both designated and non-designated heritage assets as individually and collectively these features contribute to the cultural and historic character of the North York Moors. The policy contains two key principles.

1. The first is that the Authority will expect that development proposals respect the wider character of the National Park, rather than focusing solely upon the impact on an individual asset.

2. The second is that the maintenance of local distinctiveness is an important element in managing the built environment. Proposals should result in a form and appearance of development which is recognisable as part of the North York Moors, and is linked to its particular history, economy and culture.
Policy ENV8: Historic Landscape Assets

Development proposals affecting the historic landscape assets of the North York Moors will be required to conserve and enhance its landscape quality and character, and the public’s experience of it, including:

a) Registered Parks and Gardens;
b) Other designed landscapes;
c) Battlefields;
d) Medieval street patterns and garths;
e) The layout of traditional farmsteads and their relationship with their surroundings;
f) Ridge and furrow and other evidence of past field systems and farming practices (including isolated features such as sheepfolds and limekilns);
g) Other landscape features such as mature or veteran trees, hedges and historic boundaries and enclosures and other important character elements;
h) The open, unenclosed character of Common Land;
i) Evidence of historic mining and other historic industries;
j) Features of the Heritage Coast such as harbours, harbour walls, slipways (anymore features to mention?);

Development proposals will only be permitted where they do not harm the character, integrity or setting of historic landscape assets.

Explanation:

The distinctive character of the North York Moors is made up of not only individual assets but also locally important features which cumulatively contribute significantly to the landscape quality of the North York Moors.

Small scale changes to buildings, settlements and sites take place continually, responding to changing values, fashions, availability of products and new technology and although change is inevitable it may be to the detriment of those features which give the North York Moors its particular character. It is therefore important that all development proposals consider the impact on the many features which contribute to the historic landscape of the National Park as an integrated whole, as well as upon individual assets.

The Authority’s Landscape Strategy is central to the wider appreciation and understanding of the North York Moors landscape. It provides an evaluation of the landscape character areas and the capacity of the landscape to accept change and should be used to help inform proposals with the aim of reinforcing local distinctiveness.
Policy ENV9: Archaeological Heritage

There will be a presumption in favour of preservation in-situ for Scheduled Monuments and non-designated archaeological heritage assets of national, regional and local significance.

Proposals for development that would have a harmful impact on the character, integrity or setting of a Scheduled Monument or a non-designated site considered to be of national significance will not be permitted.

In the case of sites and monuments which are of regional or local importance, development proposals will only be permitted where the archaeological interest is capable of being preserved in situ and where there is no negative effect on their character or setting.

In these cases, excavation and recording in advance of development, secured through an agreed Written Scheme of Archaeological Investigation, will be required.

The Authority will require applicants to provide sufficient information to allow an informed assessment of the significance of the archaeological heritage asset and its setting, and the impact of the proposed development on that significance.

The Authority will require all archaeological works to be undertaken to proper professional standards, as defined by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA).

Explanation:

The archaeological heritage of the North York Moors represents a finite and non-renewable resource that helps us to understand our past. It can however easily be damaged or destroyed by development, and once lost cannot be replaced.

There are over 800 monuments in the National Park which have statutory protection as Scheduled Monuments, but there are over 20,000 known non-designated historical and archaeological sites and features recorded, many of which are yet to be fully understood.

The Authority does not wish to see the needless loss of archaeological sites and monuments. It aims to protect all sites of regional and local importance and their settings, as well as those of national importance. Archaeological heritage assets of regional and local significance may collectively constitute a nationally important cultural landscape.

Information on known archaeological sites and monuments is available on the Authority’s Historic Environment Record (HER). However, this is not a definitive record of all archaeological remains in the National Park. Many assets are yet to be identified or properly understood. Applicants should therefore ensure that they consider the heritage implications of their proposals regardless of whether archaeological remains have been previously identified, as new sites may be identified during the heritage assessment phase.
Policy ENV10: Built Heritage

Development proposals affecting the built heritage of the North York Moors, which includes Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings and also non-designated heritage assets such as buildings with architectural and historic significance, should reinforce the distinctive historic character of the North York Moors by fostering a positive and respectful relationship with traditional local architecture, materials and construction.

High standards of design and construction will be promoted to conserve or enhance the built heritage, settlement layouts and distinctive historic, cultural and architectural features.

Development proposals should:

a) Preserve the significance and heritage values of assets affected;

b) Look for opportunities to better reveal or enhance significance;

c) Preserve the setting of assets affected, including key views, approaches and qualities of the immediate and wider environment that contribute to its value and significance;

d) Conserve and enhance the character of settlements including buildings, open spaces, trees and other important features that contribute to visual, historical or architectural character;

e) Reinforce the distinctive qualities of settlements through the consideration of scale, height, massing, alignment; design detailing, materials and finishes;

f) Respect the integrity of the morphology of historic settlements including boundary and street patterns;

g) In the case of new uses, ensure the new use represents the optimal viable use of the asset compatible with its conservation, and which meet the requirements of Policy ENV13: Conversion and Change of Use of Rural Buildings.

h) In the case of adapting assets for climate change mitigation, be based on a proper understanding of the asset and its material properties and performance, and of the applicability and effectiveness of the proposal. Proposals should not harm the heritage values of any assets affected.

Development proposals that fail to take account of the historic built environment and its assets, fail to make a positive design contribution, or cause damage to the character and quality of an area will not be permitted.

Explanation:

This policy establishes a clear presumption against proposals that result in loss of or harm to the significance of designated and other heritage assets of national or regional importance. Such proposals will be required to present clear and compelling justification for accepting loss or harm. A more flexible approach is adopted for the remainder of non-designated assets, although the expectation is still that development proposals will take opportunities to
conserve and enhance significant features wherever possible, and to avoid negative effects on character, integrity and setting.

The level of development pressure in the National Park is evidenced by the number of planning applications received by the Authority each year, averaging 725 applications per year (over a five year period). Whilst the vast majority of these applications entail small-scale household development, if not properly managed the cumulative impact of inappropriate development can result in an incremental suburbanisation of the National Park, gradually eroding its distinctive character.

This Policy includes assets which are recognised through formal designation such as listed buildings and conservation areas which benefit from statutory protections, but also non-designated assets of local or regional significance that contribute to the special qualities of the National Park. These assets are particularly vulnerable to inappropriate change or loss due to their lack of specific protection and therefore this policy seeks to ensure that these currently non-designated features are not overlooked in planning decisions.

Responses to climate change may require adaptations to historic buildings. Whilst these changes may help to ensure the continued preservation of the building, it is important to ensure that they are not ineffective, inappropriate or damaging. Measures to mitigate climate change, including the application of renewable energy technologies to historic buildings or within conservation areas should not harm the heritage values of the asset.

Information on identified heritage assets is available on the Authority’s Historic Environment Record (HER). However, this is not a definitive record of all heritage assets in the National Park. Many assets are yet to be identified or properly understood. Applicants should therefore ensure that they consider the heritage implications of their proposals regardless of whether heritage asset has been previously identified, as new assets may be identified during the heritage assessment phase.

The Authority will produce guidance to assist in the identification of significant non-designated heritage assets to help ensure consistency and certainty for developers in the application of this policy.

Applicants should also cross reference Policy*** which identifies important undeveloped spaces within the settlements identified in the Settlement Hierarchy.

**Policy ENV13: Helping to reuse designated heritage assets ‘at risk’**

Where development would secure the long-term future of a designated heritage asset on the At Risk Register and is otherwise in conflict with the Development Plan and meets the tests outlined in National Guidance¹ (referred to as enabling development), the Authority will assess whether the public benefits of securing the conservation and reuse of the asset significantly outweigh and disadvantages associated with departing from other policies within this Plan.

Proposals will be required to provide evidence that all other possibilities of funding to

¹ Enabling development and the conservation of significant places, Historic England, 2010.
secure the conservation and reuse of the building have been exhausted.

In exceptional cases, this policy could be applied to a non-designated heritage asset agreed to be exceptionally worthy of conservation and reuse and which has been proven to be seriously at risk of imminent collapse or further decay.

Explanation:

Enabling Development in the historic environment context is development that would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms but for the fact that it would bring heritage benefits sufficient to justify the undertaking, which could not otherwise be achieved. The heritage benefits of the proposed development should outweigh the dis-benefits of departing from other policies within the Local Plan.

The Authority undertakes regular monitoring of the condition of all the Listed Buildings within the National Park and operates a Historic Buildings Grant to assist with the maintenance of buildings which are at risk of deterioration or loss. The Authority is also prepared, where necessary, to use its statutory powers to limit further deterioration. As such, the vast majority of Listed Buildings will not be considered eligible for this Policy as there is either an option of grant assistance to maintain the building in sound condition or where the building has deliberately been neglected and left to fall into disrepair the Authority will take action through the relevant powers available. This Policy should therefore only be considered as a last resort and after extensive communication and consultation with the Authority to try and find alternative uses.

The Policy establishes a presumption against enabling development unless ‘it is demonstrated that the amount of enabling development is the minimum necessary to secure the future of the asset, and that its form minimises harm to other public interests’. Enabling development should therefore be primarily directed towards meeting the conservation deficit arising from repair and conversion work that is essential to secure the long-term future of the asset, including making it fit for purpose and marketable, or that is essential to sustain an historic entity. That may, of course, involve reversing changes that are so harmful to character and value that they are essential to achieving those ends. Restoration and enhancement that goes beyond that threshold should therefore normally be limited to work that adds as much or more to value as it does to cost, and so does not increase the need for enabling development; but there will be exceptions where substantial public benefit can be achieved at minimal public cost.

Unlike buildings or structures, planted landscapes tend to deteriorate slowly and can be recovered after a longer interval of neglect. The restoration of such landscapes per se will not normally justify enabling development, but, subject to all the criteria of the Policy, securing the future of important historic buildings and structures (including the main house) within them may do so.

In such circumstances, it is likely to be appropriate to re-establish the framework of the landscape, and elements crucial to accessing and enjoying the buildings; and through the section 106 agreement to put in place a long-term conservation management plan within which further elements of restoration may take place incrementally, as opportunities arise.
and Environmental Stewardship or other funding becomes available. Obligations that ‘run with the land’ can be particularly important in ensuring that such landscapes are not subsequently lost through the effects of divided ownership or damaged by intrusive uses outside planning control. But as with buildings, it is desirable to seize any opportunity to achieve substantial public benefit at minimal public cost.

Historic England has produced very thorough guidance on the sorts of situations in which it may, or may not, be appropriate. The Policy outlined by Historic England in its publication “Enabling Development and the Conservation of Significant Places” should be used to assess whether a proposal meets the requirements of this Policy and early engagement with the Authority is recommended to help develop proposals.

**Policy ENV15 - Important Undeveloped Spaces**

Within areas designated on the Policies Map as an “Important Undeveloped Space”, there will be a presumption against development unless a proposal can demonstrate that the development will not result in the loss of, or significantly harm, its qualities or functions.

**Explanation:**

The distinctive character of the North York Moors villages are derived from a number of inter-related historical and architectural features including the relationship between buildings and spaces, views along streets and between buildings, traditional street patterns and layouts and the design detailing and materials of traditional buildings.

As a protected landscape, the geology and landform of the North York Moors is such that the wider landscape frequently makes a significant contribution to the character of its villages. The moorland, hills and dales form a magnificent backdrop to all of the North York Moors villages and the topography generates many long-distance views towards the settlement. The distinctive form of upland villages is such that the landscape frequently extends into the core of a village. It is the combination of these features that gives each village its own distinctive character and quality.

Undeveloped spaces within villages make a significant contribution to local communities and contribute to the rural character of the North York Moors village environments. Settlements which reflect their agricultural, fishing or mining past and locally distinctive buildings and building materials are also two of the ‘special qualities we have identified as making the North York Moors National Park the place it is.

This policy, together with Important Undeveloped Spaces identified on the Policies Map is intended to ensure that important spaces in villages are protected from development to preserve their special character. Spaces have been identified on the basis that they fulfil one or more of the following criteria:

- The space makes a positive contribution to the overall form, character and appearance of the settlement;
- The space makes a positive contribution to the setting of a building or groups of
buildings either listed or of historical or architectural interest;

- The space provides a vista/viewpoint into the surrounding countryside;
- The space provides a visual relief in a settlement where there is a change in the pattern or character of development;
- The site has archaeological or historic interest;
- The space provides an open setting for a visually important tree(s) or is important for biodiversity.
North York Moors Local Plan

Draft Policy on Quality and Design of New Development

1. Introduction

1.1 This paper has been prepared to seek Development Plan Working Group Members’ views on the proposed Local Plan policy on Quality and Design of New Development. The issues for consideration in developing this area of policy are discussed and the draft policy wording and explanatory text are set out at Annex A.

1.2 Please note that the draft Local Plan will go through various stages of consultation and testing and the nothing in this background paper should be taken to represent a definite future direction of policy.

2. Existing policy

2.1 The Authority’s existing design policy is contained in Development Policy 3 of the Local Development Framework which is reproduced at Annex B. The policy has seven criteria which cover various aspects of design which are common to the design policies of most planning authorities. The policy is one of the most used by the Authority, applying as it does to many forms of development.

3. Aims for a revised policy in the new Local Plan

3.1 Development Policy 3 has proved to be a workable policy and it will be important not to lose the detailed policy requirements it contains.

3.2 However, despite the Authority’s efforts to raise the standard of design of new development in the National Park – through adoption and publication of the Design Guide and the introduction of Design Awards – officers consider that there is still scope for a better quality of design in the proposals put forward for planning permission. In too many cases, designs are acceptable but do not really enhance the local built environment. Designs are sometimes let down by poor detailing, for example in window treatments.

3.3 There is an opportunity in the new Local Plan to encourage a higher standard of design and construction in the National Park and the proposed new policy addresses this by:

   a. Requiring proposals to be of a high quality design as the first criterion within the policy and requiring good quality construction materials and detailing as the second;
   b. Bringing into the policy wording a requirement that applicants demonstrate that their proposal is in accordance with the Authority’s Design Guide – at present, the Guide is simply referred to in the supporting text;
   c. Making it clear in the explanatory text that applications must be supported with a professional standard of drawing and encouraging applicants to employ consultants with good design expertise;
   d. Expecting certain development proposals, particularly larger ones and significant proposals in very sensitive locations, for example, Conservation Areas, to be subject to a Design Review process, along the lines
recommended by the Design Council (which was merged with the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) in 2011). Making greater use of the review process should help to raise standards among local architects and agents and give a more structured appraisal of the merits of larger and more significant schemes.

3.4 It is also proposed that the new design policy is included as one of the strategic policies in the Local Plan and included 'upfront' near the beginning of the plan, as a means of reflecting the importance the Authority will place on proposals needing to comply with it.

4. **The Design Guide**

4.1 The Authority’s Design Guide is an adopted Supplementary Planning Document in five parts. It gives detailed advice on good practice for design within the National Park and is an integral part of the proposed new policy.

4.2 For the most part, advice in the Design Guide remains relevant although references to uPVC and aluminium windows and doors need to be updated in line with the Authority’s current approach which allows good quality versions in certain circumstances. Officers are currently checking the Guide to identify whether any other details need to be updated and to check references to legislation, regulations, other organisations and documents. Members are asked to support this ‘light touch’ review of the Design Guide over the coming months.

4.3 In order to ensure that the updated Design Guide remains part of the Authority’s adopted Development Plan, officers propose re-consulting on the revised version prior to the publication stage of the new Local Plan. The revised Guide can then be adopted by the Authority at the same time as the Local Plan.

5. **Village Design Statements**

5.1 Village Design Statements for Osmotherley and Thimbleby, and Hutton Buscel have also been adopted as Supplementary Planning Documents and are referred to in the explanatory text to the proposed policy. Since it is not suggested that these documents should be altered in any way, it will not be necessary to re-consult or ‘re-adopt’ these documents.

6. **Possible alternative approaches**

6.1 The next key stage of the Local Plan process is the ‘preferred options’ stage where draft policies are published for consultation along with an explanation of why the preferred policy approach has been chosen rather than any alternative options. In the case of the proposed design policy, officers do not consider that there are any reasonable alternatives to requiring a high standard of design and construction and it would therefore be artificial to suggest possible alternative approaches.

7. **Next Steps**

7.1 Members are asked to give their views on the draft policy on Quality and Design of New Development at Annex A and to support a light touch review of the Authority’s Design Guide.
Annex A – Proposed policy for the new Local Plan

Draft Policy SP6 Quality and Design of New Development

To maintain and enhance the distinctive character of the National Park, development will be permitted where:

1. The proposal is of a high quality design that will make a positive contribution to the local environment in accordance with the principles set out in the North York Moors National Park Authority Design Guide;

2. The proposal incorporates good quality construction materials and design details that reflect or complement the local vernacular;

3. The siting, orientation, layout and density of the proposal complement existing buildings and the form of the settlement, preserving or enhancing views into and out of the site and creating spaces about and between buildings which contribute to the character and quality of the locality;

4. The scale height, massing and form of the proposal are compatible with surrounding buildings and will not have an adverse impact upon the amenities of adjoining occupiers;

5. Sustainable design and construction techniques are incorporated in the proposal including measures to minimise waste and energy use and where appropriate use energy from renewable sources;

6. A good quality landscaping and planting scheme which reinforces local landscape character and makes use of appropriate native species forms an integral part of the proposal;

7. Provision is made for adequate storage and waste management facilities;

8. The proposal ensures the creation of an accessible, safe and secure environment for all potential users with appropriate car parking provision and without compromising local highway safety or public rights of way.

Explanation

New development today represents the cultural heritage of future generations and should always be of the highest quality. Its design and location should respect the character and pattern of existing settlements and the principles of local traditional building in order to ensure that the character and local distinctiveness of the built environment is maintained and the landscape of the Park conserved and enhanced. All proposals should use good quality construction materials and display a high standard of design that makes a strongly positive contribution to the locality.

The Authority does not wish simply to replicate the past and stifle innovation or originality. Modern interpretations of traditional design elements are encouraged and more contemporary, modern designs will be supported where they are sympathetic to their surroundings, reinforcing local distinctiveness and adding variety to the Park’s built heritage. All designs, whether traditional or modern, should have visual interest and applications should demonstrate how the proposal has been informed by the Authority’s Design Guide. Window treatments in particular make a big difference to the overall appearance and character of a building and should be specified with care.
New buildings should be long-lasting and adaptable, able to take account of people’s changing needs over time. They should be designed to give good accessibility for all potential users including the elderly, wheelchair users and those with children and they should not be vulnerable to crime. Principles of sustainable design should be incorporated including measures to reduce energy use, manage and recycle waste and make use of sustainable drainage systems. Development should also facilitate the efficient use of natural resources in construction and make use of recycled materials wherever possible.

Opportunities to provide green infrastructure should be taken and a landscaping and/or planting scheme should be provided with most applications. The aim should be to link the proposed new development with its surroundings, enhance biodiversity and create high quality private and public space as appropriate. It should be noted, however, that good design should avoid the need for screening planting.

Proposals within villages should respect the historic character of the settlement, taking account of traditional plot sizes, boundary lines and green spaces including verges which give many villages within the National Park an open form. Schemes should be designed around existing features that add to the character of the area, for example, trees, traditional boundary features or historic outbuildings so that they can be retained rather than demolished. Local natural stone is the most commonly used traditional construction material and will often be appropriate for new developments. It is important that the stone is of the same geological type as that which is prevalent in the locality and is coursed and jointed in a traditional manner with suitable mortar joints and mortar mix.

The treatment of boundaries is particularly important and traditional features including hedges, fences and stone walls should be kept where possible. The style of any new fencing should be chosen with care, especially in locations at the edge of villages which feature in views into the settlement. Two metre close boarded fencing will look out of place in many National Park locations. Care should also be taken with the detailing of new accesses and highway infrastructure. Excessive or inappropriate use of kerbing, road marking, lighting and signage can introduce a suburban appearance which detracts from the rural character of the National Park. Attention to such details will help to maintain and enhance the sense of place within the Park’s villages.

All proposed new developments should include good storage and facilities to manage waste efficiently in a way that does not detract from the external appearance of the building and avoids the need for additional structures to be added on later. Similarly, any renewable energy features, for example solar panels, should be thought about in the initial design rather than being added as an afterthought.

Supporting information accompanying planning applications should be proportionate to the location and what is being proposed. However, even for small scale developments, the Authority expects a high standard of drawing and all applicants are encouraged to employ consultants with design expertise when formulating proposals. Applications for larger developments, many proposals falling within Conservation Areas and those which require listed building consent will need to be accompanied by a Design and Access Statement. This should demonstrate how the principles of good design, including those set out in this policy, have been incorporated and how the development will be accessed by all users. A design review process may be appropriate for larger schemes or for those in particularly sensitive locations and may be required by the Authority, in which case the applicant would be
expected to cover the costs of the review. In such cases applicants are also encouraged to engage with the local community.

A number of settlements in the National Park have prepared Village Design Statements which have been adopted by the Authority as Supplementary Planning Documents. The guidance in these documents will be taken into account when considering planning applications in these settlements and the Authority will work with other communities that may wish to develop a Village Design Statement. Some Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans have also been adopted by the Authority and the guidance in these documents will also be taken into account.

**Annex B**

**Existing Development Policy 3 – Design**

To maintain and enhance the distinctive character of the National Park, development will be permitted where:

1. The siting, orientation, layout and density preserves or enhances views into and out of the site, spaces about and between buildings and other features that contribute to the character and quality of the environment and will not result in the loss of an open space which contributes to the amenity, character and setting of a settlement.

2. The scale, height, massing, proportion, form, size, materials and design features of the proposal are compatible with surrounding buildings, and will not have an adverse effect upon the amenities of adjoining occupiers.

3. A high standard of design detailing is used whether traditional or contemporary, which reflects or complements that of the local vernacular.

4. Provision is made for adequate storage and waste management facilities.

5. Good quality sustainable design and construction techniques are incorporated in the development including measures to minimise energy use and where possible use energy from renewable sources.

6. A satisfactory landscaping scheme forms an integral part of the proposal.

7. The design takes account of the safety, security and access needs for all potential users of the development and provides car parking provision in line with the standards adopted by the Authority.