



North York Moors National Park Local Plan

HEARING STATEMENT

Matter 8 Communities - Strategic Policy L / policies CO1-CO5

Prepared by: John Long for

The Mulgrave Estate

16 October 2019

Table of Contents

- 1 INTRODUCTION.....1
- 2 RESPONSE TO INSPECTOR’S ISSUES.....2
 - Strategic Policy L2
 - Policy CO12
 - Policy CO22
 - Policy CO33
 - Policy CO53
- 3 CONCLUSIONS.....3

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This hearing Statement has been prepared by John Long Planning Ltd, on behalf of the Mulgrave Estate. It relates to representations submitted on behalf of the Estate to the NYMNP Local Plan (pre-submission version). The Statement provides information and responses to the Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions For examination published in September 2019. The Mulgrave Estate is a major landowner and employer in the National Park, and has a large portfolio of over 200 properties and other commercial and farming interests in the Park and employs around 40 people.
-

2 Response to Inspector's Issues

Strategic Policy L

Matter 8, Issue 8.1 **What is to be understood by the term “unacceptable adverse impact” on a community facility?**

- 2.1 It is assumed that an ‘unacceptable adverse impact’ is one that would result in the community facility not being available for use, or which would eventually result in the community not being available for use. The words: ‘loss of’ adequately seems to cover the intention.

Policy CO1

Matter 8, Issue 8.2 **Should the wording of the second sentence of this policy be consistent with that of Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework)?**

- 2.1 Yes, if the policy is to remain as part of the Plan. However, a significant proportion of this policy repeats other policies in the Plan and/or National Planning Policy. For instance, the references to affordable housing and conserving the natural beauty and wildlife are already covered by other policies and do not need to be repeated in this Policy. If the intention of the Policy is to refer to infrastructure it should confine its criteria to that, rather than duplicating elements of other policies.

Matter 8, Issue 8.3 **Is the policy effective in articulating what criterion a) is seeking to achieve? “The least harmful option” when compared with what?**

- 2.2 The criteria should also acknowledge that viability should also be regarding when considering the options. Similarly, the Policy (and not just the supporting text) should also acknowledge that development viability is an important consideration in determining the amount of contributions/ that will be sought, particularly as the Policy does not include details of the levels of contribution that will be requested. The level of contributions sought should not render schemes unviable.

Matter 8, Issue 8.4 **Does the list of criteria require an “and” after criterion b) to be effective?**

- 2.1 No comment.

Policy CO2

Matter 8, Issue 8.5 **Is the title of the policy justified given that the content is about highways, not transport?**

- 2.1 No comment.

Matter 8, Issue 8.6 **Does the list of criteria require an “and” after criterion 2 to be effective?**

- 2.1 No comment.
-

Policy CO3

Matter 8, Issue 8.7 **Is the plan clear about by whom the “parking problems” should be identified?**

- 2.1 It is assumed that identifying parking problems will be done in a collaborative way by those proposing new parking and the Authority/surrounding Authorities taking into account any parking strategies and/or acknowledged parking problem hot spots.

Matter 8, Issue 8.8 **Does the list of criteria require an “and” after criterion 3 to be effective?**

- 2.1 No comment.

Policy CO5

Matter 8, Issue 8.9 **Is it effective to locate in the supporting text (paragraph 7.21) what appears to be worded as policy, having particular regard to the fact that the policy itself does not talk about suitability or viability?**

- 2.1 No Comment.

3 Conclusions

- 3.1 The Plan’s Communities approach needs clarification on the application of the various policies. Certain policies need more flexibility and a more supportive approach to development.